

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 42965
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Conditional Use Permit No. 3763
Lead Agency Name: Riverside County Planning Department
Address: P.O. Box 1409, Riverside, CA 92502-1409
Contact Person: Dionne Harris
Telephone Number: 951-955-6836
Applicant's Name: Khurana Family LLC
Applicant's Address: 7201 Micacle Mile, Riverside CA 92506

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Description:

The Conditional Use Permit proposes to permit the new construction of a gas service station and 1,960 square foot convenience store with the sale of beer and wine (Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) License Type 20) for off-premise consumption. The project also includes the construction of three (3) new underground fuel storage tanks, six (6) pumps, and a 3,258.5 square foot canopy. The project also provides six (6) standard parking spaces, twelve (12) fueling parking spaces and one (1) accessible parking space.

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

B. Total Project Area:

Residential Acres:	Lots:	Units:	Projected No. of Residents:
Commercial Acres: .48	Lots: 1	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 1,960	Est. No. of Employees: 3
Industrial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Other:			

C. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 246-150-017

Street References: The project is located at the northwest corner of Stephens Avenue and westerly of the La Cadena Drive, more precisely at 333 La Cadena Dr., Riverside, CA 92507. The Project is within the Highgrove Area Plan.

A. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:
Township: 2 South Range: 4 West Section: 7

B. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project is located in the Highgrove Valley Area Plan of Western Riverside County. The community of Highgrove is located north of the City of Riverside and south of the San Bernardino County line in northwest Riverside County. The community encompasses 2,250 acres of uniquely mixed land uses east of Interstate 215, ranging from a well-established urban core with commercial, industrial, civic and residential uses in its western portion, to larger-lot and equestrian-oriented residential uses and citrus groves to the east. Center Street serves as the community's primary thoroughfare, with the Burlington Northern - Santa Fe (BNSF) and Union Pacific (UP) railroad lines also as prominent transportation facilities. West of Interstate 215, Highgrove encompasses another 204 acres, consisting mostly of medium density and very

low density, single-family detached residential uses, with some scattered commercial and industrial uses and mobile home parks along La Cadena Drive.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Elements/Policies:

1. **Land Use:** The project site has a current General Plan Land Use designation of Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR). The proposed project is consistent with all applicable land use policies of the Riverside County General Plan and the Highgrove Area Plan.
2. **Circulation:** The Project does not impact any transportation facilities referenced in the General Plan and meets all other circulation policies
3. **Multipurpose Open Space:** The proposed project meets all applicable Multipurpose Open Space element policies.
4. **Safety:** The proposed project allows for sufficient provision of emergency services to the future user of the project. The proposed project meets all other applicable Safety Element Policies.
5. **Noise:** Sufficient limitations against any foreseeable noise sources in the area have been provided for in the design of the project. The project will not generate substantial amount of noise that would affect the surrounding area.
6. **Housing:** The proposed project meets all applicable Housing Element Policies. There are no impacts to housing as a direct result of this project.
7. **Air Quality:** The proposed project meets all applicable Air Quality element policies.
8. **Healthy Communities:** The proposed project meets all applicable Health Community element policies.

D. **General Plan Area Plan(s):** Highgrove

E. **Foundation Component(s):** Community Development

F. **Land Use Designation(s):** Commercial Retail

G. **Overlay(s), if any:** Not in a Policy Overlay

H. **Policy Area(s), if any:** Highgrove Community Policy Area

I. Adjacent and Surrounding:

1. **Area Plan(s):** Highgrove

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

3. **Land Use Designation(s):** Commercial Retail to the north, Commercial Retail and Light Industrial to the south, Commercial Retail to the east and Commercial Retail and Medium Density Residential to the west.

J. Overlay(s), if any: Not in a Policy Overlay

1. Policy Area(s), if any: Highgrove Community Policy Area

K. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any: Not in a Specific Plan.

2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any: Not in a Specific Plan.

L. Existing Zoning: General Commercial (C-1/C-P)

M. Proposed Zoning, if any: Not Applicable.

N. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) to the North, General Commercial (C-1/C-P) and Manufacturing-Service Commercial (M-SC) to the south, Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) and General Residential (R-3) to the east and General Commercial (C-1/C-P) to the west.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant

effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.

I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.

I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.



Signature

5/28/2019

Date

Dionne Harris Project Planner

Printed Name

For: Charissa Leach, P.E.
Assistant TLMA Director

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure C-8 “Scenic Highways”

Findings of Fact:

a) The project is located adjacent to the west of freeway I-215. However, the look of the canopy and pumps will not negatively affect the freeway. As indicated on Figure C-8 “Scenic Highways” of the Riverside County General Plan Circulation Element, the proposed project is not located within close vicinity to a scenic highway corridor; the project will have no impact.

b-c) The topography surrounding the project site is relatively flat with elevation at the range of 896 feet, the site is not located within an area that has scenic vistas or resources. As a result, the project will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public, or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. The project is infill within an urbanized area with surrounding commercial properties, including an existing gas station, of similar size and intensity of use; therefore this project will not degrade the visual character or quality of the public views of the site and its surroundings area. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

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

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

a) According to the Riverside County GIS Database (RCLIS), the project site is located 77.3 miles from the Mount Palomar Observatory; which is not within any Special Lighting Area or zones that surrounds the Observatory. Ordinance No. 655 requires methods of installation, definition, requirements for lamp source and shielding, prohibition and exceptions. Since the project is not within any Special Lighting Area or zones that surrounds the Observatory, there will be no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

3. Other Lighting Issues

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

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The closest existing residential use is located approximately 257 feet to the north. The proposed land use will necessitate the installation of minimal outdoor lighting for security purposes, the County of Riverside has established standards for the design, placement, and operation of outdoor lighting. These standards set forth the preferred lighting source, identify maximum lighting intensity, dictate shielding requirements, and establish hours of operation. Because these standards are imposed on all outdoor lighting sources and because they must comply to obtain project approval, they are not considered mitigation. While the proposed development will increase the number and distribution of light sources in the vicinity of the project, impacts related to this issue will be less than significant level, due to adherence to County lighting standards. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES Would the project:

4. Agriculture

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				
b) Conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 "Right-to-Farm")?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

- a) The proposed project will not convert farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. As indicated on Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources", the project is located on land that is designated as urban-built up land and other lands. The project site is currently developed with a hardscape material from the previously approved project car sales establishment. The project will have no impact with converting designated farmland.
- b) The project site does not have an agriculture zoning designation/use subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. The closest Agriculture Preserve is the Highgrove 1 Agriculture Preserve and is located approximately .25 miles to the southeast of the project site. The project will have no impact.
- c) The project site is currently developed with a hardscape material from the previously approved project car sales establishment. The project site is not located within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. The project will have no impact.
- d) As previously addressed, the project is not located within close vicinity to properties that are designated unique farmland or for agricultural uses. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

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

a) The County has no designation of “forest land” (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Govt. Code section 51104(g)). Therefore, the proposed project will not impact land designated as forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

b) According to the Highgrove Area Plan Land Use Map, the project is not located within forest land and will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; therefore, no impact will occur as a result of the proposed project.

c) The County has no designation of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned areas. Therefore, the project will not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project:				
6. Air Quality Impacts				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors, which are located within one (1) mile of the project site, to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan (“CAP”), SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook. SCAQMD Rule 403, Fugitive Dust. Based on CalEEMod, Version 2016.3.1. Air Quality Report, by LSA, May 24, 2018.

Findings of Fact:

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for developing a regional air quality management plan to insure compliance with state and federal air quality standards. The SCAQMD has adopted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

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

a) The 2016 AQMP is based on socioeconomic forecasts (including population estimates) provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The County General Plan is consistent with SCAG's Regional Growth Management Plan and SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan. This project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation. Conformance with the AQMP for development projects is determined by demonstration compliance with local land use plans, population projections, and SCAQMD regulations. SCAQMD has established standards for air quality constituents generated by construction and operational activities for such pollutants as ozone, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and particulate matter (PM). SCAQMD maintains an extensive air quality monitoring network to measure criteria pollutant concentrations throughout the Basin. The Basin where the proposed Project is located has been designated nonattainment status for the federal and state standards for ozone and PM_{2.5}, as well as the state standard for PM₁₀ and lead (California Air Resources Board, Area Designations Maps/State and National, June 2013) shown in Table 2 the long

Table 2: Long-Term Operational Emissions

Source	Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOCs	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area Sources	0.03	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Energy Sources	<0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
Mobile Sources	2.51	9.88	17.67	0.04	2.83	0.79
Total Emissions	2.56	9.90	17.69	0.05	2.83	0.79
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Compiled by LSA Associates, Inc. (June 2017).

CO = carbon monoxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

NO_x = nitrogen oxides

PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

MDAQMD = Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District

SO_x = sulfur oxides

VOCs = volatile organic compounds

term construction emissions.

The proposed Project does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan as the Project implementation will follow guidance and guidelines consistent with the applicable plans. The air quality report concluded that the project is consistent with the goals of the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.

b-c) Air quality impacts may occur during site preparation and construction activities required to implement the proposed land uses. Major sources of emissions during construction include exhaust emissions, fugitive dust generated as a result of soil and material disturbance during demolition, site preparation and grading activities, and VOC (ROG) emission during any painting of structures. In order to reduce these short-term construction related impacts, the project is required to comply with the SCAQMD's Rule 403 that governs fugitive dust emissions from construction projects. This rule sets forth a list of control measures that must be undertaken for all construction projects to ensure that no dust emissions from the project are visible beyond the property boundaries. Adherence to Rule 403 is mandatory and as such does not denote mitigation under CEQA. With the incorporation of the state's recommended measures for construction paint emissions, criteria pollutants are all within the recommended SCAQMD regional threshold levels and, from a regional air quality perspective, the project will have a less than significant impact.

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

Table 1: Short-Term Construction Emissions

Source	Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOCs	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Construction Activities	3.04	11.04	8.33	0.01	1.49	1.04
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Compiled by LSA Associates, Inc. (June 2017).

CO = carbon monoxide
 lbs/day = pounds per day
 NO_x = nitrogen oxides
 PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
 MDAQMD = Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
 SO_x = sulfur oxides
 VOCs = volatile organic compounds

The emissions anticipated to be generated during construction were modeled based on anticipated construction phasing and the results were found to be below SCAQMD thresholds, thereby not having a significant impact shown in Table 1. However the Project construction will follow state regulations including application of water during grading and a 15-miles per hour (mph) speed limit on unpaved surfaces, and watering a minimum of twice daily during construction operations. With regards to stationary source emissions, in addition to vehicle trips, the occupants would produce emissions from on-site sources, including the combustion of natural gas for space and water heating. Additionally, the structures would be maintained and this requires repainting over time, thus resulting in the release of additional VOC emissions. The use of consumer aerosol products (e.g. cleaners) are also associated with the proposed project. The mechanized equipment associated with landscape maintenance also produces emissions.

Table 4: Heath Risk Screening of Benzene Exposure

Type of Exposure	Distance to Fueling Positions	Theoretical Cancer Risk (in one million)
Residential Exposure	100 meters	0.50
Residential Exposure	125 meters	0.33
Occupational Worker Exposure	25 meters	0.81

The primary air toxic contaminate (TAC) that occurs at gasoline stations is fugitive emissions of benzene at the fueling positions while people are refueling their cars. The vapor recovery systems required (both in the car gas tanks and the gas pumps at gasoline stations) capture 99% of these vaporous emissions. However, because people sometimes spill gasoline and overfill the car, this creates the potential for TACs including benzene to vaporize. While there are other TACs associated with gasoline, they are in such small quantities compared to benzene that benzene is used to assess the potential health effects of gasoline service stations. As shown in the air study, the closest sensitive receptors are homes at a distance of 100 meters (327 feet) to 125 meters (409 feet) within an neighborhood on the east side of Center Drive east the proposed project site. There are several land uses between the proposed gasoline service station and the sensitive receptor including a strip mall directly east of the project site followed by a parking lot and then Center Street. The throughput of the proposed project is less than one million gallons annually, which is why the screening level health risk was applied.

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

Table 4 shows the estimated theoretical risk of cancer due to prolonged exposure to benzene for residents approximately 100 and 125 meters of the fueling positions. Table 4 shows that residential exposure rates for a gasoline service station with one million gallons of throughput per year result in a theoretical cancer rate of 0.50 in one million for sensitive receptors within 100 meters of the site and 0.33 in one million for sensitive receptors within 125 meters of the site. The closest sensitive receptor is an existing residential use located approximately 257 feet to the north of the site, which would fall within the 100 meter radius discussed in Table 4. The threshold for potential cancer-related health risk impacts is 10 in one million, so the exposure to benzene itself would be well below that. Furthermore, regarding other toxic air contaminants, based on the extremely low regional operational emissions described within table 2, it is highly unlikely that those emissions coupled with benzene would cause a significant impact. Table 4 of the document shows estimated theoretical risk of cancer due to prolonged exposure to benzene for occupational workers approximately 25 meters of the fueling positions within Riverside County of 0.81 theoretical cancers in one million. The 10 in a million threshold is the SCAQMD Threshold provided for CEQA analysis of projects. The OEHHA 2015 Guidance provides various levels of acceptable cancer risk depending upon the industry covered under the Air Toxics Hot Spot program. Gasoline service stations are not a regulated industry under Air Toxics Hot Spot program. Because this is a CEQA analysis of a small gasoline service station the SCAQMD CEQA Threshold of 10 in a million is the appropriate threshold to use in the CEQA analysis of the project. Therefore, the potential health risks associated with the project and air quality report concluded that all emissions are within their respective criteria and the impact is less than significant.

d) A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. The project proposes the new construction of Gasoline Service Station and 1,960 square foot convenience store with the sale of beer and wine (Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) License Type 20) for off-premise consumption. The closest sensitive receptor is an existing residential use located approximately 257 feet to the north of the site. The air quality report determined that the project is not anticipated to generate significant odors nor would it create substantial point source emissions as discussed under c) above. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Project construction would involve the use of heavy equipment creating exhaust pollutants from on-site earth movement and from equipment bringing concrete and other building materials to the site. An occasional "whiff" of diesel exhaust from passing equipment and trucks accessing the site from public roadways may result. Such brief exhaust odors are an adverse, but less than significant air quality impact. Enhanced vapor recovery systems are standard requirement for all gasoline service station pumps as required by SCAQMD Rule 461. All pumping equipment used for service stations within the South Coast Air Basin complies with this rule and the proposed project will be comply with the rule by having enhanced vapor recovery systems on all the pumps. Also note that small gasoline service stations are not a regulated industry under Air Toxics Hot Spot program other than to provide a screening analysis which was done for the project. The project site is within Source Receptor Area (SRA) 23. The construction site is less than one acre in size. Therefore the one acre LST Look Up Tables were used. As shown in the tables the LST thresholds for SRA 23 with a one acre or less construction site with sensitive receptors at 100 meters distance from the site are as follows:

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

LST Thresholds: NOx and NO2 = 221 lbs./day (Table C-1), CO = 1,746 lbs./day (Table C-2), PM-2.5 = 8 lbs./day (Table C3), and PM-10 = 30 lbs./day. Table 1 of the air quality analysis shows project construction will result in 11.04 lbs./day of NOx and NO2, 8.33 lbs./day of CO, 1.49 lbs./day of PM-10, and 1.04 lbs./day of PM-2.5. These levels of emissions are below the LST Thresholds. Therefore, this issue is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:

7. Wildlife & Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

f) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source(s): GIS database, WRCMSHCP and/or CVMSHCP, On-site Inspection

Source: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (Adopted June 2003)

Findings of Fact:

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

a-g) The proposed project is located within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan within Highgrove Area Plan. The project site is not located within a Criteria Cell.

The project and surrounding area is totally developed. The project is in close proximity to the existing highway, the site was previously developed and now remains entirely graded and hardscaped, and the site is not next to any area that supports habitat or species and no habitat exists on the project site. Therefore, the project site does not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Wildlife Service.

The project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridor, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, since no existing habitat exists onsite and the project site is not located next to any areas of habitat that would support the movement of species or act as a nursery site or wildlife corridor.. The project will not 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 as no such habitat exists onsite and the project will not impact any offsite habitat. The project site will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of Clean Water Act. The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protection biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of the proposed project.

6.1.2 Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools

The project site does not contain MSHCP Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool habitat or species associated with these habitats. No additional surveys are required. The project is consistent with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP.

6.1.3 Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species

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

6.1.4 Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface

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

6.3.2 Additional Survey Needs and Procedures

The project site does have additional survey requirements for amphibians, mammals, or criteria area species.

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

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Based on an analysis of Riverside County archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by Riverside County staff archaeologist, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. The entire site has been previously graded and is currently hardscape material. Therefore, the project would not alter or destroy or cause a substantial adverse change to the significance of a historical site because there are none present. Therefore, there will be no impacts.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

9. Archaeological Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Project Application Materials; EIC-RIV-ST-4195 Cultural Resource Records Search for CUP03763.

Findings of Fact:

a) Based on an analysis of Riverside County archaeology resource files, archaeological records, maps, and aerial photographs by Riverside County staff archaeologist, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any archaeological resources. Further, the project will not impact archaeological resources since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried archaeological resources. The project will not impact an archaeological site because there are no archaeological sites present. Therefore, there will be n impacts in this regard.

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

b) There will be no substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource because there are no archaeological resources present. Therefore, there will be no impacts in this regard.

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

Based on an analysis of records and Native American consultation, it has been determined the project property is currently not used for religious or sacred purposes. Therefore, the project will not restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area because there were none identified. Therefore, there will be no impacts in this regard.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

ENERGY Would the project:

10. Energy Impacts

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a State or Local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) Implementation of the proposed Project will comply with the California Green Building Standards Code. The Project is not anticipated to utilize a significant amount of resources, including energy; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project directly or indirectly:

11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

a) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 “Earthquake Fault Study Zones,” GIS database, Geologist Comments, Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project is not located within proximity to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Overall, the project will not expose people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to commercial development will minimize the potential for structural failure or loss of life during earthquakes by ensuring that structures are constructed pursuant to applicable seismic design criteria for the region. The potential impact will be less than significant. As CBC requirements are applicable to all commercial developments, the requirements are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

12. Liquefaction Potential Zone

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 “Generalized Liquefaction,” Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the consulting geologist for the project, and based on the dense nature of earth materials underlying the site and an estimated groundwater depth of 111 feet, the potential for liquefaction at the site is considered low. According to RCLIS (GIS database), the site is mapped within an area with low potential for seismically induced liquefaction. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

13. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 “Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map,” and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), Geologist’s Comments

Findings of Fact:

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

a) The proposed project site is located in seismically active Southern California. With the incorporation of CBC requirements pertaining to new development the potential for structural failure or loss of life due to strong seismic ground shaking will be minimized by ensuring that structures are constructed pursuant to applicable seismic design criteria for the region. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

14. Landslide Risk

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

Source(s): On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 “Regions Underlain by Steep Slope,” Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the General Plan and the Project Consulting Geologist, the project site will have low potential for risk of landslides. Potential for lateral spreading, collapse, and rockfall hazards are also low. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

15. Ground Subsidence

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 “Documented Subsidence Areas Map,” Geology Report

Findings of Fact:

a) The effects of areal subsidence generally occur at the transition of boundaries between low-lying areas and adjacent hillside terrain, where materials of substantially different engineering properties (i.e. alluvium vs. bedrock) are present. This condition does not occur on the project site. However, according to “Map My County,” the Project site is mapped as susceptible to subsidence. California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant. Through the CBC, the State provides a minimum standard for building design and construction. The CBC contains specific requirements for seismic safety, excavation, foundations, retaining walls, and site demolition. It also regulates grading activities, including drainage and erosion control. As CBC requirements are applicable to all development, they are not considered mitigation for CEQA

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

implementation process. In addition, the project geologist concluded that unfavorable ground subsidence is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

16. Other Geologic Hazards

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The Project site is more than 25 miles from the Pacific Ocean at an elevation of approximately 913 feet (msl) and is not located in close proximity to any enclosed bodies of water. Additionally, there are no volcanoes in the Project vicinity. As such, the Project site would not be subject to inundation by tsunamis or seiches, and would not be affected by volcanoes. The Project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone, nor is it located within FEMA Flood Zone or a 100-Year Flood Zone. Due to the relatively flat topography of the Project site and surrounding areas, there is no potential for the Project site to be impacted by mudflow hazards. The Project site would not be affected by any other geologic hazards beyond what is discussed herein under the appropriate topic heading. Accordingly, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

17. Slopes

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

Source(s): Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials, Slope Stability Report

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the Project Geologist, there are no natural slopes on or near the site that could impact the proposed development, and no slopes are proposed. Furthermore, proposed grading will not create cut or fill slopes, nor will it affect or negate subsurface sewage disposal systems. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. Soils				
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) Proposed grading activities associated with the Project would temporarily expose underlying soils to water and air, which would increase erosion susceptibility while the soils are exposed. Exposed soils would be subject to erosion during rainfall events or high winds due to the exposure of these erodible materials to wind and water. Erosion by water would be greatest during the first rainy season after grading and before the Project's structure foundations are established and paving and landscaping occur. Erosion by wind would be highest during periods of high wind speeds when soils are exposed.

Pursuant to requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board, the Project Applicant is required to obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for construction activities. The NPDES permit is required for all projects that include construction activities, such as clearing, grading, and/or excavation that disturb at least one acre of total land area. Additionally, during grading and other construction activities involving soil exposure or the transport of earth materials, Chapter 15.12 (Uniform Building Code) of the Riverside County Municipal Code, which establishes, in part, requirements for the control of dust and erosion during construction, would apply to the Project. As part of the requirements of Chapter 15.12, the Project Applicant would be required to prepare an erosion control plan that would address construction fencing, sand bags, and other erosion-control features that would be implemented during the construction phase to reduce the site's potential for soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Following construction, wind and water erosion on the Project site would be minimized, as the areas disturbed during construction would be landscaped or covered with impervious surfaces. Only nominal areas of exposed soil, if any, would occur in the site's landscaped areas. The only potential for erosion effects to occur during Project operation would be indirect effects from storm water discharged from the property. Because the Project's drainage would be fully controlled via the proposed on-site drainage facilities, and because the peak velocity of storm flows under the proposed Project conditions would decrease, impacts due to water erosion would be less than significant under long-term conditions.

b) According to the Project Geologist, there are no natural slopes on or near the site that could impact the proposed development, and no significant slopes are proposed. Furthermore, proposed grading will not create cut or fill slopes, nor will it affect or negate subsurface sewage disposal systems. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant.

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

c) The proposed project requires the installation of a new, separate OWTS to support the new development. As stated under to ensure that the project site has adequate soils to support a new OWTS, a Percolation Investigation was conducted on the site in accordance with the requirements of the County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health. The results of the investigation indicate that the use of a subsurface sewage effluent disposal system is feasible on the site, as designed. The evaluation of the subsoils as observed within the test holes indicates that the groundwater table is not expected to encroach within the allowable limit currently set forth by County or State requirements. During site preparation, the proposed leach line area, will be staked and flagged to prevent heavy construction equipment from traveling over this area. Additionally, standard conditions of approval have been placed on the project to ensure that no grading practices undermine the stability of the site for subsurface sewage disposal systems. Therefore, potential adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on subsurface sewage disposal systems as a result of grading activities are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Figure S-8 “Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map,” Ord. No. 460, Article XV & Ord. No. 484

Findings of Fact:

a) The site is located in an area of Moderate Wind Erodibility rating. The General Plan, Safety Element Policy for Wind Erosion requires buildings and structures to be designed to resist wind loads which are covered by the California Building Code (CBC). With such compliance, the project will not result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site. The project will have less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS Would the project:

20. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) A variety of emissions were evaluated for analyzing generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the proposed Project. These including during construction and operation. Operational emissions were further evaluated to include areas source, energy, vehicular (mobile), off-road, stationary, solid waste, water, and other emission sources. The total emission from all the above sources result in an annual GHG emissions of 709.97 MT CO₂e, which is less than the County CAP's 3,000 MT CO₂e per year screening threshold shown in Table 3. Therefore, the increase in GHG emissions would not be cumulatively considerable, and the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures would be required.

Table 3: Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Source	Pollutant Emissions (MT/yr)					
	Bio-CO ₂	NBio-CO ₂	Total CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e
Gasoline Service Station with eight pumping positions						
Area Sources	0.00	<0.01	<0.01	0.00	0.00	<0.01
Energy Sources	0.00	8.52	8.52	<0.01	<0.01	8.56
Mobile Sources	0.00	695.65	695.65	0.05	0.00	696.93
Waste Sources	1.31	0.00	1.31	0.08	0.00	3.25
Water Usage	0.05	1.01	1.06	<0.01	<0.01	1.23
Total Emissions						709.97
CAP Screening Thresholds						3,000
Significant?						No

Source: Compiled by LSA (June 2017).

Note: Numbers in table may not appear to add up correctly due to rounding of all numbers to two significant digits.

Bio-CO₂ = biologically generated carbon dioxide

MT/yr = metric tons per year

CH₄ = methane

N₂O = nitrous oxide

CO₂ = carbon dioxide

NBio-CO₂ = non-biologically generated carbon dioxide

CO₂e = carbon dioxide equivalent

The proposed project is an in-fill project, as such there will be minimal grading for the site's 1,960 square foot convenience store and 3,258 square foot canopy. Approval of this grading plan does not expressly authorize the construction of any buildings; however, construction of 1,960 square foot convenience store and 3,258 square foot canopy is likely to occur thereafter. Additionally, the type of small-scale in-fill development that could follow this grading project would not generate enough GHG emissions from its construction or operation to be deemed cumulatively significant sufficient to warrant quantitative or qualitative GHG analysis, nor would the grading proposed by this application. More specifically, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) proposed a very aggressive 900 metric tons per year of the GHG emissions threshold for residential and commercial projects.

There are numerous State plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The principal overall State plan and policy is AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The quantitative goal of AB 32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. SB 32 would require further reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Because the project's operational year in 2018, the project aims to reach the quantitative goals set by AB 32. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles (AB 1493), the LCFS, and regulations requiring an increasing fraction of electricity to be generated from renewable sources are being implemented at the statewide level; as such, compliance at the project level is not addressed. Therefore, the proposed Project does not conflict with those plans and regulations.

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

As previously discussed, the County CAP applies a screening threshold of 3,000 MT CO₂e per year to comply with the reduction goals of AB 32. The proposed project's increase in GHG emissions would be less than County's screening threshold. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the County CAP. Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. This would represent a less than significant impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

Source(s): Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The project proposes a convenience market and gas station. The project has been reviewed by the Department of Environmental Health and is not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The Department of Environmental Health has required a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet or 500 pounds, or any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous materials to be provided. Construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the Hazardous Materials Division prior to the installation of the underground storage tank (UST) system. There is a construction fee based on the number of UST's installed. Permits from the Hazardous Materials Division must be obtained for the operation of the UST's prior to occupancy (COA 80.E Health.1) This is a standard condition that would apply to any similar-sized facility and is not considered mitigation for CEQA purposes. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

c) The project has been reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department for emergency access, and will not impair the implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

d) The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, there is no impact.

e) The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore, the project will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore will not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The project is not located within an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

d) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
23. Water Quality Impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site presently drains in a sheet flow manner in an east to southwest direction. Iowa Avenue is fully improved with curb, gutters and catch basins for a storm drain maintained by the Transportation Department. Except for nuisance nature local runoff that may traverse portions of the property, the project is considered free from ordinary storm flood hazard. (COA 10.FLOOD RI. 1) Therefore, the project shall not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The impact is considered less than significant.

b) Due to the small size and limited development of the project site, the project is not anticipated to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The impact is considered less than significant.

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

c) The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

d) The project site presently drains in a sheet flow manner in an east to southwest direction. Iowa Avenue is fully improved with curb, gutters and catch basins for a storm drain maintained by the Transportation Department. Except for nuisance nature local runoff that may traverse portions of the property, the project is considered free from ordinary storm flood hazard. (COA 10.FLOOD RI. 1) Therefore, the project shall not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The impact is considered less than significant.

e-f) The project will not place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, there is no impact.

g-i) The project will not substantially degrade water quality or include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors). The impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project:

24. Land Use

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

b) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project proposes a convenience market with a gas station. The project site is currently designated Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR) (0.20-0.35 Floor Area Ratio) on the Highgrove Area Plan. Commercial retail uses at a neighborhood, community and regional level, and tourist-oriented commercial uses are allowed within the Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR) (0.20-0.35 Floor Area Ratio) Land Use designation. The proposed project is in conformance with the land use designation; therefore shall not result in the substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

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

b) The project is located within the City of Riverside sphere of influence. The project was sent to the City of Riverside for comments on November 1, 2016, however there have not been comments received as of the writing of this report. Therefore, it will not affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries, due this project being infill development. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:

25. Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is within MRZ-3, which is defined as areas where the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist; however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. The General Plan identifies policies that encourage protection for existing mining operations and for appropriate management of mineral extraction. A significant impact that would constitute a loss of availability of a known mineral resource would include unmanaged extraction or encroach on existing extraction. No existing or abandoned quarries or mines exist in the area surrounding the project site. The project does not propose any mineral extraction on the project site. Any mineral resources on the project site will be unavailable for the life of the project; however, the project will not result in the permanent loss of significant mineral resources. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State. The project will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The proposed project is not adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine resource. The project will not expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

NOISE Would the project result in:

26. Airport Noise

a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

b) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore, the project will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The project site is not located within the vicinity of any public or private airport; therefore, the project will not require review by the Airport Land Use Commission. The closest airport is a small public-use airport (Flabob Airport), located approximately 4 miles southwest of the site. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The project is not located within an airport land use plan and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

d) The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

27. Noise Effects by the Project

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The County of Riverside Noise Element and Ordinance contain land use compatibility guidelines for community noise. The project is within 0.03 mile of the existing Interstate 215 and directly adjacent to Iowa Avenue, which is a 'Major Highway'. Given the number of existing service stations in the area, the project will serve already existing traffic from Iowa Avenue, Center Street, and Interstate 215 and will not significantly draw in new traffic sources that would contribute to ambient noise. Generally along a 'Major Highway' the acceptable dBA is between 65 and 75 dBA CNEL. Vehicle noise can potentially affect the project site, as well as land uses located along nearby roadways. Because of the location and size of the project, the project will not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Impacts will be less than significant.

b) The project might create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project during construction. The project will follow the County of Riverside's policies of the Noise Element for hours of operation to prevent excessive noise impacts. Noise generated by construction equipment can reach high levels; however Chapter 9.5.020 of the County's Municipal Code restricts construction activity between the hours of 6:00 PM and 6:00 AM during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 PM and 7:00 AM during the months of October through May. However, all noise generated during project construction and the operation of the site must comply with the County's noise standards, which restricts construction (short-term) and operational (long-term) noise levels. Adherence of General Plan Noise Element policies: N 13.1 – N 13.4, construction-related noise levels will not exceed standards and will be less than significant.

The proposed project is the construction of a gasoline service station and 1,960 square foot convenience store. While the use may generate noise due to vehicular traffic the anticipated noise level will not be in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The Project is located in a mostly developed in a commercial and Light Industrial area. The project is also in close proximity of the Interstate 215 of the County with many sources of exterior noise. Light Industrial land uses are adjacent to the project site to the east, commercial uses to the north, west and south of the Project site. The Project site is located at the intersection of a Major and Secondary Highway. The impact will be less than significant.

The proposed project may create excessive ground-borne vibration or noise above existing levels during construction. As mentioned in 34.b above, Chapter 9.5.020 of the County's Municipal Code restricts construction activity between the hours of 6:00 PM and 6:00 AM during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 PM and 7:00 AM during the months of October through May. Adherence of Chapter 9.5.020 and General Plan Noise Element policies, construction-related noise levels will not exceed standards and will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the County’s General Plan, this site has been mapped as having a “Low Potential” for paleontological resources. This category encompasses lands for which previous field surveys and documentation demonstrates a low potential for containing significant paleontological resources subject to adverse impacts. As such, this project is not anticipated to require any direct mitigation for paleontological resources. There is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				
29. Housing				
a) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County’s median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The proposed project site is currently auto sales facility; thus, the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project is a commercial use that would not demand more housing. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) The proposed project will not create a demand for additional housing. The project is a commercial use that would not demand more housing. Therefore, there is no impact.

c) The proposed project site is currently an auto sales facility, and it will be replaced by a gas station and convenience store. Therefore, it will not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there is no impact.

The project is not located within or near a County Redevelopment Project Area. The project proposes a convenience market and gas station and will not increase the population of the area beyond that which was already accounted for when the property was previously developed. The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

30. Fire Services

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the demand for Fire services. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the Applicant shall comply with the provisions of the Ordinance No. 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees related to the funding and construction of facilities necessary to address the direct cumulative environmental effect generated by new development projects.

Additionally, the project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. As such, this project will not cause the construction that could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Mitigation: No Mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

31. Sheriff Services

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) provides law enforcement and crime prevention services to the project site. Similar to fire protection services, the proposed project will incrementally increase the demand for Sheriff Services in the project area; however, due to its limited size, the proposed project will not create a significant impact on sheriff services. Riverside County's development impact fee Ordinance No. 659 also collects fees for sheriff services, which is intended to offset any incremental increases in need for sheriff services. The proposed project is required to pay these development impact fees prior to the issuance of building permits. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered mitigation under CEQA. Therefore, with payment of the development impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659, the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on sheriff services and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

32. Schools

Source(s): School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

The Riverside Unified School District provides public education services for the project area. The applicant of this project is conditioned to pay the school impact fees for commercial uses as set by State Law. Fees are required to be paid prior issuance of building permits. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

33. Libraries

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The proposed development will have no impacts on library resources because it will not generate traffic for this particular use. However, Riverside County's development impact fee Ordinance No. 659, also collects fees for library services, which is intended to offset any incremental increases in need for libraries. The proposed project is required to pay these development impact fees prior to issuance of building permits. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

34. Health Services

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The project will not create a significant additional need for additional health services. However, these types of services are normally user fee or tax-supported services. No shortage in the provision of health care service is expected as a result of the proposed project. The proposed project will not have a significant on health services and no mitigation measures are required. Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

RECREATION Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
35. Parks and Recreation				
a) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a-c) The project will not have recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The project is commercial in nature and therefore is not subject to quimby fees. The project will have no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
36. Recreational Trails				
a) Include the construction or expansion of a trail system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Riv. Co. 800-Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

Findings of Fact:

The proposed project has not incorporated any trails into its design nor will the proposed use impact any recreational trails; therefore, the project will have no impacts to recreational trails. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
37. Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a) The Riverside County Transportation Department has reviewed the traffic study submitted for Conditional Use Permit No. 3763. The study has been prepared in accordance with County-approved transportation guidelines. Overall, the Transportation Department concurs with the findings relative to traffic impacts.

The General Plan circulation policies require a minimum of Level of Service 'C', except that Level of Service 'D' may be allowed in community development areas within Highgrove at intersections of any combination of secondary highways, major highways, arterials, urban arterials, expressways or state highways and ramp intersections.

The study indicates that it is possible to achieve adequate levels of service for the following intersections based on the traffic study assumptions.

Stephens Avenue (NS) at:
Center Street (EW)

La Cadena Drive (West) (NS) at:
Stephens Avenue-I-215 Southbound Ramps (EW)

Highgrove Place (NS) at:
Center Street (EW)

La Cadena Drive (East) (NS) at:
Highgrove Place (EW)

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

As such, the proposed project is consistent with this General Plan policy. The associated conditions of approval incorporate mitigation measures identified in the traffic study, which are necessary to achieve or maintain the required level of service. With the mitigation measures identified below, as well as the payment of required Development Impact Fees (DIF), the project will be able to maintain acceptable traffic flows and will not lead to any significant delays beyond what already exists within the impacted area. To identify potential traffic impacts, trip generation factors were applied to the land use to generate project trip estimates.

b) The proposed project will create an increase in vehicle trips to this area, thus creating an increase in road maintenance. The project site is located in the Highgrove Area. An Infrastructure Phase Plan (IPP) has been prepared for the Highgrove area. To fund necessary roadway improvements beyond those in the TUMF program, the project will be required to pay their applicable DIF fees. Under Existing plus Project Conditions most of the study intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. The intersection of La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/1-215 SB Ramps is anticipated to continue to operate at LOS F during the pm peak. The trip generation factors for a Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market were obtained from the 9th Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation report. Table 3-1 summarizes the estimated trip generation for the project site during the AM (7-9 AM) peak and PM (4-6 PM) peak periods. Table 3-1: Project Trip Generation Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station.

Table 3-1: Project Trip Generation
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station

Use	Daily	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
1 Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market							
(ITE 945) Per Vehicle Fueling Position	152.84	6.04	5.80	11.84	7.07	6.79	13.86
12 Vehicle Fueling Position	1,835	73	70	143	85	82	167
Pass-By Trips (15%)	275	11	10	21	13	12	25
Diverted Link Trips (30%)	551	22	21	43	25	25	50
Total Primary Trips (55%)	1,009	40	39	79	47	45	92

Source: "Trip Generation Manual, Institute of Transportation Engineers", 9th Edition

As presented in Table 3-1, it is estimated that the project will generate 1,009 Daily Primary Trips, 79 AM peak hour Primary Trips, and 92 PM peak hour Primary Trips.

The Transportation Department has determined that the project will not exceed either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency or designated road or highways. The study intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. The intersection of La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/1-215 SB Ramps is anticipated to continue to operate at LOS F during the pm peak. Although the intersection of La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/1-215 SB Ramps is anticipated to operate at LOS F during the pm peak, the operating is acceptable due to the anticipated arrival rate of the traffic and the queue at the off-ramp. The anticipated maximum queue at the ramp is contained within the provided storage length and is not anticipated to spill into the freeway mainline. The impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.

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

**Table 2-3: Intersection Capacity Analysis – Existing Conditions
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station**

Intersection	AM		PM	
	Delay(1)	LOS(2)	Delay(1)	LOS(2)
1 Center Street and Stephens Avenue	39.4	D	39.1	D
2 La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps (3)	20.2	C	50.1	F
3 Center Street and Highgrove Place (3)	18.9	C	16.9	C
4 La Cadena Drive (East) and I-215 NB Off-Ramp (3)	9.0	A	9.9	A

(1) Delay –In Seconds

(2) LOS – Level of Service

(3) Un-signalized Intersection

Source: **David Evans and Associates, Inc.**

c) The proposed project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment). Street improvements as conditioned by the project will make the local streets less dangerous through lane improvements, striping programs, etc. The impacts are considered less than significant. The proposed project is not located within an Airport Influence Area. The project will not change air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that would result in a substantial safety risk. To identify potential traffic impacts, trip generation factors were applied to the land use to generate project trip estimates. As presented in Table 3-2, under Existing plus Project Conditions most of the study intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. The intersection of La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps is anticipated to continue to operate at LOS F during the pm peak.

**Table 3-2: Intersection Capacity Analysis – Existing plus Project Conditions
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station**

Intersection	AM		PM	
	Delay(1)	LOS(2)	Delay(1)	LOS(2)
1 Center Street and Stephens Avenue	44.3	D	45.6	D
2 La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps (3)	23.2	C	60.2	F
3 Center Street and Highgrove Place (3)	20.8	C	18.7	C
4 La Cadena Drive (East) and I-215 NB Off-Ramp (3)	9.2	A	10.3	B
5 La Cadena Drive (West) and Driveway #1 (3)	10.8	B	10.6	B
6 Stephens Avenue and Driveway #2 (3)	13.0	B	15.2	C

(1) Delay –In Seconds

(2) LOS – Level of Service

(3) Un-signalized Intersection

Source: **David Evans and Associates, Inc.**

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

**Table 3-3: Queue Length Existing plus Project Conditions
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station**

Intersection/Movement		Storage Length (ft)	AM	PM
2	La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps	EBLTR	87	103
		WBLTR	550	66
		NBLT		44
		NBR		39
		SBLTR		56
4	La Cadena Drive (East) and I-215 NB Off Ramp	EBLT	765	87
		EBR		-
		WBL		50
		WBR		-
		NBTR		69
		SBLT		60

(-) No queue length was reported

95th %– 95th Percentile Queue provided in feet rounded up to the nearest 25', Length of vehicle

Source: **David Evans and Associates, Inc.**

d-f) The project is infill and mostly built-out. Therefore, the project sites conditions would not cause an effect upon or potentially impact any new or alter existing maintenance of any roads adjacent to the project. The proposed project will result in temporary impacts to circulation during construction activities. During construction activities, the traffic flow will be maintained to the highest level possible with the use of standard traffic control devices. Most of the study intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. The intersection of La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps is anticipated to continue to operate at LOS F during the pm peak. The impact will be

**Table 4-1: Intersection Capacity Analysis - Project Conditions
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station**

Intersection	AM		PM	
	Delay(1)	LOS(2)	Delay(1)	LOS(2)
1 Center Street and Stephens Avenue	42.4	D	72.7	E
2 La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps (3)	25.3	D	67.8	F
3 Center Street and Highgrove Place (3)	21.5	C	19.3	C
4 La Cadena Drive (East) and I-215 NB Off-Ramp (3)	9.3	A	10.4	B
5 La Cadena Drive (West) and Driveway #1 (3)	10.9	B	10.7	B
6 Stephens Avenue and Driveway #2 (3)	13.2	B	15.5	C

(1) Delay –In Seconds

(2) LOS – Level of Service

(3) Un-signalized Intersection

Source: **David Evans and Associates, Inc.**

**Table 5-3: Intersection Capacity Analysis –Cumulative Conditions
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station**

Intersection	AM		PM	
	Delay(1)	LOS(2)	Delay(1)	LOS(2)
1 Center Street and Stephens Avenue	56.7	E	60.8	E
Mitigations: Widen East and West and Signal modification	29.9	C	34.8	C
2 La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps (3)	33.9	D	87.2	F
3 Center Street and Highgrove Place (3)	26.5	D	25.1	D
4 La Cadena Drive (East) and I-215 NB Off-Ramp (3)	9.6	A	11.4	B
5 La Cadena Drive (West) and Driveway #1 (3)	10.9	B	10.7	B
6 Stephens Avenue and Driveway #2 (3)	13.8	B	16.7	C

(1) Delay –In Seconds

(2) LOS – Level of Service

(3) Un-signalized Intersection

Source: **David Evans and Associates, Inc.**

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

less than significant. Although the intersection of La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/1-215 SB Ramps is anticipated to operate at LOS F during the pm peak, the operating is acceptable due to the anticipated arrival rate of the traffic and the queue at the I-215 off-ramp. The trip generation factors for a Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market were obtained from the 9th Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers trip generation report. The above, Table 5-3 summarizes the estimated trip generation for the project site during the AM (7-9 AM) peak and PM (4-6 PM) peak periods along the intersections of :Stephens Avenue (NS) and Center Street (EW), La Cadena Drive (West) (NS) and Stephens Avenue-I-215 Southbound Ramps (EW), Highgrove Place (NS) and Center Street (EW), La Cadena Drive (East) (NS) and Highgrove Place (EW). Table 5-3: Project Trip Generation Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station. The anticipated maximum queue at the ramp is contained within the provided storage length and is not anticipated to spill into the freeway mainline. The above Table 2-3 (Baseline Conditions), shows the intersection operating at LOS F in the PM peak hour. The project is conditioned to pay TUMF fees to address project indirect impacts. The interchange is an eligible facility under the WRCOG TUMF Network.

Table 4-2: Queue Length Project Conditions
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station

Intersection/Movement			Storage Length (ft)	AM	PM
2	La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps	EBLTR	550	74	108
		WBLTR		66	99
		NBLT		30	58
		NBR		39	27
		SBLTR		56	71
4	La Cadena Drive (East) and I-215 NB Off Ramp	EBLT	765	90	85
		EBR		-	-
		WBL		47	43
		WBR		-	-
		NBTR		60	85
		SBLT		64	72

(-) No queue length was reported

95th %– 95th Percentile Queue provided in feet rounded up to the nearest 25'. Length of vehicle

Source: **David Evans and Associates, Inc.**

The proposed project will result in temporary impacts to circulation during construction activities. During construction activities, the traffic flow will be maintained to the highest level possible with the use of standard traffic control devices. Typical traffic control measures include warning signs, warning lights, and flaggers. Implementation of traffic control measures will provide guidance and navigational tools throughout the project area in order to maintain traffic flow and levels of safety during construction. The

Table 5-4: Queue Length Project Conditions
Traffic Impact Analysis – La Cadena Gas Station

Intersection/Movement			Storage Length (ft)	AM	PM
2	La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps	EBLTR	550	58	103
		WBLTR		90	98
		NBLT		49	63
		NBR		33	-
		SBLTR		57	60
4	La Cadena Drive (East) and I-215 NB Off Ramp	EBLT	765	67	96
		EBR		-	-
		WBL		78	43
		WBR		-	-
		NBTR		72	91
		SBLT		78	71

(-) No queue length was reported

95th %– 95th Percentile Queue provided in feet rounded up to the nearest 25'. Length of vehicle

Source: **David Evans and Associates, Inc.**

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

proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. The proposed project will not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. The impacts will be less than significant with mitigation.

The trip generation rates for the other area projects during the AM (7-9 AM) peak and PM (4-6 PM) peak periods were obtained from the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. The resulting daily, am in and out, and pm in and out trips. Cumulative Conditions most of the study intersections are anticipated to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS. The intersection of La Cadena Drive (West) and Stephens Avenue/I-215 SB Ramps is anticipated to continue to operate at LOS F during the pm peak. The intersection of Center Street and Stephens Avenue is anticipated to operate at LOS F during the pm peak.

Mitigation:

- TRANS-1 (80. TRANS.) The intersection of Stephens Avenue (NS) at Center Street (EW) shall be improved to provide the following geometrics:
 Northbound: one shared left-turn/through lane, one right-turn lane
 Southbound: one shared left-turn/through/right-turn lane
 Eastbound: one left-turn lane, one through lane, one shared through/right-turn lane
 Westbound: one left-turn lane, one shared through/right-turn lane
- TRANS-2 (90. TRANS.) Construct the project driveways at Stephens Avenue and La Cadena Drive (West).
- TRANS-3 (90. TRANS.) Install a raised median on La Cadena Drive (West) north of Stephens Avenue. Restricting the La Cadena Drive (West) project driveway to right in-right out.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

38. Bike Trails

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

Source(s): Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

The project is not located adjacent to or nearby any designated bike trails. The curb, gutter, and sidewalk have already been constructed and the applicant would not be required to provide a Class II Bike Facility. Therefore, the impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
39. Tribal Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): County Archaeologist, AB52 Tribal Consultation

Findings of Fact:

a-b) In accordance with AB 52, separate notices regarding the proposed Project were mailed to all requesting Tribes on November 15, 2016. Staff received notification from the Morongo Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians within the 30-day period, requesting to initiate consultation. The project has a lack of onsite resources and the land has been used for prior commercial processes and is entirely scraped and hardscape.

Staff met with the Morongo Tribe on December 28, 2016. Staff sent conditions of approval for the project to the Morongo Tribe. The Morongo Tribe agreed the conditions of approval on January 11, 2017. The Morongo Tribe consultation was formally concluded on June 16, 2017. Staff also met with the San Manuel Tribe on December 27, 2016 and sent conditions of approval for the project. San Manuel tribal consultation was formally concluded on January 17, 2017. Staff met with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and they decided to monitor if other tribes want to monitor during the grading process. Soboba consultation was formally concluded on July 18, 2017. No tribal cultural resources were identified by any of the Tribes. COAs (15. USE - UNANTICIPATED RESOURCES. Planning-CUL) and (15. USE - IF HUMAN REMAINS FOUND. Planning-CUL)

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
40. Water	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Water Company

Findings of Fact:

a) The project will not require in the construction of new water treatment facilities. The project will require the expansion of existing facilities to connect to the City of Riverside’s water and sewer. The applicant provided a water will-serve letter to the Environmental Health Department on November 13, 2017. The impacts will be less than significant.

b) City of Riverside requires the project to connect to the water and sewer service. The City of Riverside has water sewer along Center Street. The Riverside Public Utilities Department is prepared to offer water service to the above referenced property upon completion of financial arrangements and compliance with the Department’s Rules and Regulations for the installation of water facilities. The

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

41. Sewer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

a) According to the WMWD comment letter dated December 16, 2016, the project is not in within the vicinity of the WMWD and is on septic. According to the City of Riverside Public Works Department comment letter dated March 22, 2018, the project is not within an area where public sewer is available to serve the project. The project will install a 3,000 gallon septic tank. The onsite wastewater treatment systems (OWTS), the average flowrate per employee is 13 gallons per day. The commercial establishment, it is estimated that there will be 6 full time employees per day plus visitors. This existing project is primarily infill and does not require construction of new wastewater treatment facilities and would not result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. There will be no impact.

b) Environmental Health Department has conditioned that prior to issuance of building permits the applicant shall submit a detailed soil percolation report and groundwater detection borings to ensure

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

adequacy of the soil for the onsite septic systems. The onsite wastewater treatment septic (OWTS) shall be designed in accordance with current Local Agency Management Program (LAMP) guidelines and other applicable regulations or standards at the time the development is submitted for review. Such restrictions and approvals will ensure that any septic systems will be designed appropriately in order to ensure no impacts occur. Impacts will be less than significant. (15.E Health).

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

42. Solid Waste

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

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

Findings of Fact:

a-b) The Project will be served by Riverside County Waste Management. Adequate capacity exists at all three landfills located in Riverside County. The development will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes. Condition of approval 80. WASTE 1, requires that the applicant prepare a Waste Recycling Plan (WRP) identifying materials that will be generated during construction and methods and measures taken to recycle, reuse, or reduce the amount of materials generated. Condition of approval 90. WASTE 1, requires the developer to provide evidence showing that the Project is in compliance with the approved WRP. The proposed Project will not require nor result in the construction of new landfill facilities, including the expansion of existing facilities. The impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No mitigation measures are required.

43. Utilities

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

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

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

Source(s): Project Application Materials, Utility Companies

Findings of Fact:

a-f) The project will not require or result in the construction of new community utility or the expansion of existing community utility facilities. The applicant or applicant-in-successor shall make arrangements with each utility provider to ensure the lot is connected to the appropriate utilities. The project is not anticipated to be in conflict nor create any impacts associated with the adopted energy conservation plans.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

WILDFIRE If located in or near a State Responsibility Area (“SRA”), lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zone, or other hazardous fire areas that may be designated by the Fire Chief, would the project:

44. Wildfire Impacts

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Expose people or structures either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

a-e) The proposed project is not located within a high fire area. The proposed project has been reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department and several conditions of approval have been applied based on the above regulations to help ensure the safety of the residents and structures. Some of these conditions address the location of fire hydrants, construction materials, length and grade of the driveways, gated entries and turning radius. Therefore the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency evacuation or response plan.

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

The project site is not located within a high fire hazard area. Development within the project site is required to comply with the wildland-urban interface fire area building standards of the California Building Code as well as the County's Ordinance No. 787, use of fire retardant roofing materials and submittal of a fire protection/vegetation management (fuel modification) plan to the Riverside County Fire Department. The project would not contribute to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

The project site is served by the Riverside County Fire Department. The nearest fire station is the Riverside Fire Department located at 2300 Market Street, Riverside, CA, 92501 approximately 3.7 miles south of the project. The project would possibly increase demands on fire protection but would be consistent with the Riverside County Fire Department Strategic Plan. In addition, the project would not significantly alter fire personnel response times and would be required to pay impact fees through the County fire protection impact mitigation program and development impact fee program and comply with County Fire Protection Ordinance No. 787.6. These are standard conditions for developments and thus are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. The project alone would not result in the need for the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment, new fire station or the expansion of existing facilities, and thus impacts would be less than significant.

The project's elevation is relatively flat at a range of 896 feet and is an infill project. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, drainage changes, or to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

The project would not contribute to the cumulative demands for new fire facilities. With the payment of impact fees, the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on fire services. Therefore, the impacts will be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the Project:

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

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or

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

reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

46. Have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and probable future projects)?

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

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

Source(s): Staff Review, Project Application Materials

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

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

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

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department
 4080 Lemon Street, 12th Floor
 Riverside, CA 92505

VII. AUTHORITIES CITED

Authorities cited: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21083.05; References: California Government Code Section 65088.4; Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095 and 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San*

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

Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Revised: 5/28/2019 4:29 PM
Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\EA-IS_Template.docx