INITIAL STUDY

Development Plan 2020-2140

Madison Industrial Building Project

W M Lyles Co.

Prepared for:

CITY OF MURRIETA 1 Town Square Murrieta, California 92562 Contact: Juliet Mukasa, Assistant Planner (951) 461-6084

Prepared by:

Matthew Fagan Consulting Services, Inc. 42011 Avenida Vista Ladera Temecula, California 92591 Contact: Matthew Fagan (951) 265-5428

April 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BAC	KGROUND INFORMATION	1
PRO	JECT ASSESSMENT	1
ENV	IRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED	11
DETI	ERMINATION	11
EVAI	LUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	
1.	Aesthetics	
2.	Agriculture Resources	
3.	Air Quality	
4.	Biological Resources	
5.	Cultural Resources	
6.	Energy	
7.	Geology and Soils	
8.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	51
9.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	
10.	Hydrology and Water Quality	
11.	Land Use and Planning	
12.	Mineral Resources	74
13.	Noise/Vibration	75
14.	Population and Housing	
15.	Public Services	86
16.	Recreation	89
17.	Transportation	
18.	Tribal Cultural Resources	
19.	Utilities and Service Systems	101
20.	Wildfire	107
21.	Mandatory Findings of Significance	109
CON	ICLUSION	112
<u>TABI</u>	LES	
Table	e 3-1 Regional Significance – Construction Emissions (pounds/day)	23
Table	e 3-2 Regional Significance – Unmitigated Operational Emissions (pounds/day)	20
Table	e 3-3. Localized Significance – Construction	25
Table	e 3-4. Localized Significance – Operation	26
Table	e 7-1, Closest Known Active Faults	
Table	e 8-1, Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
Table	e 8-2, Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions	53
Table	e 10-1, Local Receiving Waters	
Table	e 10-2, Project Drainage Strategies	60
Table	e 10-3, Best Management Practices	65
Table	e 13-1, City of Murrieta Construction Noise Standards	76
Table	e 13-2, Construction Equipment Noise Levels	77
Table	e 13-3, Project Operational Noise Impacts – Daytime	78
Table	e 13-4, Project Operational Noise Impacts – Nighttime	78
Table	e 13-5, Noise Impacts from Project-Related Traffic	
Table	e 13-6, Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts on Nearby Sensitive Receptors	
Table	e 13-7, Guideline Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria	

Table 13-8, Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment	84
Table 17-1, Project Trip Generation	90

FIGURES

Figure 1, Regional Location Map	3
Figure 2, Vicinity Map	4
Figure 3, Site Plan	5
Figure 4, Landscape Plan	6
Figure 5, LAFCO Annexation Exhibit	7
Figure 6 Aerial Photo	8
Figure 7, General Plan Land Use Designations	9
Figure 8, Zoning Classifications	10
Figure 10-1, Project Drainage Plan	63
Figure 11-1, Average Slope Computation for Natural Areas	71
Figure 11-2, Hillside Overlay Zone	72
Figure 13-1, Noise Receiver and Barrier Locations	79

<u>APPENDICES</u> (provided electronically)

Appendix A: Map My County

Appendix B: Air Quality and Greenhouse Analysis, prepared Enviroassessors, Inc., 10-15-2020

Appendix C1: General Biological Assessment and Western Riverside County MSHCP Consistency Analysis for APN 910230003, prepared by DEC LLC, 8-2019

Appendix C2: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Joint Project Review1 (JPR) Analysis (Includes 2006 JPR Materials), prepared by Searl Biological Services, 8-28-2020

Appendix D1: Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by Archaeological Associates, 10-2020

Appendix D2: Tribal Cultural Resources Letters, prepared by City of Murrieta, 7-15-2020

Appendix D3: Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment of the 7+Acre Lyles Diversified, Inc. Commercial Project Site Located South of the Intersection of Madison Avenue and Golden Gate Circle, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, prepared by Archaeological Associates, 6-2020

Appendix E: *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report, Proposed Office Building and Workshop, 26501 Madison Avenue, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California, APN: 910-230-003,* prepared by LGC Geo-Environmental, Inc., 4-25-2019

Appendix F: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Office Building and Workshop, 26501 Madison Avenue, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California, APN: 910-230-003, prepared by LGC Geo-Environmental, Inc., 2-28-2019

Appendix G1: *Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for 26501 Madison Avenue, Murrieta, CA,* prepared by dk Greene Consulting, Inc., 10-20-2020

Appendix G2: CEQA Level Hydrology & Hydraulics Report for 26501 Madison Avenue, Murrieta, CA, APN 910-230-003, prepared by dk Greene Consulting, Inc., 10-20-2020

Appendix H: *Noise Impact Analysis*, prepared by Eilar Associates, Inc. Acoustical & Environmental Consulting, 6-23-2020

Appendix I: *Trip Generation Letter for the Proposed 11,706 square foot Office Building and a 4,980 square foot Industrial Warehouse Building, located at 26051 Madison Avenue in the City of Murrieta*, prepared by Darnell and Associates, dated 1-12-2021

Appendix J: *Fire Flow*, prepared by Rancho California Water District, 5-2020

Appendix K: Project Facility Availability - Sewer, prepared by Eastern Municipal Water District, 2-26-2020

Appendix L: Project Plans, 2-2021

Appendix M: Project Facility Availability – Potable Water, prepared by City of Murrieta, 2-26-2020

Appendix N: Project Facility Availability - Fire, prepared by City of Murrieta, 2-28-2020

Appendix O: Regarding Impact on Air Quality and Greenhouse Analysis of Eight Additional Parking Spaces, prepared Enviroassessors, Inc., 1-11-2021

CITY OF MURRIETA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT INITIAL STUDY

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.	Project Title:	Madison Industrial Building Project Development Plan 2020-2140 (DP 2020-2140); Conditional Use Permit 2020-2215 (CUP 2020-2215)
2.	Lead Agency: Address:	City of Murrieta 1 Town Square Murrieta, California 92562

- 3. Contact Person: Juliet Mukasa, Assistant Planner Phone Number: (951) 461-6084
- 4. Project Location: The Project site is located at the southwest corner of Madison Avenue and Golden Gate Circle, northeasterly of Jefferson Avenue, in the City of Murrieta (City), Riverside County, California (Figure 1, Regional Location Map and Figure 2, Vicinity Map). The Project is mapped on Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APN) 910-230-003.
- 5. Project Sponsor: W M Lyles Co. Address: 42142 Roick Drive Temecula, CA 92590 Attn: Scott Youngren, 760-728-9874

PROJECT ASSESSMENT

Project Description: The Project proposes a Development Plan (DP) to develop a two-story, 11,706 square foot (sq. ft.) office building with a detached, single-story, 4,980 sq. ft. warehouse (with an outdoor storage area for the warehouse component) on a 5.38 acre site (see note regarding acreage, below). A Conditional Use Permit is required for the outdoor storage area (CUP 2020-2215). Reference Figure 3, *Site Plan*.

The Project entry driveway is proposed off Madison Avenue, at the northeastern side of the Project. The Project will provide 53 parking spaces (45 spaces are required); these will include accessible spaces and electric vehicle spaces, as required. The City's Municipal Code has established a 40% shade requirement for the number of parking spaces provided by the Project; this is achieved with covered spaces and by shade from trees. The required shade for the Project is 2,592 sq. ft. and total shade provided is 2,622 sq. ft. Additionally, approximately 54% percent of the Project site (within the property boundary and includes all of the slopes, basins, and parking lots, as well as the native areas in the creek and around the exterior that are not being graded) will be landscaped with a water-efficient plant palate. Reference **Figure 4**, *Landscape Plan*.

The site will be mass graded with approximately 15,000 cubic yards of cut and 15,000 cubic yards of fill, resulting in a balanced site with no soils being exported off site. The proposed Project will annex in and connect to Rancho California Water District facilities. After the site is annexed, the developers of the site will need to extend the existing 16" waterline to the site and then an 8" line will be constructed into the site to provide for Fire service. The Project would also have to be annexed into Eastern Municipal Water District. Upon annexation, the Project would be served by an existing 8-inch vitrified clay pipe sewer line in an easement at the southwest corner of the Project site.

It should be noted that as a part of the annexation process, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) requires that Madison Avenue be included in the total project acreage; the post-annexation acreage will be 5.82 acres. This should explain any discrepancy in acreages between Project plans and technical reports. Please reference **Figure 5**, *LAFCO Annexation Exhibit*.

2. Description of the Project Site: The Project site is undeveloped. The Project site is disturbed and appears to be routinely maintained for weed abatement purposes. The Project site is relatively flat with a gentle slope from northwest to southeast. The elevation on the Project site ranges from 1,051 feet above mean sea-level (AMSL) in the southeast to 1,083 feet AMSL in the northeast. The Project site contains three different habitat types: ruderal, disturbed coastal sage scrub, and cottonwood riparian forest.

A portion of the northeasterly section of the site will be dedicated to the City of Murrieta for Madison Avenue road improvement. The southerly portion of the site is located in the Warm Springs Creek 100-year flood zone. This area will remain undisturbed and is not considered as part of this Project. In the current pre-development condition, the site has one basin and one outlet (outfall) point. Generally, the entire Project drains southeasterly toward the southeastern corner of the property, then flows directly into Warm Springs Creek. The high point of the site is located near the northeast corner of the property. There is a small amount of off-site drainage ("run-on"), which sheet flows southeasterly through the property and exits into Warm Springs Creek.

3. Land Uses: The proposed Project site is vacant/undeveloped.

North: Business Park (BP) and vacant land South: Business Park (BP) East: Business Park (BP) West: Vacant land Reference Figure 6, *Aerial Photo*

4. General Plan Designation:

Existing: Business Park (BP) Proposed: Business Park (BP) Reference Figure 7, General Plan Land Use Designations

5. Zoning:

Existing: Business Park (BP) **Proposed:** Business Park (BP) Reference **Figure 8, Zoning Classifications**

6. Other Agencies whose approval may be required: The developer must file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to be enforced by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) for a Construction General Permit to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements.

FIGURE 1 Regional Location Map



Source: Map My County https://gis.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/?viewer=MMC_Public

SITE



Source: Project Plans (Appendix L)



FIGURE 4 Landscape Plan



Source: Project Plans (Appendix L)

FIGURE 5 LAFCO Annexation Exhibit



FIGURE 6 Aerial Photo



Source: Google Earth https://www.google.com/earth/

FIGURE 7 General Plan Land Use Designations



Source: Project Plans (Appendix L)

FIGURE 8 Zoning Classifications



Source: City of Murrieta https://www.murrietaca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/681/Murrieta-Zoning-Map-PDF

SITE

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

	Aesthetics		Agricultural and Forestry Resources		Air Quality
x	Biological Resources	x	Cultural Resources		Energy
x	Geology and Soils		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Hazards and Hazardous Materials
	Hydrology and Water Quality		Land Use and Planning		Mineral Resources
X	Noise		Population and Housing		Public Services
	Recreation		Transportation	X	Tribal Cultural Resources
	Utilities and Service Systems		Wildfire		
x	Mandatory Findings of :	Signi	ficance		

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
X	I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

4 6/2021 Signature Dáte Juliet Mukasa, Assistant Planner Project Planner

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
- 10) Initial Study Source List Numbers that precede the sources below are used in the answers to the CEQA checklist questions in the following section of the Initial Study to represent the sources.
 - 1) City of Murrieta, *Murrieta General Plan 2035*, adopted July 19, 2011 https://www.murrietaca.gov/303/General-Plan-2035 Accessed September 2020)
 - 2) City of Murrieta, *Final Environmental Impact Report Murrieta General Plan 2035,* certified July 19, 2011 <u>https://www.murrietaca.gov/303/General-Plan-2035</u> (Accessed September 2020)
 - 3) General Biological Assessment and Western Riverside County MSHCP Consistency Analysis for APN 910230003, prepared by DEC LLC, 8-2019 (Appendix C1)
 - 4) City of Murrieta Zoning Map. Adopted June 17, 2014 <u>http://www.murrietaca.gov/civicax/</u> <u>filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=6702</u> (Accessed September 2020)
 - 5) City of Murrieta General Plan Map. Adopted July 19, 2011 <u>http://www.murrietaca.gov/civicax/</u> <u>filebank/blobdload.aspx?BlobID=6702</u> (Accessed September 2020)

- 6) Google Maps <u>www.google.com/maps</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 7) Project Plans, 2-2021 (Appendix L)
- 8) City of Murrieta, Municipal/Development Code <u>http://library.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/murrieta_ca/murrietacaliforniamunicipalcode?</u> <u>f=templates\$fn=default.htm\$3.0\$vid=amlegal:murrieta_ca</u> (Accessed September 2020)
 2) Marrieta Construction (Accessed September 2020)
- 9) Map My County (Appendix A)
- 10) California Codes https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes.xhtml (Accessed September 2020)
- 11) Air Quality and Greenhouse Analysis, prepared Enviroassessors, Inc., 10-15-2020 (Appendix B)
- 12) CEQA Guidelines http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/ (Accessed September 2020)
- 13) Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, prepared by Archaeological Associates, 10-2020 (Appendix D1)
- 14) *Project Facility Availability Sewer,* prepared by City of Murrieta, 2-26-2020 (Appendix K)
- 15) Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report, Proposed Office Building and Workshop, 26501 Madison Avenue, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California, APN: 910-230-003, prepared by LGC Geo-Environmental, Inc., 4-25-2019 (Appendix E)
- 16) Pre-Construction Paleontological Assessment of the 7+Acre Lyles Diversified, Inc. Commercial Project Site Located South of the Intersection of Madison Avenue and Golden Gate Circle, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, prepared by Archaeological Associates, 6-2020 (Appendix D3)
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Office Building and Workshop, 26501 Madison Avenue, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California, APN: 910-230-003, prepared LGC Geo-Environmental, Inc., 2-28-2019 (Appendix F)
- 18) Murrieta Valley Unified School District website <u>https://www.murrieta.k12.ca.us/</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- Temecula Valley Unified School District website <u>https://www.tvusd.k12.ca.us/</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 20) California Environmental Protection Agency. *Cortese List Data Resources.* 2017. <u>https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 21) California State Water Resources Control Board. *GeoTracker*. 2015. <u>https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 22) Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission, *French Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*, amended 2011 <u>http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/0/15%20-</u> <u>%20Vol.%201%20French%20Valley%20Amd%202011.pdf?ver=2016-08-15-151151-090</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 23) California Building Code <u>https://up.codes/viewer/california/ca-building-code-2016-v1</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 24) California Fire Code <u>https://archive.org/details/gov.ca.bsc.title24.2016.09</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 25) Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for 26501 Madison Avenue, Murrieta, CA, prepared by dk Greene Consulting, Inc., 10-20-2020 (**Appendix G1**)
- 26) CEQA Level Hydrology & Hydraulics Report for 26501 Madison Avenue, Murrieta, CA, APN 910-230-003, prepared by dk Greene Consulting, Inc., 10-20-2020 (**Appendix G2**)
- 27) FEMA https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home (Accessed September 2020)
- 28) Rancho California Water District's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan <u>https://www.ranchowater.com/DocumentCenter/View/2023/2015-UWMP---June-2016?bidId=</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 29) Eastern Municipal Water District's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan https://www.emwd.org/home/showdocument?id=1506 (Accessed September 2020)
- Noise Impact Analysis, prepared by Eilar Associates, Inc. Acoustical & Environmental Consulting, 6-23-2020 (Appendix H)
- 31) State of California Department of Finance <u>http://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/Estimates/E-5/ (</u>Accessed October 2020)
- 32) Murrieta Valley Unified School District, *Residential Development School Fee Justification Study*, dated 3-30-2018
- 33) Trip Generation Letter for the Proposed 11,706 square foot Office Building and a 4,980 square foot Industrial Warehouse Building, located at 26051 Madison Avenue in the City of Murrieta, prepared by Darnell and Associates, dated 1-12-2021 (Appendix I)

- 34) Senate Bill 743 <u>https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB743 (</u>Accessed October 2020)
- 35) Tribal Cultural Resources Letters, prepared by City of Murrieta, 7-15-2020 (Appendix D2)
- 36) Assembly Bill 52 <u>http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140AB52</u> (Accessed October 2020)
- 37) Southern California Edison <u>https://www.edison.com/content/dam/eix/documents/investors/events-presentations/eix-february-2018-business-update.pdf</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 38) Energy.ca.gov Website <u>https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/getdocument.aspx?tn=223244</u> (Accessed March 2020)
- 39) CalRecycle El Sobrante Landfill <u>https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0217/Document/</u> (Accessed September 2020)
- 40) Project Facility Availability Potable Water, prepared by City of Murrieta, 2-26-2020 (Appendix M)
- 41) Project Facility Availability Fire, prepared by City of Murrieta, 2-28-2020 (Appendix N)
- 42) Fire Flow, prepared by Rancho California Water District, 5-2020 (Appendix J)
- 43) Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Joint Project Review (JPR) Analysis (Includes 2006 JPR Materials), prepared by Searl Biological Services, 8-28-2020 (Appendix C2)
- 44) Riverside Transit Agency Website <u>https://www.riversidetransit.com/images/DOWNLOADS/ROUTES/205.pdf</u> (Accessed October 2020)
- 45) Site Visit by MFCS, Inc. 10-2020
- 46) Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report Murrieta General Plan 2035, prepared by Rick Engineering, 5-2020 - Adopted July 2020 (Accessed December 2020) https://www.murrietaca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/3891/Final-Supplemental-EIR-May-2020
- 47) Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines, prepared by The Department of Public Works/Engineering and the Development Services Department, 5-2020 – Adopted July 2020 (Accessed December 2020) <u>https://www.murrietaca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4205/Murrieta-TIA-Preparation-Guidelines-July-2020?bidId=</u>
- 48) *Climate Action Plan*, prepared by RBF Consulting, Adopted July 2020 (Accessed December 2020) <u>https://www.murrietaca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/806/P---Climate-Action-Plan-PDF</u>
- 49) Regarding Impact on Air Quality and Greenhouse Analysis of Eight Additional Parking Spaces, prepared Enviroassessors, Inc., 1-11-2021 (**Appendix O**)

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
1. AESTHETICS: Except as provided in				
Public Resources Code Section 21099,				
would the Project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a				Y
scenic vista? (References 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)				~
b) Substantially damage scenic resources,				
including, but not limited to, trees, rock				x
outcroppings, and historic buildings within a				~
state scenic highway? (References 1, 2, 6)				
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			Х	
vantage point). If the project is in an				
urbanized area, would the Project conflict				
with applicable zoning and other regulations				
governing scenic quality? (References 7)				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or				
glare, which would adversely affect daytime			Y	
or nighttime views in the area? (References			~	
6, 7, 8)				

a) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The City defines scenic vistas generally as views of undisturbed natural lands exhibiting a unique or unusual feature that comprises an important or dominant portion of the view shed. The Santa Ana Mountains and the Santa Rosa Plateau located west of the City are the most dominant visual features in the area. To a lesser extent, the Sedco Hills along the northern portion of the City can be seen, as well as the Agua Tibia Mountain to the southeast can be seen in the far distance.

The Project site is located south of the intersection of Madison Avenue and Golden Gate Circle in the southern portion of the City. The Project site and is currently vacant and zoned for commercial use. The Project site is bordered by developed commercial uses to the north (along the north side of Golden Gate Circle) and to the southwest (along the east side of Jefferson Avenue), with vacant land to the northeast and Warm Springs Creek to the southeast. The Project site is disturbed and has been routinely maintained for weed abatement purposes. The Project site slopes down from the from northwest to south. The elevation on the Project site ranges from 1,086 feet above mean sea-level (AMSL) at the northwest corner down to 1,041 AMSL adjacent to Warm Springs Creek to the south. Due to its slope and existing condition, the site does not contain any scenic vistas, and none are readily visible from the Project site. The Project site contains three different vegetation/habitat types: ruderal/disturbed, disturbed coastal sage scrub, and coastal sage scrub with no unique rock outcroppings, stands of large trees, or other scenic features.

Based upon the General Plan definition of a scenic vista, the Project does not display any of the characteristics of a scenic vista. The Project will not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. **No impact** will occur.

b) No Impact or Does Not Apply. There are no officially designated State Scenic Highways traversing the City, but Interstate 15 (I-15) is defined as an *Eligible* State Scenic Highway. This means that I-15 has a potential to become officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). However, the City would be required to apply for designation, adopt a Corridor Protection Plan, and be approved by the State for I-15 to receive official State Scenic Highway designation. The Project site is located 0.25 miles west of I-15 – it is at a lower elevation and separated from the freeway by urban development and vacant land. Despite the presence of vacant land in the area, the Project site is not readily visible from the I-15 Freeway and would not block any views of the area for travelers on the freeway. Views from this portion of I-15 are of a rural but developing area of commercial and light industrial uses in addition to Warm Springs Creek.

Interstate 215 (I-215) is designated by Riverside County as an Eligible County Scenic Highway, but the Project site is located over a mile south of I-215 (at its junction with the I-15) and is separated from the I-215 by urban development. Therefore, the Project site is neither visible from nor offers views to I-215. In the absence of any officially designated State Scenic Highways in the City, the proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway. **No impact** will occur.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is currently vacant, and the proposed improvements will change its visual character. However, the proposed improvements will be compatible in scale and appearance with the existing development in the vicinity of the Project site. The Project site is zoned for commercial use and is bordered by developed commercial uses to the north (along the north side of Golden Gate Circle) and to the southwest (along the east side of Jefferson Avenue), with vacant land to the northeast and Warm Springs Creek to the southeast. The proposed Project consists of the development of a two-story office building and a supporting warehouse building. The Project would continue the existing pattern of development so it would integrate uniformly with the established and planned commercial and business park uses.

The General Plan designation and zoning classification for the Project site are both Business Park (BP). The Project proposes no change to the either the General Plan designation or zoning classification and will be developed in accordance with the existing land use and zoning designations. The Project site consists of both man-made and natural slopes. The Project site slopes down from the from northwest to south with elevations ranging from 1,086 feet AMSL at the northwest corner down to 1,041 AMSL adjacent to Warm Springs Creek to the south.

The Project would not introduce structures or other built environment elements that would contrast with the existing development of the vicinity of the Project site. Furthermore, the design of the Project complies with all zoning requirements, as amended (i.e., height restrictions, setbacks, lot coverage, etc.). For these reasons, the Project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

In addition, the Project is not located in an urbanized area. The area could be classified as "urbanizing" or even more of a "suburban" land pattern. As noted above, the Project proposes no change to either the General Plan designation or zoning classification (i.e., business park). Therefore, the Project will not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Currently, no lighting sources are located within the Project limits. New development would result in new lighting sources such as parking lot lighting, interior and exterior building lighting (included for safety purposes), vehicle headlights, and illuminated signage. These new sources of light would be visible from neighboring development and along adjacent roadways. Adherence to provisions of Title 16, Section 16.18.100-Lighting of the Murrieta Development Code (MDC), which requires that exterior lighting be directed downward, shielded, and confined to the subject parcel, is required for all development in the City. Additionally, the selection of building materials and colors, subject to City design review, would reduce the potential for architectural glare (i.e., from glass or other reflective surfaces). Furthermore, incorporation of perimeter and streetscape landscaping would serve to further shield surrounding properties from light and/or glare generated on the Project site.

The Project site is located approximately 28 miles northwest of the Mount Palomar Observatory. The intent of the City's Mount Palomar Lighting Standards is to restrict the use of certain light fixtures emitting into the night sky undesirable light rays that have a detrimental effect on astronomical observation and research. All development within 30 miles of Palomar Observatory is required to comply with the general, lamp source, and shielding requirements cited in the MDC. The Project site

is located in an area that is developed with commercial and business park uses. The amount and level of lighting would generally be similar to that which currently exists in the Project vicinity. Because Project lighting would be designed, installed, and operated consistent with the provisions detailed in the MDC, the proposed Project would have a **less than significant impact** on daytime or nighttime views in the Project area and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply		
2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Roard. Would the Project:						
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use? (References 2, 5, 9, 17)				x		
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (References 2, 4, 5)				x		
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (References 10)				x		
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (References 10)				x		
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Reference 2, 4, 5, 9, 10)				x		

- a) *No Impact or Does Not Apply.* The Project site is undeveloped land that is not historically known to ever have been used as farmland. The site is designated Other Lands and Urban-Built Up Land. Therefore, the proposed Project would not affect any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. **No impacts** will occur.
- b) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project site is currently undeveloped and zoned Business Park. The surrounding land has land use designations of Business Park, Office, and Industrial and is developed with business, office, and industrial uses. The Project site and the land that surrounds it is not intended for agricultural uses. Additionally, there are no Williamson Act contracts in the City. No impact related to agricultural zoning or agricultural resources will occur.
- c) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project site is not located in forest land, timberland or timberland zoned for Timberland Production. Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) identifies forest land as land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. The

Project site and the land that surrounds it is not currently being defined, managed, or used as forest land as identified in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g). Therefore, **no impacts** will occur.

- d) *No Impact or Does Not Apply.* The Project site will not result in the loss of forest land or in the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. See response to Threshold 2.c. **No impacts** will occur.
- e) *No Impact or Does Not Apply.* As outlined in the response to Thresholds 2.a through 2.c, the proposed Project site is not currently used for agricultural or farmland purposes, nor is it an area zoned or planned for agricultural uses. Development of the proposed Project would not result in the conversion of farmland or timberland to a non-agricultural or non-forest use. **No impacts** will occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
3. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the Project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (References 11)			x	
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? (References 11, 33, 49)			x	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (References 11, 49)			x	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) affecting a substantial number of people? (References 11, 49)			X	

Any Tables in this Section are from information in the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis*, unless stated otherwise.

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a discussion of any inconsistencies between a proposed project and applicable General Plans and Regional Plans (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125). The regional plan that applies to the proposed Project includes the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Therefore, this section discusses any potential inconsistencies of the proposed Project with the AQMP.

The purpose of this discussion is to set forth the issues regarding consistency with the assumptions and objectives of the AQMP and discuss whether the proposed Project would interfere with the region's ability to comply with Federal and State air quality standards. If the decision-makers determine that the proposed Project is inconsistent, the lead agency may consider Project modifications or inclusion of mitigation to eliminate the inconsistency.

The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook states that "New or amended General Plan Elements (including land use zoning and density amendments), Specific Plans, and significant projects must be analyzed for consistency with the AQMP." Strict consistency with all aspects of the plan is usually not required. A proposed Project should be considered to be consistent with the AQMP if it furthers one or more policies and does not obstruct other policies. The SCAQMD CEQA Handbook identifies two key indicators of consistency:

- 1. Whether the project will result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP.
- 2. Whether the project will exceed the assumptions in the AQMP in 2016 or increments based on the year of project buildout and phase.

Both of these criteria are evaluated in the following analysis.

• Criterion 1 - Increase in the Frequency or Severity of Violations.

Based on the air quality modeling analysis contained in the *AQ/GHG Impact Analysis* (**Appendix B**), neither short-term construction impacts, nor long-term operations will result in significant impacts based on the SCAQMD regional and local thresholds of significance.

Therefore, the proposed Project is not projected to contribute to the exceedance of any air pollutant concentration standards and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the first criterion.

• Criterion 2 - Exceed Assumptions in the AQMP.

Consistency with the AQMP assumptions is determined by performing an analysis of the proposed Project with the assumptions in the AQMP. The emphasis of this criterion is to ensure that the analyses conducted for the proposed Project are based on the same forecasts as the AQMP. The 2016-2040 Regional Transportation/Sustainable Communities Strategy, prepared by SCAG, 2016, includes chapters on: the challenges in a changing region, creating a plan for our future, and the road to greater mobility and sustainable growth. These chapters currently respond directly to federal and state requirements placed on SCAG. Local governments are required to use these as the basis of their plans for purposes of consistency with applicable regional plans under CEQA. For this Project, the City of Murrieta Land Use Plan defines the assumptions that are represented in the AQMP.

The proposed Project is currently zoned as Business Park (BP) and is also classified as Business Park (BP) in the City of Murrieta General Plan. The Project includes construction of a new two-story office building with 11,706 square feet and a new single-story warehouse building with 4,980 square feet. The Project also includes 10,168 square feet of paved parking with 53 parking spaces (it should be noted that while 45 parking spaces are referenced in the *AQ/GHG Impact Analysis*, this difference in parking spaces does not affect the outcome of the analysis; confirmation of this is provided in a supplemental air quality memo attached as **Appendix O** to this Initial Study) and 121,678 square feet landscaped area. The land involved consists of one parcel and grading is expected to be balanced onsite (15,000 cubic yards of cut and fill). The proposed development is a business park that would be consistent with the zoning and General Plan land use designations. The proposed Project would not result in an inconsistency with the land use designation in the City's General Plan. Therefore, the proposed Project is not anticipated to exceed the AQMP assumptions for the Project site and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the second criterion.

Based on the above, the proposed Project will not result in an inconsistency with the SCAQMD AQMP. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). State and federal air quality standards are often exceeded in many parts of the Basin. A discussion of the Project's potential short-term construction impacts, and long-term operational impacts is provided below.

Construction

Typical emission rates from construction activities were obtained from CalEEMod Version 2016.3.2 CalEEMod is a computer model published by the SCAQMD for estimating air pollutant emissions. The CalEEMod program uses the EMFAC2014 computer program to calculate the emission rates specific for the southwestern portion of Riverside County for construction-related employee vehicle trips and the OFFROAD2011 computer program to calculate emission rates for heavy truck operations. EMFAC2014 and OFFROAD2011 are computer programs generated by California Air Resources Board (CARB) that calculates composite emission rates for vehicles. Emission rates are reported by the program in grams per trip and grams per mile or grams per running hour. Using CalEEMod, the peak daily air pollutant emissions for each of the construction phases in terms of air pollutant emissions.

The proposed Project is to be operational by 2022 and the phases of the construction activities which have been analyzed below are: 1) grading, 2) building, 3) paving, and 4) architectural coating.

The Project will be required to comply with existing SCAQMD rules for the reduction of fugitive dust emissions. SCAQMD Rule 403 establishes these procedures. Compliance with this rule is achieved through application of standard best management practices in construction and operation activities, such as:

- Application of water or chemical stabilizers to disturbed soils
- Managing haul road dust by application of water
- Covering haul vehicles
- Restricting vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph
- Sweeping loose dirt from paved site access roadways
- Cessation of construction activity when winds exceed 25 mph and establishing a permanent
- Stabilizing ground cover on finished sites

In addition, projects that disturb 50 acres or more of soil or move 5,000 cubic yards of materials per day are required to submit a Fugitive Dust Control Plan or a Large Operation Notification Form to SCAQMD. Based on the size of the Project area (approximately 5.38 acres). The Project will not move more than 5,000 cubic yards of material a day, therefore, a Fugitive Dust Control Plan or Large Operation Notification will not be required.

Lastly, SCAQMD's Rule 403 minimum requirements require that the application of the best available dust control measures is used for all grading operations and include the application of water or other soil stabilizers in sufficient quantity to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes. Compliance with Rule 403 would require the use of water trucks during all phases where earth moving operations would occur. Compliance with Rule 403 is required.

Regional Construction Emissions

The following CEQA significance thresholds for construction emissions are established for the Basin:

- 75 pounds per day (lbs./day) of Volatile organic compounds (VOC)
- 100 lbs./day of Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x)
- 550 lbs./day of Carbon monoxide (CO)
- 150 lbs./day of Particles that are less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM₁₀)
- 55 lbs./day of Particles that are less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM_{2.5})
- 150 lbs./day of Sulfur dioxide (SO₂)

Projects in the Basin with construction-related emissions that exceed any of the emission thresholds are considered to be significant under SCAQMD guidelines.

The latest version of CalEEMod was used to estimate the onsite and offsite construction emissions. The emissions incorporate Rule 402 and 403. Rule 402 and 403 (fugitive dust) are not considered mitigation measures as the Project by default is required to incorporate these rules during construction.

The construction emissions for the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's daily emission thresholds at the regional level as demonstrated in **Table 3-1**, *Regional Significance – Construction Emissions (pounds/day)*, and therefore would be considered less than significant.

Table 3-1
Regional Significance - Construction Emissions (pounds/day)

	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)					
Activity	VOC	NOx	СО	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Construction ¹						
Winter	8.1	42.4	22.1	0.0	20.5	12.0
Summer	8.1	42.5	22.2	0.0	20.5	12.0
Annual	2.0	17.5	16.7	0.0	1.3	1.0
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Thresholds	No	No	No	No	No	No

¹ Construction emissions include grading, building construction, architectural coatings and paving.

Operations

Operational or long-term emissions occur over the life of the Project. Both mobile and area sources generate operational emissions. Area source emissions arise from consumer product usage, heaters that consume natural gas, gasoline-powered landscape equipment, and recurring architectural coatings (painting). Mobile source emissions from motor vehicles are the largest single long-term source of air pollutants from the operation of the Project. Small amounts of emissions would also occur from area sources such as the consumption of natural gas for heating, hearths, from landscaping emissions, and consumer product usage. The operational emissions were estimated using the latest version of CalEEMod.

Mobile Sources

Mobile sources include emissions from the additional vehicle miles generated from the proposed Project. The vehicle trips associated with the proposed Project are based upon the trip generation rates give in the Project-specific Traffic Scoping Agreement (**Appendix I**) which uses the following Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 10th Trip Generation Manual trip generation rates: Office = 11.276 daily trips per thousand square feet (ITE 710); and Warehouse = 1.74 daily trips per thousand square feet (ITE 150). The program then applies the emission factors for each trip which is provided by the EMFAC2014 model to determine the vehicular traffic pollutant emissions.

Area Sources

Area sources include emissions from consumer products, landscape equipment and architectural coatings. As specifics were not known about the landscaping equipment fleet, CalEEMod defaults were used to estimate emissions from landscaping equipment.

Per SCAQMD Rule 1113 as amended on June 3, 2011, the architectural coatings that would be applied after January 1, 2014 will be limited to an average of 50 grams per liter or less and the CalEEMod model default was utilized as the new model takes this rule into account.

Energy Usage

2016.3.2 CalEEMod defaults were utilized.

Regional Operational Emissions

The daily operational emissions significance thresholds for the Basin are as follows:

- 55 lbs./day of VOC
- 55 lbs./day of NOx
- 550 lbs./day of CO
- 150 lbs./day of PM₁₀
- 55 lbs./day of PM_{2.5}

• 150 lbs./day of SO₂

The operations-related criteria air quality impacts created by the proposed Project have been analyzed through the use of CalEEMod model. The operating emissions were based on year 2021, which is the anticipated opening year for the Project. The summer and winter emissions created by the proposed Project's long-term operations are summarized in **Table 3-2**, *Regional Significance – Unmitigated Operational Emissions (pounds/day)*.

	Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)							
Activity	VOC	NOx	СО	SO ₂	PM 10	PM _{2.5}		
Operations ¹								
Winter	0.5	1.1	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.1		
Summer	0.5	1.1	1.2	0.0	0.1	0.1		
Annual	0.7	1.1	1.3	0.0	0.1	0.1		
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55		
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No		

 Table 3-2

 Regional Significance - Unmitigated Operational Emissions (pounds/day)

Operations include area sources, energy use, and mobile sources. Area sources consist of emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping equipment. Energy usage consists of emissions from on-site natural gas usage. Mobile sources consist of emissions from vehicles and road dust.

Table 3-2 provides the Project's unmitigated operational emissions. **Table 3-2** shows that the Project does not exceed the SCAQMD daily emission threshold and regional operational emissions are considered to be less than significant.

Based on this analysis, implementation of the Project will not 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. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. In order to determine if the proposed Project would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, an analysis of localized emissions should be conducted. The following includes an analysis of localized significance thresholds (localized construction emissions, operational emissions), construction-related toxic air contaminant impact, and CO Hot Spot Emissions.

Localized Significance Thresholds (LST)

SCAQMD has published a "Fact Sheet for Applying CalEEMod to Localized Significance Thresholds." CalEEMod calculates construction emissions based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment. In order to compare CalEEMod reported emissions against the localized significance threshold lookup tables, the CEQA document should contain, in its Project design features or its mitigation measures, the following parameters:

- The off-road equipment list (including type of equipment, horsepower, and hours of operation) assumed for the day of construction activity with maximum emissions.
- The maximum number of acres disturbed on the peak day.
- Any emission control devices added onto off-road equipment.
- Specific dust suppression techniques used on the day of construction activity with maximum emissions.

Construction LST

The local air quality emissions from construction were analyzed using the SCAQMD's Mass Rate Localized Significant Threshold Look-up Tables and the methodology described in Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, prepared by SCAQMD, revised July 2008. The Look-up Tables were developed by the SCAQMD in order to readily determine if the daily emissions of CO, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from the proposed Project could result in a significant impact to the local air quality. The emission thresholds were based on the Temecula Valley source receptor area (SRA 26). According to LST methodology, the distance from the boundary of the Project site is 840 meters (2,755 feet) to the nearest off-site sensitive receptor, which is a residential community located to the northeast, therefore 500 meters (the distance in the table closest to the actual receptor distance) is used as the receptor distance.

The data provided in **Table 3-3**, *Localized Significance – Construction*, shows that none of the analyzed criteria pollutants would exceed the local emissions thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptors. Therefore, local air quality impacts occurring from construction of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Phase	Onsite Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)			
	NOx	со	PM 10	PM2.5
Construction ¹				
Winter	42.5	22.1	20.5	12.0
Summer	42.5	22.2	20.5	12.0
Annual	17.5	16.7	1.3	1.0
SCAQMD Threshold ²	896	23,866	178	86
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

 Table 3-3

 Localized Significance – Construction

¹ Construction emissions include grading, building construction, architectural coatings and paving.

² The closest sensitive receptor is located 840 meters (2,755 feet) to the northeast.

Operational LST

According to SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a project, if the project includes stationary sources, or attracts mobile sources (such as heavy-duty trucks) that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site; such as industrial warehouses. Similar to construction, the local air quality emissions from Project operation were also analyzed using the SCAQMD's Mass Rate Localized Significant Threshold Look-up Tables and the methodology described in Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, prepared by SCAQMD, revised July 2008. The Look-up Tables were developed by the SCAQMD in order to readily determine if the daily emissions of CO, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} from the proposed Project could result in a significant impact to the local air quality. The emission thresholds were based on the Temecula Valley source receptor area (SRA 26). According to LST methodology, the distance from the boundary of the Project site is 840 meters (2,755 feet) to the nearest off-site sensitive receptor, which is a residential community located to the northeast, therefore 500 meters (the distance in the table closest to the actual receptor distance) is used as the receptor distance.

The data provided in **Table 3-4**, *Localized Significance – Operation*, shows that none of the analyzed criteria pollutants would exceed the local emissions thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptors. Therefore, local air quality impacts occurring from operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Table 3-4 Localized Significance – Operation

Phase	Onsite Pollutant Emissions (pounds/day)			
	NOx	СО	PM 10	PM _{2.5}
Operation ¹				
Winter	1.1	1.2	0.1	0.1
Summer	1.1	1.2	0.1	0.1
Annual	1.1	1.3	0.1	0.1
SCAQMD Threshold ²	896	23,866	43	26
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No

¹ Operations include area sources, energy use, and mobile sources. Area sources consist of emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscaping equipment. Energy usage consists of emissions from on-site natural gas usage. Mobile sources consist of emissions from vehicles and road dust.

² The closest sensitive receptor is located 840 meters (2,755 feet) to the northeast.

Construction-Related Toxic Air Contaminant Impact

The greatest potential for toxic air contaminant emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during construction of the proposed Project. The Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has issued the Air Toxic Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines and Guidance Manual for the Preparation of Health Risk Assessments, February 2015 to provide a description of the algorithms, recommended exposure variates, cancer and noncancer health values, and the air modeling protocols needed to perform a health risk assessment (HRA) under the Air Toxics Hot Spots Information and Assessment Act of 1987. All substances that are evaluated for cancer risk and/or noncancer acute, 8-hour, and chronic health impacts. In addition, identify any multi-pathway substances that present a cancer risk or chronic noncancer hazard via non-inhalation routes of exposure.

Given its size and relatively limited number of heavy-duty construction equipment and construction schedule, the proposed Project would not result in a long-term substantial source of toxic air containment emissions and corresponding individual cancer risk. Furthermore, construction-based particulate matter (PM) emissions (including diesel exhaust emissions) do not exceed any local or regional thresholds. Therefore, no significant short-term toxic air contaminant impacts would occur during construction of the proposed Project.

CO Hot Spot Emissions

CO is the pollutant of major concern along roadways because the most notable source of CO is motor vehicles. For this reason, CO concentrations are usually indicative of the local air quality generated by a roadway network and are used as an indicator of potential local air quality impacts. Local air quality impacts can be assessed by comparing future without and with project CO levels to the State and Federal CO standards.

To determine if the proposed Project could cause emission levels in excess of the CO standards, a sensitivity analysis is typically conducted to determine the potential for CO "hot spots" at a number of intersections in the general Project vicinity. Because of reduced speeds and vehicle queuing, "hot spots" potentially can occur at high traffic volume intersections with a Level of Service E or worse.

Micro-scale air quality emissions have traditionally been analyzed in environmental documents where the air basin was a non-attainment area for CO. However, the SCAQMD has demonstrated in the CO attainment redesignation request to EPA that there are no "hot spots" anywhere in the Basin, even at intersections with much higher volumes, much worse congestion, and much higher background CO levels than anywhere in Riverside County. If the worst-case intersections in the Basin have no "hot spot" potential, any local impacts will be below thresholds.

Table 1 of the Traffic Scoping Agreement shows that the Project would generate only 141 total daily trips with 39 peak AM hour trips and 16 peak PM hour trips. The 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for

Carbon Monoxide showed that an intersection which has a daily traffic volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day would not violate the CO standard. The volume of traffic at Project buildout with cumulative projects would be well below 100,000 vehicles and below the necessary volume to even get close to causing a violation of the CO standard. Therefore, no CO "hot spot" modeling was performed, and no significant long-term air quality impact is anticipated to local air quality with the on-going use of the proposed Project.

Based on this analysis, implementation of the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the application of materials such as asphalt pavement. The objectionable odors that may be produced during the construction process are of short-term in nature and the odor emissions are expected cease upon the drying or hardening of the odor producing materials. Diesel exhaust and VOCs would be emitted during construction of the Project, which are objectionable to some, however, emissions would disperse rapidly from the Project site and therefore should not reach an objectionable level at the nearest sensitive receptors. Due to the short-term nature and limited amounts of odor producing materials being utilized, impacts related to odors would occur during construction of the project will be considered less than significant.

SCAQMD recommends that odor impacts be addressed in a qualitative manner. Such an analysis shall determine whether the Project would result in excessive nuisance odors, as defined under the California Code of Regulations and Section 41700 of the California Health and Safety Code, and thus would constitute a public nuisance related to air quality.

Potential sources that may emit odors during the on-going operations of the proposed Project would include odor emissions from trash storage areas. Due to the distance of the nearest receptors from the Project site (2,755 feet to the northeast) and through compliance with SCAQMD's Rule 402 no significant impacts related to odors or other emissions would occur during the on-going operations of the proposed Project.

Based on this analysis, implementation of the Project will not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) affecting a substantial number of people. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the Project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any identified candidate, sensitive, listed, or special status species in local or regional plans or policies? (References 3)		x		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (References 3, 43)			x	
c) 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? (References 3, 43)			X	
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? (References 3)		x		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (References 2, 3, 8)		x		
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (References 3, 43)		x		

a) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Based on a Project-specific General Biological Assessment and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis (BRA/MSHCP 2019 Report, Appendix C1), the Project site is bordered by industrial uses to the north, vacant land to the east, a commercial development to the west, and Warm Springs Creek to the south. The Project site is disturbed and has been routinely maintained for weed abatement purposes. The Project site slopes gently down from north to south toward the creek. The elevation on the Project site ranges from 1,083 feet above mean sea-level (AMSL) in the north corner down to 1,051 AMSL along the southern edge of the site adjacent to Warm Springs Creek. The Project site contains three different habitat types: ruderal or disturbed, coastal sage scrub, and cottonwood riparian forest:

Ruderal

The Project site contains approximately 4.64 acres of ruderal land which has been heavily disturbed and is dominated by mostly non-native species of plants, however, some native species are present as well. In addition to a number of non-native weedy species, this area also supports eucalyptus trees (*Eucalyptus sp.*) and Peruvian pepper trees (*Schinus molle*).

Disturbed Coastal Sage Scrub

The Project site contains approximately 0.21-acre of disturbed coastal sage scrub. This habitat has plant species associated with native coastal sage scrub (CSS); however, these have been heavily disturbed by human activities and the CSS species are no longer dominant. This area supports native species such as California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasiculatum*), brittlebush (*Encelia fairnosa*), and California sage (*Artemisia californica*) but also weedy species such as tree tobacco, mustard, brome, foxtail barely, stink net, sunflower, and black mustard.

Cottonwood Riparian Forest

The Project site contains approximately 0.98-acre of cottonwood riparian forest along Warm Springs Creek which is dominated by Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*), tamarisk (*Tamarix ramosissima*), red willow (*Salix laevigata*), arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), black willow (*Salix goodingii*), and common sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*).

General wildlife on or within the vicinity of the Project site include red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicanus*), turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), California ground squirrel (*Otospermophilus beecheyi*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*), blue grey gnatcatcher (*Polioptila caerulea*), California towhee (*Melozone crissalis*), and American bushtit (*Psaltriparus minimus*).

Listed/Sensitive Species

The Project site is not located within any designated federal critical habitat so no impact to critical habitat would occur. According to the CNDDB, a total of 68 sensitive species of plants and 61 sensitive species of animals have the potential to occur on or within the vicinity of the Project area. These include those listed or candidates for listing by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). All habitats with the potential to be used by sensitive species were evaluated during the site visit and a determination was made regarding the presence or probability of presence for each species that could occur in the area. This evaluation includes those species listed as Candidate, Rare, Threatened, or Endangered under the state and federal endangered species laws or those species directed to be evaluated under the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

Plants. A total of 25 plant species are: listed as state and/or federal Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate species; required to be reviewed under the Narrow Endemic Plant section of the Western Riverside MSHCP; or are 1B.1 listed plants on the CNPS Rare Plan Inventory. These species were evaluated based on their habitat requirements and existing conditions on the Project site. The Project *BRA/MSHCP 2019 Report* determined the Project site had no habitat for these species and there was **NO** potential for them to occur on the Project site:

- Chaparral sand-verbena
- Munz's onion
- San Diego ambrosia
- Rainbow Manzanita
- Jaeger's milk-vetch
- San Jacinto Valley crownscale
- Parish's brittlescale
- Nevin's barberry
- Thread-leaved brodiaea
- Orcutt's brodiaea
- Vail Lake ceanothus
- Smooth tarplant

- Orcutt's pincushion
- Parry's spineflower
- Slender-horned spineflower
- San Diego button-celery
- Campbell's liverwort
- Tecate cypress
- Coulter's goldfields
- Parish's meadowfoam
- Spreading navarretia
- Prostrate vernal pool navarretia
- California Orcutt grass
- Bottle liverwort

The *BRA/MSHCP 2019 Report* concludes the only sensitive plant species that could be impacted by Project development would be Robinson's pepper grass. This species is not covered under the MSHCP but, due to the small Project impact, the disturbed nature of the Project site, and the fact that habitat for this species is being conserved under the MSHCP, Project impacts to this species are considered to be less than significant with the payment of the MSHCP fee (see **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-5**).

It should be noted that, while the site itself does not contain any listed or sensitive plants, payment of the MSHCP mitigation fee (see **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-5**) will help further the goals of the MSHCP including long-term protection of sensitive plants such as those listed above.

Wildlife. A total of 22 animal species that are listed as state and/or federal Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate were identified and evaluated based on their habitat requirements and existing conditions on the Project site. The Project *BRA/MSHCP 2019 Report* determined the Project site had no habitat for these species and there was **NO** potential for them to occur on the Project site:

- Tricolored blackbird
- Arroyo Toad
- Vernal pool fairy shrimp
- San Diego fairy shrimp
- Swainson's hawk
- Western snowy plover
- Western yellow-billed cuckoo
- San Bernardino kangaroo rat
- Stephen's kangaroo rat
- Quino checkerspot butterfly
- Bald eagle
- Coastal California gnatcatcher
- California red-legged frog
- Riverside fairy shrimp

Conversely, the Project *BRA/MSHCP 2019 Report* determined there is suitable habitat and the following animals have the potential to occur on the Project site:

- Cooper's hawk
- California glossy snake
- Orange-throated whiptail
- Coastal whiptail
- San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit
- Coast horned lizard

Least Bell's vireo¹

The Project site has the potential to support seven (7) of the listed or sensitive plant species expected in the Project area. The site plan indicates the northern 4.64 acres of the site will be developed which contains the ruderal or weedy vegetation that provides minimal support for listed or sensitive species. In addition, the southern 1.19 acres of the site adjacent to and including Warm Springs Creek contains the disturbed coastal sage scrub and cottonwood riparian forest habitat which will remain undisturbed (i.e., vacant). The *BRA/MSHCP 2019 Report* concluded that incremental impacts to Cooper's hawk, orange-throated whiptail, coastal whiptail, coastal horned lizard, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, coastal California gnatcatcher, and Bell's sage sparrow from site development are adequately mitigated by the MSHCP, and the Project will pay the MSHCP fee (see **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-5**). Therefore, impacts are less than significant due to Project design and payment of impact fees.

Nesting Birds

Migratory non-game native bird species are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Additionally, Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take of all birds and their active nests. The Project site contains shrubs and trees that can support nesting songbirds or raptors. The disturbed coastal sage scrub and the cottonwood riparian forest are considered habitat for nesting birds and raptors during the nesting bird season of February 1 through September 15. The site plan indicates the central and northern 4.64 acres of the site will be developed while the southern 1.19 acres of the site, adjacent to Warm Springs Creek, will remain undeveloped. Since there are trees and shrubs in the central and northern portions of the site, impacts to nesting birds are potentially significant so **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-1** will be implemented which requires a nesting bird survey be conducted prior to grading the site.

In addition to the other nesting birds addressed above, burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) is a CDFW species of special concern and there is potential habitat on the Project site. A focused survey for this species was conducted in July 2019 and was not found on-site. However, this species is very opportunistic and utilizes existing small mammal burrows for nests, so it can occupy a "vacant" site in a relatively short time. Small mammals are present on the Project site, and burrowing owl is present in the general surrounding area. Because of this, even though the species was not found on-site, **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-2** is recommended to conduct a pre-grading survey for burrowing owl to assure the species is not present on the site at the time Project grading is to begin. **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-3** is recommended to conduct a pre-construction walkover three days prior to any ground disturbing activities or vegetation removal, by a qualified biological monitor to identify any sensitive biological resources to flag for avoidance.

MM BIO-1 Pre-Construction Nesting Bird Survey. If vegetation removal is scheduled during the nesting season (typically February 1 to September 1), then a focused survey for active nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (as determined by a combination of academic training and professional experience in biological sciences and related resource management activities) no more than five (5) days prior to the beginning of Project-related activities (including but not limited to equipment mobilization and staging, clearing, grubbing, vegetation removal, and grading). Surveys shall be conducted in proposed work areas, staging and storage areas, and soil, equipment, and material stockpile areas. For passerines and small raptors, surveys shall be conducted within a 200-foot radius surrounding the work area (in areas where access is feasible). For larger raptors, the survey area shall encompass a 500foot radius. Surveys shall be conducted during weather conditions suited to maximize the observation of possible nests and shall concentrate on areas of suitable habitat. If a lapse in Project-related work of five (5) days or longer

¹ Least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) is a federal and state listed endangered species found in riparian forest, riparian scrub, and riparian woodland. Nesting habitat of this species is restricted to willow and/or mulefat dominated riparian scrub along permanent or nearly permanent streams. The Project site does contain suitable habitat for this species in and adjacent to Warm Springs Creek and has the potential to be present.

occurs, an additional nest survey shall be required before work can be reinitiated. If nests are encountered during any preconstruction survey, a qualified biologist shall determine if it may be feasible for construction to continue as planned without impacting the success of the nest, depending on conditions specific to each nest and the relative location and rate of construction activities. If the qualified biologist determines construction activities have potential to adversely affect a nest, the biologist shall immediately inform the construction manager to halt construction activities within minimum exclusion buffer of 50 feet for songbird nests, and 200 to 500 feet for raptor nests, depending on species and location. Active nest(s) within the Project site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist during construction if work is occurring directly adjacent to the established no-work buffer. Construction activities within the no-work buffer may proceed after a qualified biologist determines the nest is no longer active due to natural causes (e.g., young have fledged, predation, or other non-human causes of nest failure).

- MM BIO-2 Pre-Construction Burrowing Owl Survey. A burrowing owl pre-construction survey shall be conducted on the Project site within fourteen (14) days prior to ground disturbance to avoid direct take of burrowing owls. The preconstruction survey will follow the guidance outlined in Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside MSHCP (2006). A report of the findings prepared by a qualified biologist shall be submitted to the City prior to any permit or approval for ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls are detected on site during the 14-day preconstruction survey within the breeding season (February 1st to August 31st), then construction activities shall be limited to beyond 300 feet of the active burrows. If burrowing owls are detected on site during the 14-day pre-construction survey outside the breeding season (February 1 to August 31), then the buffer for construction activities shall be determined by a qualified biologist in consultation with the City. No construction activity shall be permitted within any burrowing owl construction buffer until a gualified biologist has confirmed that nesting efforts are complete or not initiated. In addition to monitoring breeding activity, if construction is initiated during the breeding season or active relocation is proposed, a burrowing owl mitigation plan shall be developed based on the County of Riverside Environmental Programs Division, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and United States Fish and Wildlife Service requirements for the relocation of individuals to Riverside Conservation Authority (RCA) conserved lands located in the general vicinity of Murrieta. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City of Murrieta Planning Department.
- MM BIO-3 Pre-Construction Walkover. Three days prior to any ground disturbing activities or vegetation removal, a qualified biological monitor shall conduct a pre-construction survey to identify any sensitive biological resources to flag for avoidance. Any reptile species that may be present within the Project area shall be relocated outside of the impact areas.

Potential impacts to listed or sensitive species are less than significant due to Project design. Development of the Project would not eliminate significant amounts of habitat for potentially occurring special-status plant or wildlife species, nor would it reduce population size of sensitive plant and/or wildlife species below self-sustaining levels on a local or regional basis. However, onsite vegetation could provide potential nesting sites for common native bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) or the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3515), so removal of these onsite features could result in a significant impact to habitat of species protected by regulation. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1** through **MM BIO-3**, potential impacts to nesting birds and burrowing owl will be reduced to less **than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.
b) Less Than Significant Impact. Warm Springs Creek runs from east to west on the southern portion of the site. The 2020 JPR Consistency Analysis (Includes 2006 JPR Materials) (Appendix C2) indicates the Project site contains approximately 0.83-acre of County of Riverside riparian/riverine resources and California Department of Fish and Wildlife jurisdictional land while the BRA/MSHCP 2019 Report indicates the site has and approximately 0.62 acre of waters of the United States. Hydric soils classified as Riverwash by the United States Soil Survey are found within Warm Springs Creek. The site does not contain and isolated vernal pool habitat or depressions that would be suitable habitat for listed fairy shrimp species. The southern portion of the site that contains these water-related features will be left undeveloped and undisturbed.

No natural watercourses or riparian vegetation/habitat of any kind are present in the central and northern portions of the Project site planned for development. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community will **be less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

- c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is disturbed and has been routinely maintained for weed abatement purposes. The Project site slopes gently down from north to south toward Warm Springs Creek. The Project site contains approximately 0.62-acre of "waters of the Unites States" represented by Warm Springs Creek, and hydric soils classified as Riverwash by the United States Soil Survey are found within the creek. The southern 1.19 acres of the site including the creek and an adjacent 50-foot buffer along the northern bank of the creek will be left undisturbed. In addition, no depressions or areas where water would pool were observed within the Project site. The Project does not contain obligate hydrophytes and facultative wetlands plant species. No hydric soils occur within the central and northern portions of the site planned for development. No vernal pools or suitable habitat for fairy shrimp occur on the site. Therefore, the Project as designed will not 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. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
- d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The City General Plan identifies multiple creeks within the City limits as wildlife corridors, including Murrieta Creek and Warm Springs Creek which is within the southern portion of the Project site. Wildlife movement corridors link together areas of suitable habitat that are otherwise separated by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbances. The Project site is located within the Southwest Area Plan of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. The Project site is located within Criteria Cell 6525 of sub-unit (SU5) French Valley/Lower Sedco Hills. Warm Springs Creek runs from east to west on the southern portion of the site. It is likely that this adjacent drainage supports regional and local wildlife movement.

A review of the site plan indicates the Project has been designed to avoid impacts to Warm Springs Creek. The development area of the Project is outside of a 50-foot buffer area along the north bank of the creek. In addition, no Project activities will occur within the onsite drainage prior to, during, and following construction, including grading, creation of manufactured slopes, fuel modification zones, and equipment and material staging areas. One major goal of the Western Riverside MSHCP is to keep reserved lands contiguous and connected, so avoidance of impacts on Warm Springs Creek will comply with the Western Riverside MSHCP guidelines and requirements (i.e., *Section 6.1.4 Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines*). The only potential aspect of the Project that may affect wildlife movement along Warm Springs Creek would be security and parking lot lighting in the central and southern portion of the site close to Warm Springs Creek. **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-4** will help reduce potential indirect impacts of Project lighting on wildlife movement to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

MM BIO-4 Night Lighting. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the developer shall provide a photometric plan prepared by a qualified professional that demonstrates onsite building and parking lot lighting will be directed away from Warm Springs Creek and that the anticipated light levels at the southern boundary of the Project adjacent to Warm Springs Creek will not exceed 0.5 foot-candles per square foot. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Planning Department.

- e) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The City of Murrieta and Riverside County land use-based conservation goals and policies are in place to protect:
 - The ecological and lifecycle needs of threatened, endangered, or otherwise sensitive species and their associated habitats;
 - The groundwater aquifer, water bodies, and water courses, including reservoirs, rivers, streams, and the watersheds located throughout the region, and to conserve and efficiently use water;
 - Floodplain and riparian areas, wetlands, forest, vegetation, and environmentally sensitive lands; and,
 - Native trees, specimen trees and trees with historical significance (heritage).

The City of Murrieta is a participant in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) which has established a regional plan to achieve the above-listed goals and help reduce impacts to threatened, endangered, or otherwise sensitive species. As outlined in Threshold 4.f, implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM BIO-5** (MSHCP fee) and **MM BIO-6** (SKR fee) will reduce potential impacts related to conflicts with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources to less than significant levels.

As detailed in response to Thresholds 4.b and 4.c, the Project site contains riparian areas but no wetlands. No riparian resources are in the central and northern portions of the site where development is planned, so impacts on riparian areas or wetlands based on Project design will be less than significant.

The City's Tree Preservation Section of the Municipal Code defines "Mature Tree" as "a living tree with a total circumference of thirty (30) inches or more (9.5 inches in diameter) of all major stems, as measured 4.5 feet above the root crown (diameter at breast height - DBH). A major stem shall measure at least 12.5 inches in circumference (four inches in diameter). Mature trees shall not include stump regrowth." There are no mature trees in the planned development area of the proposed Project site that meet that definition. No impact would occur.

Overall, implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM BIO-5** and **MM BIO-6** would reduce potential impacts related to conflicts with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

f) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project site is located within the Southwest Area Plan of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. However, the Project site is not located within a Criteria Cell or Subunit. A discussion of the applicable Western Riverside County MSHCP requirements follows:

Section 6.1.2 Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Habitat and Vernal Pools

The proposed Project site contains approximately 0.83 acre of drainage feature and associated riparian/wetland habitat that would be considered Western Riverside MSHCP riparian/riverine resources. This area has been delineated and avoidance of the delineated area will be incorporated into the Project design. The site contains a wetland/riparian area associated with Warm Springs Creek and is composed of cottonwood riparian forest with an understory dominated by mulefat.

Section 6.1.3 Sensitive Plant Species

The Project site is not located within the Western Riverside County MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA) pursuant to Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP. In addition, the Project site is not located within the Western Riverside County MSHCP Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Area (CAPSSA) pursuant to Section 6.3.2 of the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Therefore, the NEPSSA and CAPSSA requirements are not applicable to the Project.

Section 6.1.4 Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines

The Project site is not located adjacent to a Western Riverside County MSHCP Conservation Area. However, the site does contain a portion of Warm Springs Creek that will not be impacted by Project activities. Warm Springs Creek is tributary to Murrieta Creek which ultimately flows to the Santa Margarita River. Therefore, the Urban/Wildlands Interface Guidelines (Section 6.14 of the MSHCP) are required to be applied to the Project.

No Project construction activities will occur within the on-site drainage and associated riparian habitat. The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the Project to reduce potential impacts to the drainage:

Drainage – Water Quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be incorporated, including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) and erosion control requirements from the Regional Water Quality Control Board to ensure that the quantity and quality of surface water runoff discharged into the on-site drainage is not altered in an adverse way when compared with existing conditions. These BMPs will be implemented as part of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in order to ensure that water quality is not degraded.

Toxics - Measures such as those employed to address drainage issues will be implemented for toxics. Land uses proposed in proximity to the on-site drainage that use chemicals or generate bioproducts that are potentially toxic or may adversely affect wildlife species, habitat or water quality must incorporate measures to ensure that application of such chemicals does not result in discharge to the drainage.

Lighting - Any night lighting will be directed away from adjacent riparian habitat to protect species from direct nighttime lighting. If nighttime lighting is required, shielding will be incorporated in the design to ensure ambient nighttime lighting is not increased in the adjacent riparian habitat areas (see **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-4**).

Noise - Proposed noise-generating land uses affecting adjacent riparian areas must incorporate setbacks to minimize the effects of noise on the drainage area. The drainage area should not be subject to noise that would exceed residential noise standards.

Invasives - Invasive, non-native plant species must not be used as landscaping materials for development that is proposed adjacent to the onsite drainage area. Table 6-2 of Volume 1 of the MSHCP lists the plants that should be avoided.

Barriers - Proposed land uses adjacent to the on-site drainage area must incorporate barriers, such as native landscaping, rocks/boulders, fencing, walls, signage and/or other appropriate mechanisms, to minimize unauthorized public access, domestic animal predation, illegal trespass or dumping.

Grading/Land Development - Manufactured slopes associated with proposed site development must not extend into the onsite drainage area.

Section 6.3.2 Additional Surveys and Procedures

The Project site is located within the Western Riverside County MSHCP Additional survey area for Los Angeles pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris brevinasus*) and Burrowing Owl (*Athene cunicularia*). Small mammal surveys for Los Angeles pocket mouse were conducted from July 6 to July 11, 2019. The surveys were negative for Los Angeles pocket mouse. In addition, focused Burrowing Owl surveys were conducted on July 17, 23, 29, and 31, 2019. No Burrowing Owl or Burrowing Owl sign were found. Burrowing Owl have been determined to not be present on the site.

The MSHCP includes a Local Development Mitigation Fee to assist in providing revenue to acquire and preserve vegetation communities and natural areas within Riverside County which are known to support populations of threatened, endangered or key sensitive populations of plant and wildlife species. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-5** requires the Project proponent to pay the MSHCP Mitigation Fee for the development of the Project per Riverside County Ordinance 810.2. **Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1** and **MM BIO-2** require pre-construction surveys prior to any ground disturbing activities or vegetation removal for nesting birds and burrowing owl. **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-3** is recommended to conduct a pre-construction walkover three days prior to any ground disturbing activities or vegetation removal, by a qualified biological monitor to identify any sensitive biological resources to flag for avoidance.

In addition to the MSHCP, the Project site is within the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) fee boundary, but is not located within an SKR reserve, nor is the site located in an area requiring focused SKR surveys. Therefore, the Project proponent will be required to pay SKR HCP fees, as detailed in **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-6**.

- MM BIO-5 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project proponent shall provide evidence to the City that payment of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation Fee has been made for the development of the Project or portions thereof to be constructed within the City and County (per Riverside County Ordinance 810.2). This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.
- MM BIO-6 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project proponent shall provide evidence to the City that payment of the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation Fee has been made for the development of the Project or portions thereof to be constructed within the City and County (per Riverside County Ordinance 663). This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department.

With implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1** through **MM BIO-6**, impacts related to conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan would be reduced to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the				
Projeci.				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource_pursuant to § 15064.5? (References 12, 13)		x		
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (References 12, 13)		x		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (References 10, 12,13)		X		

a) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A complete Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA, Appendix D1) was prepared for the Project. When a project will impact a cultural resources site, a lead agency shall first determine whether the site is an historical resource. CEQA defines a "historical resource" as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) is listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) is listed in a local register of historical resources as defined in *Public Resources Code* (*PRC*) Section 5020.1(k); (3) is identified as significant in a historical resource by a project's Lead Agency (*PRC* Section 21084.1 and *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5[a]).

PRC section 5020.1(j) defines a historical resource as including but not limited to "any object, building, structure site, area, place, record, or manuscript which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural engineering scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California. And PRC section 5024.1 lists the properties that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register.

Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* section 15064.5[c][4], regarding effects on archaeological sites, if a cultural resource is neither a unique archaeological nor an historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the Initial Study, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

A "substantial adverse change" to a historical resource, according to PRC §5020.1(q), "means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired."

The Project site is currently vacant and subject to disking for weed abatement. No improvements exist on the Project site. A Cultural Resources Records Search (CHRIS), a Sacred Lands File (SLF) search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and an intensive pedestrian field survey were conducted for the Project site as part of the *CRA* for the Project.

Cultural Resources Records Search (CHRIS): On March 8, 2018, the Cultural Resources Consultant conducted a CHRIS search on the campus of University of California Riverside, to identify previously documented cultural resources within a one-mile radius of the Project site. The Eastern Information Center (EIC) maintains records of previously documented cultural resources (including those that meet the definition of a tribal cultural resource) and technical studies.

The Cultural Resources Records Search at the EIC indicated that no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites, historic structures, or isolates have been previously recorded within the boundaries of the Project site although two archaeological sites have been documented within a onemile radius of the Project area. The first site is CA-RIV-1730 a large former Native American habitation site along Santa Gertrudis Creek that was found in 1979 but has since been degraded by plowing and erosion. This site is approximately one mile southeast of the Project site. The second site is CA-RIV-6466H which consists of Temecula Hot Springs over a mile north of the Project site. The site consists of not only the historical hot springs site, but historic period architectural features and debris accompanied by a very disturbed scatter of groundstone and lithics.

Regarding historical resources, two historic buildings have been recorded within a one-mile radius of the Project site. The first is the Raleigh Brown Place (Primary # 33-7746) located at 25751 Jefferson Avenue. Constructed around 1910-1912, it is a single-story bungalow (residence) fashioned from stone with a barn and windmill. It is one mile northwest of the Project site. The second historic period residence, (Primary # 16009) is located at 41223 Madison Avenue and is a two-story, wood framed, Craftsman style residence constructed around 1930. It is also located one mile northwest of the Project site.

No listed National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California Historical Landmarks (CHL), or California Point of Historical Interest (CPHI) properties have been recorded within a one-mile radius of the Project site. In addition, numerous historic maps of the east Temecula region were inspected including those of the Bureau of Land Management, Science Library at University of California Riverside, the United States Geological Survey TopoView Historic Topographic Map Database, and the California Historic Topographic Map Collection. These maps revealed no evidence of historic structures or resources on or adjacent to the Project site.

Sacred Lands File (SLF) Search: Additional background on the general vicinity of the Project site was also conducted through a search of the NAHC SLF to determine if known cultural resources are present, and to evaluate the potential for undocumented cultural resources not listed at the EIC. The NRHP, Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, the Office of Historic Preservation, and the Directory of Properties in the Historic Property Data File were also reviewed for historic properties within the area surrounding the Project site. The NAHC's SLF search did not identify any specific information with respect to tribal lands or sites for the area surrounding the Project site. However, the presence of deeply buried archaeological material below the disturbed sediments cannot be completely ruled out.

The Cultural Resources Consultant also initiated a Native American consultation by contacting the NAHC to request a review of their SLF on September 3, 2017 to obtain a list of Native American groups or individuals listed by the NAHC for Riverside County, determine if known cultural resources are present within the vicinity of the Project, and evaluate the potential for undocumented cultural resources not listed at the EIC. The NAHC responded on September 7, 2017, noting that the negative results of the SLF search may not indicate the absence of Native American cultural resources in the Project area and provided a contact list of 28 Native American individuals or tribal organizations that may have knowledge of cultural resources in or near the Project area.

The Cultural Resources Consultant for the Project mailed letters to each of the NAHC-listed contacts on September 10, 2017, to inform them of the Project and inquire if they were aware of any cultural resources with the Project area or the immediate vicinity. The *CRA* stated that to date no responses have been received from any Native American tribal groups regarding this Project. However, the City did receive subsequent correspondence from the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians requesting that a portion of the *CRA* be revised to more accurately reflect Luiseño history; the *CRA* was revised, as requested.

Pedestrian Field Survey: On September 10 and December 14, 2017, the Project's Archaeological Consultant conducted an intensive pedestrian survey of the Project area. The site was inspected in their entirety for archaeological artifacts as well as evidence of historic features. No prehistoric or historic artifacts or built environment features were observed during the field survey.

Although the *CRA* recommended no mitigation relative to historical resources, the City will implement **Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1** through **Mitigation Measure MM CUL-4** if unanticipated cultural resources are found during grading. These measures are based on past discussions with representatives of local Native American tribes and local historical organizations.

- MM CUL-1 The Project permittee/owner shall retain a Riverside County-certified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown cultural resources. Prior to grading, the Project permittee/owner shall provide to the City verification that a certified archaeologicalmonitor has been retained. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shallbe subject to a cultural resources evaluation.
- MM CUL-2 Archaeological Monitoring: At least 30-days prior to grading permit issuance and before any grading, excavation, and/or ground-disturbing activities on the site takeplace, the Project permittee/owner shall retain a Riverside County-certified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources.
 - 1. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with consulting tribes, the permittee/owner, and the City, shall develop a Cultural Resources Management Plan to address the details, timing, and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the Project site. Details in the plan shall include:
 - a. Project grading and development scheduling.
 - b. The development of a schedule in coordination with the permittee/owner and the Project Archeologist for designated Native American Tribal Monitors from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation and ground- disturbing activities on the site: including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American Tribal Monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all Project archaeologists.
 - c. The protocols and stipulations that the permittee/owner, City, tribes, and Project Archaeologist will follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resource evaluation.
 - 2. A final report documenting the monitoring activity and disposition of any recovered cultural resources shall be submitted to the City of Murrieta, Eastern Information Center and the consulting tribes within 60 days of completion of monitoring.
- MM CUL-3 Native American Monitoring: Native American Tribal monitors shall also participatein monitoring of ground-disturbing activity. At least 30 days prior to issuance of grading permits, agreements between the permittee/owner and the Consulting Native American Tribal Government(s) shall be established for tribal cultural resources, and shall identify any monitoring requirements. The monitoring agreement shall address the scope of work, along with the responsibilities, and participation of the Tribal monitors during grading, excavation, and ground- disturbing activities; Project grading and development scheduling.
- MM CUL-4 Disposition of Cultural Resources: In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project, one or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed with the tribes. Evidence of such shall be submitted to the City of Murrieta Planning Department:
 - 1. Preservation-in-place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place

where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resource.

- 2. On-site reburial of the discovered items as detailed in the Monitoring Plan required pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM CUL-2. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed. No cataloguing, analysis, or other study may occur on human remains and grave goods.
- 3. The permittee/owner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources, and adhere to the following:
 - a. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 Code of Federal Regulations 800 Part 79 and therefore would be curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
 - b. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground disturbing activities on-site, a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the Project Archaeologistand Native American Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the Property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grademeeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the City of Murrieta, Eastern Information Center and consulting tribes.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-4** would reduce impacts on known, unknown, or potential cultural resources, including potential historical resources that may be located within the Project site, to a level of **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

b) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As outlined under Threshold 5.a, no on-site archaeological resources were identified during the archaeological records search or during the intensive pedestrian survey. The NAHC's SLF search also did not identify any site information with respect to tribal lands or sites for the area surrounding the Project site. However, the presence of deeply buried archaeological material below the disturbed sediments cannot be ruled out. In addition, two archaeological sites have been documented within a one-mile radius of the study area. The first site is CA-RIV-1730 a large former Native American habitation site along Santa Gertrudis Creek that was found in 1979 but has since been degraded by plowing and erosion. This site is approximately one mile southeast of the Project site. The second site is CA-RIV-6466H which consists of Temecula Hot Springs over a mile north of the Project site. The site consists of not only the historical hot springs site, but historic period architectural features and debris accompanied by a very disturbed scatter of groundstone and lithics.

Although the *CRA* recommended no mitigation relative to archaeological resources, the City will implement the following standard mitigation if unanticipated cultural resources are found during grading. These measures are based on past discussions with representatives of local Native

American tribes. To reduce the impact of any inadvertent discoveries of archaeological resources, **Mitigation Measure MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-6** shall be implemented which will reduce potential impacts on archaeological resources to a level of **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

c) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. No known human remains are present on the Project site, and there are no facts or evidence to support the idea that Native Americans or people of other descent are buried on the Project site. In the unlikely event that human remains are encountered during Project grading, the proper authorities would be notified, and standard procedures for the respectful handling of human remains during the earthmoving activities would be followed. Construction contractors are required to adhere to CCR Section 15064.5(e), PRC Section 5097, and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5.

To ensure proper treatment of burials, in the event of an unanticipated discovery of a burial, human bone, or suspected human bone, the law requires that all excavation or grading in the vicinity of the find halt immediately, the area of the find be protected, and the contractor immediately notify the County Coroner of the find. The Coroner must then determine whether the remains are human, and if such remains are human, the Coroner must determine whether the remains are or appear to be of a Native American. If deemed potential Native American remains, the Coroner shall contact the NAHC to identify the *most likely descendant* and to initiate appropriate recovery of such remains. The construction contractor, developer, and the County Coroner are required to comply with the provisions of CCR Section 15064.5(e), PRC Section 5097.98, and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. To ensure compliance with these regulatory policies, **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-5** and **MM CUL-6** are required.

- MM CUL-5 Inadvertent Finds Protocols: If during ground disturbance activities, unique cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to Project approval, the following procedures shall be followed:
 - i. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the Project Applicant, the Project Archaeologist, the Tribal Representative(s) and the City to discuss the significance of the find.
 - ii. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed andafter consultation with the Tribal Representative(s) and the Project Archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the City, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resources.
 - iii. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the

appropriate mitigation. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of thebuffer area and will be monitored by additional Tribal Monitors if needed.

iv. Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resources shall be consistent with the Cultural Resources Management Plan and MonitoringAgreements entered into with the appropriate tribes. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through Project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils and/or re-burial on the Project property, so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity as identified in Non-Disclosure of Reburial Location Condition.

- v. If the find is determined to be significant and avoidance of the site has notbeen achieved, a Phase III data recovery plan shall be prepared by the Project archeologist, in consultation with the Tribe(s), and shall be submitted to the City for their review and approval prior to implementation of the said plan.
- MM CUL-6 Human remains: If human remains are encountered, California Health and SafetyCode Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California 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 disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately identify the "most likely descendants(s)" for purposes of receiving notification of discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

Implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-5** and **MM CUL-6**, and compliance with the provisions of CCR Section 15064.5(e), PRC Section 5097.98, and Section 7050.5 of the State Health and Safety Code, would reduce impacts on human remains to a level of **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
6. ENERGY: Would the Project:				
a) Result in potentially significant				
environmental impact due to wasteful,				
inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of			Х	
energy resources, during Project construction				
or operation? (References 11)				
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan				
for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	
(References 11)				

a) Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the proposed Project would require the typical use of energy resources. Energy would be temporarily consumed during site clearing, excavation, grading, and other construction activities. The construction process would be typical of business parks and no site conditions or Project features would require an inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy. The Project has been designed in compliance with California's Energy Efficiency Standards and 2016 CALGreen Standards. These measures include the use of water-conserving plumbing, installation of bicycle racks, pre-plumbing of car charging ports for at least 3% of all parking space, installation of solar panels on the canopy roof that covers at least 15% of each roof area, the use of Light Emitting Device (LED) lighting, and water reclamation for irrigation systems.

Operation of the proposed Project would involve the use of electricity and natural gas for heating, cooling and equipment operation. The *AQ/GHG Impact Study* (**Appendix B**) indicates the Project will consume approximately 337 million British thermal Units (BTU) or 325,000 cubic feet of natural gas each year) (CalEEMod printouts section 5.2, Energy by Land Use – Natural Gas). In addition, the report also estimated the Project would consume approximately 227,819 kilo-Watt hours of electricity each year (kWh/yr) (CalEEMod printouts section 5.3, Energy by Land Use – Electricity). The proposed business park facilities would comply with all applicable California Energy Efficiency Standards and 2016 CALGreen Standards. With anticipated regulatory compliance, the Project would not use energy in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary way during either Project construction or operation.

Transit services are provided to the Murrieta area by the Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) but there are no local bus lines or stops within a one-quarter mile walking distance of the proposed Project site due to the non-residential nature of the Project area. However, the Project will provide jobs in a housing rich community so it will help achieve the overall regional goal of reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by single passenger vehicles which will help reduce the consumption of gasoline and diesel as vehicular fuels.

Neither construction or operation of the Project would result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources. Therefore, impacts related to wasteful energy use would be **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project will purchase electricity through Southern California Edison, which is subject to the requirements of California Senate Bill 100 (SB 100). SB 100 is the most stringent and current energy legislation in California, requiring that renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources supply 100% of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100% of electricity procured to serve all state agencies by December 31, 2045.

The Project will further comply with the mandatory requirements of California's Green Building and Building Energy Efficiency standards that promote renewable energy and energy efficiency, including include the use of water conserving plumbing, installation of bicycle racks and two electric carcharging stations, installation of solar hot water heating for the office, and LED lighting; refer to Threshold 6.a.

Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, therefore, impacts would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the Project:				
a.i) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (References 1, 2, 15)			X	
a.ii) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking? (References 1, 2, 15)		x		
a.iii) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic- related ground failure, including liquefaction? (References 1, 2, 15)			x	
a.iv) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides? (References 1, 2, 15)			x	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (References 1, 2, 15)			x	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (References 1, 2, 15)		x		
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (References 1, 2, 15)		x		
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (References 1, 2, 15)				x
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (References 1, 2, 15, 16)		X		

a.i) Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Murrieta along with the greater Southern California area is located in a seismically active region. The regional geologic structure is dominated by northwest-trending faults associated with the San Andreas Fault system. Faults such as the Newport-Inglewood, Whittier, Elsinore, San Jacinto and San Andreas, are major faults in this system and are

known to be active and may produce moderate to strong ground shaking during an earthquake. In addition, the San Andreas, Elsinore and San Jacinto faults are known to have ruptured the ground surface in historic times. The Project site is not underlain by active faults. A short trace of the Wildomar fault, which is not designated an active fault, is located approximately 0.10 mile southwest of the site. The nearest active fault is the Wildomar fault which is part of the Elsinore Fault Zone and is located approximately 0.2 mile southwest of site. A narrow portion of the site along the southwest property line is within the Wildomar Fault Zone established by Riverside County. **Table 7-1**, *Closest Known Active Faults* lists the significant faults located within 20 miles of the site.

Fault Name	Distance/Direction from Project Site (miles)	Maximum Earthquake Magnitude	Fault Type
Elsinore – Temecula (Wildomar Segment)	0.2 SW	6.8	А
Elsinore – Glen Ivy Segment	12.6 NE	6.8	А
Elsinore – Julian Segment	14.5 NE	7.1	A

Table 7-1Closest Known Active Faults

Source: Geo Investigation (Appendix E)

Surface rupture occurs where displacement or fissuring occurs along a fault zone. Although primary ground damage due to earthquake fault rupture typically results in a relatively small percentage of the total damage in an earthquake, the location of structures or facilities too close to a rupturing fault can cause significant damage. It is difficult to reduce the hazards of surface rupture through structural design. The primary method to avoid this hazard is to either set structures and facilities away from active faults, or avoid their construction in close proximity to an active fault. The *Geotechnical Investigation* (Appendix E) prepared for the Project indicated the potential for shallow ground rupture on the Project site is moderate due to potentially active faults near the site. However, cracking because of shaking from nearby or distant seismic events is not considered a significant hazard.

Faults throughout Southern California have formed over millions of years. Some of these faults are considered inactive under present geologic conditions and other faults are known to be active.² Such faults have either generated earthquakes in historic times (200 years) or show geologic and geomorphic indications of movement within the last 11,000 years. Faults that have moved in the relatively recent geological past are generally presumed to be the most likely candidates to generate damaging earthquakes in the lifetimes of residents, buildings, or communities.

The *Geotechnical Investigation* concludes there are no known active or potentially active faults crossing the Project site. The Project site is not located within the presently defined boundaries of an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however, a narrow portion of the site (along the southwest property line) is within the Wildomar Fault Hazard Zone established by Riverside County.

Based on the above, the Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, 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. Impacts will be **less than significant,** and no mitigation is required.

a.ii) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The vast majority of earthquake damage is caused by ground shaking. The extent of shaking is a result of the size of the earthquake and distance from the epicenter. The exact way that rocks and other earth materials move along the fault can also influence shaking, as can the subsurface orientation of the fault.

² The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act defines active faults as those showing proven displacement of the ground surface within the last 11,000 years. Potentially active faults are those showing evidence of movement within the last 1.6 million years.

The primary threat associated with nearby faults is the intensity of potential ground shaking at the Project site. As stated previously, the most significant earthquake event to potentially affect the Project site is a 6.8 Richter magnitude earthquake on the Elsinore fault zone (both Glen Ivy and Wildomar segments). Adherence to the 2016 CBC is considered regulatory compliance that applies to all development in the City and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

In addition, the *Geotechnical Investigation* identifies grading and building recommendations for the Project site that would reduce the impact of geotechnical, geologic, or soil-related hazards that may occur during the grading, construction, or occupation of the proposed Project. Therefore, the Project will be required to implement **Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1**.

MM GEO-1 Prior to issuance of a grading or building permit, the developer shall provide evidence to the City that all Project plans comply with the Project-specific geotechnical requirements of the geotechnical investigation prepared for the proposed Project. The Project plans shall incorporate all applicable design requirements regarding site-specific geologic, seismic, or soil-related hazards or constraints on the Project site. All structures shall meet the seismic and other geologically-related requirements of the California Building Code in effect at the time the Project is built and in the seismic zone applicable to the Project site. Implementation of these specific actions address all of the identified geotechnical constraints at the Project site including future ground shaking effects, liquefaction, and landslides. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

With implementation of **Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1**, the Project will not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. Impacts will be reduced to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

a.iii) Less Than Significant Impact. Liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs when strong seismic ground shaking causes soils to collapse from a sudden loss of cohesion and undergo a transformation from a solid to a liquefied state. The site is located within a Riverside County designated liquefaction hazard zone. The Pauba formation bedrock that underlies the young alluvial fan deposits are not considered to be potentially liquefiable. In addition, groundwater was not encountered in the nine exploratory trenches to a maximum depth of approximately 10 feet below ground surface (bgs) during the preliminary geotechnical investigation conducted in 2019 on the subject site. Groundwater was also not encountered in the nine borings to a maximum depth of approximately 18.5 feet bgs during another preliminary geotechnical investigation of the site in 2017. In the summer of 2017, a public water supply well was drilled in the northwest portion of the site. This well is now capped but in 2017 the recorded groundwater depth was 380 feet bgs. Based on available data, the *Geotechnical Investigation* concluded that liquefaction does not constitute a significant risk to the Project site. Therefore, impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

The Project will be required to comply with the CBC which is considered regulatory compliance that applies to all development in the City and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA. Based on the above, impacts to the Project site related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, will be **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

a.iv) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site and surrounding area generally slope down toward the southwest (i.e., toward Warm Springs Creek). Ground surface elevations on the site range from approximately 1,088 feet above mean sea level (msl) along the northwest property line to approximately 1,040 feet above msl in the channel of Warm Springs Creek near the south property corner. An existing 2:1 cut slope with a height of up to 20 feet descends southwest from the northwest part of the site toward an offsite parking area. There is an elevated L-shaped area in the northwest and northeast which is partially underlain by undocumented artificial fill. The northwest portion is a bench; a cut slope ascends northwest from the bench toward higher ground off-site. The bench and a small adjoining pad, together with the access road from Madison Avenue in the northeast, were graded in 2017 for equipment access to drill an onsite water well. The northeast portion of the site

is a former pad for a single-family residence (since removed) and graded slopes descend southwest, southeast and northeast from the pad. The south portion of the site is ungraded natural ground including the steeply-sloped incised channel of Warm Springs Creek. Most on-site runoff flows into Warm Springs Creek. The *Geotechnical Investigation* found no landslides mapped in the area so the risk of seismically induced landslides affecting the proposed Project is low.

Additionally, on-site settlement is expected to occur primarily during construction as structural loads are being applied. The proposed structural footings are anticipated to be founded in medium-dense to dense engineered fill overlying dense bedrock. Therefore, the settlement potential under seismic loading conditions for these on-site materials is low.

The Project will be required to comply with the CBC which is considered regulatory compliance that applies to all development in the City and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA. Based on the above, direct or indirect impacts from the Project that could cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides, will be **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed Project will require significant grading to prepare the pad for building construction in accordance with the 2016 CBC. The development plan proposes one 2-story office building with 11,706 square foot (sq. ft.) office building and one single story 4,980 sq. ft. warehouse building with parking and driveway areas, retaining walls, etc. The conceptual grading plan indicates that the site will be mass graded into three separate pad areas with the top (northern) pad for the office building, the middle pad for the warehouse building, and the lowest (southwest) pad for the on-site detention basin. Grading will involve 15,000 cubic yards of cut and 15,000 cubic yards of fill so earthwork will be balanced onsite with no significant import or export of soil.

According to the *Geotechnical Investigation*, the site is underlain by up to approximately 3 feet to 9 feet of potentially compressible topsoil and weathered bedrock, as well as localized undocumented artificial fill. These potentially compressible materials are considered unsuitable for support of proposed fills, structures, and/or improvements and it is recommended these materials be over-excavated to expose the underlying stable Pauba formation bedrock.

Project grading will expose topsoil to potential erosion by wind and water. In order to prevent any negative impacts during grading of the site, a temporary sediment basin would be built in the same location as the proposed permanent detention basin. Upon completion of grading and building, onsite runoff will be collected by the onsite detention basin in the southwest corner of the site. Low flow volumes would be treated for water quality through soil media, while runoff from significant storm events would be discharged as permitted to Warm Springs Creek.

The Project would require detailed evaluations of water quality impacts and consistency with the City's grading standards and typical best management practices (BMPs) for multi-family residential development. The City would also require the Project to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to address potential short-term water quality impacts (including erosion) during construction, and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to address potential long-term water quality impacts (including erosion) during Project operation. These items are standard conditions of approval for the City and thus would not require separate mitigation measures. With implementation of these conditions of approval, potential short- and long-term erosion impacts would be **less than significant**.

- c) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. As discussed above, the site is underlain by the stable Pauba bedrock formation which is overlain by various natural and artificial fill materials as discussed in the Geotechnical Investigation and presented below:
 - Artificial Fill (Undocumented)(Afu): Areas of undocumented artificial fill were found on downslope
 portions of the former single-family residence site and the bench/pad for the water well. The
 undocumented fill was encountered in several exploratory trenches ranging up to 8 feet thick.
 The undocumented fill is generally composed of silty to clayey sand.

- Topsoil: Topsoil was encountered in several exploratory trenches ranging from half to one foot thick. The topsoil is generally composed of silty to clayey sand and sandy clay.
- Young Alluvial Fan Deposits (Qyf): Holocene and late Pleistocene age young alluvial fan deposits (Qyf) overlie Pauba formation bedrock in the southwest and south parts of the site including in Warm Springs Creek and in an onsite drainage that trends in a northerly direction across the site. Deposits range from 2.5 feet to 9 feet thick and consist of silty to clayey sand and sandy silt and clay.
- Pauba Formation (Qpfs): Pleistocene age bedrock of the Pauba formation (Sandstone member) was encountered underlying the undocumented artificial fill, topsoil and young alluvial fan deposits to the maximum depth of approximately 10.5 feet bgs in the onsite exploratory trenches. The upper 1.0 foot to 2.0 feet were generally weathered to clayey sand and sandy silt. The Pauba formation is generally composed of sandstone (very fine- to coarse-grained) and siltstone which is moderately hard to very hard.

As discussed in Thresholds a and b, the *Geotechnical Investigation* determined that the risks associated with slope instability, liquefaction, and differential settlement were low and implementation of **Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1** would ensure potential impacts related to these risks (i.e., unstable geologic unit or soil, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse) will be reduced to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

- d) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Geotechnical Investigation indicates that onsite soils have a relatively low expansion potential. However, it also recommended that site specific soil expansion characteristics be further evaluated for the building pads during and at the completion of rough grading to observe and document the actual as-graded soil conditions. The Geo Investigation indicated it will be necessary to blend the excavated soil to alleviate the high expansion potential of some of the upper soil materials. With implementation of Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1, potential impacts related to expansive soils will be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated.
- e) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project development plan proposes connection to existing wastewater collection and conveyance facilities located proximate to the Project site. No portion of the proposed Project proposes the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Because the proposed Project would not include the installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, **no impact** would occur.
- f) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. In order to identify any paleontological resource localities that may exist in or near the Project area and to assess the possibility for such resources to be encountered during the project, a Paleontological Resources Assessment (PRA, Appendix D3) was conducted. The PRA initiated records searches at the appropriate repositories, conducted a literature review, and carried out a systematic field survey of the Project area. The results of these research procedures indicate that the potential for the proposed Project to impact paleontological resources appears to be moderate to high, especially for vertebrate fossils within the Older Quaternary Alluvium Deposits and high within the Pauba Formation deposits that are present below but near the ground surface within the Project area.

Based on the finding that the Project site has "a high sensitivity" for paleontological resources, **Mitigation Measure MM GEO-2** shall be implemented during site ground disturbing activities to ensure impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. The mitigation program shall be developed in accordance with the provisions of CEQA as well as the proposed guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology as outlined below:

MM GEO-2 Present site conditions indicate paleontological monitoring is warranted. The monitoring can be part-time during the 5-foot over-excavation of the building pads in the Older Quaternary Alluvium, increasing to full-time during excavation in the Pauba Formation and the deeper utilities (e.g., deeper removals, storm drain and sewers) in the Older Quaternary Alluvium.

Supervision by AA's paleontologist will be maintained during paleontologic grading observations when grading in the on-site geologic units. In the event that fossils are exposed, the paleontologist shall be allowed to divert or direct grading in the area of exposure to facilitate evaluation, and (if identified as potentially significant) to salvage significant fossils.

All fossils collected shall be prepared and identified by a qualified paleontologist. Excavated significant fossil finds shall be offered to the County or its designee, on a first-refusal basis. These actions, as well as, final mitigation and disposition of the resources, shall be subject to County guidelines and regulations.

This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure MM GEO-2** will reduce impacts on paleontological resources to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would				
the Project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either				
directly or indirectly, that may have a			x	
significant impact on the environment?			Χ	
(References 11, 47, 49)				
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or				
regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing			v	
the emissions of greenhouse gases?			^	
(References 11, 47, 49)				

Any Tables in this Section are from information in the *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Analysis*, unless stated otherwise.

Less Than Significant Impact. Constituent gases of the Earth's atmosphere, called atmospheric a) greenhouse gases (GHG), play a critical role in the Earth's radiation amount by trapping infrared radiation emitted from the Earth's surface, which otherwise would have escaped to space. Prominent greenhouse gases contributing to this process include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), ozone, water vapor, nitrous oxide (N₂O), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). This phenomenon, known as the Greenhouse Effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate. Anthropogenic (caused or produced by humans) emissions of these greenhouse gases in excess of natural ambient concentrations are responsible for the enhancement of the Greenhouse Effect and have led to a trend of unnatural warming of the Earth's natural climate, known as global warming or climate change. Emissions of gases that induce global warming are attributable to human activities associated with industrial/manufacturing, agriculture, utilities, transportation, and residential land uses. Transportation is responsible for 41 percent of the State's greenhouse gas emissions, followed by electricity generation. Emissions of CO₂ and nitrous oxide (NO₂) are byproducts of fossil fuel combustion. Methane, a potent greenhouse gas, results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. Sinks of CO_2 , where CO_2 is stored outside of the atmosphere, include uptake by vegetation and dissolution into the ocean.

The GHG assessment in the AQ/GHG Impact Analysis (Appendix B) prepared for the proposed Project addressed CO₂, N₂O, and CH₄ emissions. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has established recommended significance thresholds for greenhouse gases for local lead agency consideration ("SCAQMD draft local agency threshold"). SCAQMD has published a five-tiered draft GHG threshold of 10,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year for stationary/industrial sources and 3,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year significance threshold for residential/commercial projects. Tier 3 is anticipated to be the primary tier by which the SCAQMD will determine significance for projects. The Tier 3 screening level for stationary sources is based on an emission capture rate of 90 percent for all new or modified projects. A 90-precent emission capture rate means that 90 percent of total emissions from all new or modified stationary source projects would be subject to CEQA analysis. The 90-percent capture rate GHG significance screening level in Tier 3 for stationary sources was derived using the SCAQMD's annual Emissions Reporting Program. The current draft thresholds consist of the following tiered approach or selection process:

- Tier 1 consists of evaluating whether or not the project qualifies for any applicable exemption under CEQA.
- Tier 2 consists of determining whether or not the project is consistent with a greenhouse gas reduction plan. If a project is consistent with a qualifying local greenhouse gas reduction plan, it does not have significant greenhouse gas emissions.
- Tier 3 consists of screening values, which the lead agency can choose but must be consistent. A project's construction emissions are averaged over 30 years and are added to a project's operational emissions. If a project's emissions are under one of the following screening thresholds, then the project is less than significant:

- All land use types: 3,000 MTCO₂e per year
- Based on land use types: residential is 3,500 MTCO₂e per year; commercial is 1,400 MTCO₂e per year; and mixed use is 3,000 MTCO₂e per year
- Tier 4 has the following options:
 - Option 1: Reduce emissions from business as usual by a certain percentage; this percentage is currently undefined
 - o Option 2: Early implementation of applicable AB 32 Scoping Plan measures
 - Option 3: Year 2020 target for service populations (SP), which includes residents and employees: 4.8 MTCO₂e/SP/year for projects and 6.6 MTCO₂e/SP/year for plans
 - Option 3, 2035 target: 3.0 MTCO2e/SP/year for projects and 4.1 MTCO2e/SP/year for plans
- Tier 5 involves mitigation offsets to achieve target significance threshold.

The City of Murrieta adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) as part of the City's General Plan 2035 in 2011. The City's CAP provides a framework for reducing GHG emissions and managing resources to best prepare for a changing climate. The CAP implements policies that have been identified in the Land Use; Economic Development; Circulation; Infrastructure; Healthy Community; Conservation; Recreation and Open Space, and Air Quality Elements of the General Plan. The CAP recommends GHG emission targets that are consistent with the reduction targets of the state and presents a number of strategies that will make it possible for the City to meet the recommended targets. The City's CAP also suggests best practices for implementation and makes recommendations for measuring progress. The purpose of the City's GHG emissions by 15 percent below baseline (year 2009) levels by 2020.

Therefore, to determine whether the Project's GHG emissions are significant, the AQ/GHG Impact Analysis used the SCAQMD draft local agency tier 3 screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year for all land use types for the Project.

Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact

The greenhouse gas emissions from Project construction equipment and worker vehicles are shown in **Table 8-1**, *Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. The emissions are from all phases of construction equals 322.2 MTCO2e. The total construction emissions amortized over a period of 30 years are estimated at 10.74 metric tons of CO_2e per year.

	Emissions (MTCO ₂ e) ¹				
Period	CO ₂	CH₄	N ₂ O	CO2e	
Year 1	35.4	0.0	0.0	35.7	
Year 2	320.3	0.1	0.0	322.2	
Year 3	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	
Maximum	320.3	0.1	0.0	322.2	
SCAQMD Threshold	3,000				
Averaged over 30 years ²	10.74				

Table 8-1 Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

¹ MTCO₂e=metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (includes carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide).

² The emissions are averaged over 30 years because the average is added to the operational emissions pursuant to SCAQMD.

Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact

Operational emissions occur over the life of the Project. The unmitigated operational emissions for the Project are 119.3 metric tons of CO₂e per year as shown in **Table 8-2**, *Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Therefore, the Project's GHG emissions are well below the SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 metric tons CO₂e per year for all land uses as outlined in SCAQMD's Interim CEQA GHG Significance Threshold for Stationary Sources, Rules and Plans. In addition, the Project will be required to implement the latest requirements of the California Green Building and Title 24 Energy Efficiency Standards (currently 2016) which would further reduce potential Project-related greenhouse gas emissions. Compliance with established regulatory requirements is not considered project specific mitigation under CEQA. Based on available information, the Project will not result in significant generation of greenhouse gases, either directly or indirectly, and will not have a significant impact on the environment due to greenhouse gas emissions. Anticipated GHG emissions impact is **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Metric Tons/Year)				
GHG Emission Category	CO ₂	CH₄	N ₂ O	CO ₂ e	
Area Sources ¹	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Energy Usage ²	90.6	0.0	0.0	90.9	
Mobile Sources ³	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Solid Waste ⁴	17.6	0.0	0.0	17.7	
Water ⁵	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Construction ⁶				10.7	
Total Emissions				119.3	
SCAQMD Screening Threshold	3,000				
Exceeds Threshold?				No	

Table 8-2 Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Area sources consist of GHG emissions from consumer products, architectural coatings, and landscape equipment.

² Energy usage consist of GHG emissions from electricity and natural gas usage.

⁶ Mobile sources consist of GHG emissions from vehicles.

Solid waste includes the CO₂ and CH₄ emissions created from the solid waste placed in landfills.

⁵ Water includes GHG emissions from electricity used for transport of water and processing of wastewater.

⁶ Construction GHG emissions based on a 30-year amortization rate.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project and its GHG emissions have been compared to the goals of the City's CAP. The CAP includes the emission target to reduce the City's GHG emissions by 15 percent below baseline (year 2009) levels by 2020.

SCAQMD's tier 3 thresholds used Executive Order S-3-05 goal as the basis for deriving the screening level. The California Governor issued Executive Order S-3-05, GHG Emission, in June 2005, which established the following reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 2000 levels
- 2020: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels
- 2050: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels

In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires CARB, to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve GHG emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 through an enforceable statewide emission cap which was phased in starting in 2012.

The Project is consistent with the existing City's zoning and General Plan land use designation of "Business Park" (BP) for the site and does propose a zone change or General Plan Amendment. Hence, the Project is consistent with the assumptions and policies proposed in the City CAP and it does not represent development in excess of the CAP's "Business as Usual" scenario. The City of Murrieta has not stipulated its own or a different GHG emission threshold. The City has chosen to include air quality within its General Plan and the following two General Plan policies encourage regional and local efforts to address air quality:

- **AQ-1.1** Continue to work with the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) Regional Air Quality Task Force to implement regional and local programs designed to meet federal, state, and regional air quality planning requirements.
- **AQ-1.2** Review and update City regulations and/or requirements, as needed, based on improved technology and new regulations including updates to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), rules and regulations from South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and revisions to SCAQMD's CEQA Guidelines.

In this regard, this *AQ/GHG Impact Analysis* is consistent with the City of Murrieta's General Plan with respect to its Air Quality Element. Because the estimated emissions are less than significant, no mitigation measures to reduce projected air pollutant and GHG emissions are proposed to be implemented to ensure compliance with the requirements of the City of Murrieta and consistence with its General Plan and CAP.

Therefore, as the Project's GHG emissions meet the threshold for compliance with Executive Order S-3-05 and also comply with the goals of AB 32 and the CAP. In addition, the Project meets the current interim emissions targets/thresholds established by SCAQMD, so it would also be on track to meet the reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 mandated by SB-32. Finally, all of the post 2020 reductions in GHG emissions are addressed via regulatory requirements at the State level and the Project will be required to comply with these regulations.

In conclusion, the Project's GHG emissions do not exceed the SCAQMD draft threshold and are in compliance with the reduction goals of the CAP, AB-32, and SB-32. Furthermore, the Project will comply with applicable Green Building Standards and City of Murrieta's policies regarding sustainability as directed by the City's General Plan and CAP. Therefore, the proposed Project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS				
MATERIALS: Would the Project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or				
the environment through the routine			х	
transport, use, or disposal of hazardous				
materials? (References 1, 2, 7, 10)				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or				
the environment through reasonably				
foreseeable upset and accident conditions			X	
involving the release of hazardous materials				
into the environment? (References 2, 7, 17)				
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle				
hazardous or acutely hazardous materials,				
substances, or waste within one-quarter mile				Х
of an existing or proposed school?				
(References 6, 18, 19)				
d) Be located on a site which is included on				
a list of hazardous materials sites compiled				
pursuant to Government Code Section				x
65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a				X
significant hazard to the public or the				
environment? (References 17, 20, 21)				
e) For a project located within an airport land				
use plan or, where such a plan has not been				
adopted, within two miles of a public airport				
or public use airport, would the Project result				Х
in a safety hazard or excessive noise for				
people residing or working in the Project				
area? (References 6, 22)				
f) Impair implementation of or physically				
interfere with an adopted emergency			x	
response plan or emergency evacuation			A	
plan? (References 1, 2, 7)				
g) Expose people or structures, either				
directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of			X	
loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			A	
(References 1, 8, 23, 24)				

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project would result in the construction and operation of an office and warehouse buildings with supporting parking, driveway, and landscaped areas. Potential hazardous materials such as fuel, paint products, lubricants, solvents, and cleaning products may be used and/or stored on-site during the construction and/or occupancy of the proposed Project. Due to the type and size of the Project, only limited quantities of these materials are expected to be used by the proposed Project, so the Project is not considered hazardous or a risk to the public at large. In accordance with the City's Hazardous Materials Policy, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction and operation of the site will be conducted pursuant to all applicable local, State and federal laws, and in cooperation with the Murrieta Fire Department in partnership with Riverside County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch.

Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, implemented by Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), describes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials. Compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local laws related to the transportation, use and

storage of hazardous materials would reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents during transit, use, and storage.

As required by California Health and Safety Code Section 25507, a business shall establish and implement a Hazardous Materials Business Emergency Plan for emergency response to a release or threatened release of a hazardous material in accordance with the standards prescribed in the regulations adopted pursuant to Section 25503 if the business handles a hazardous material or a mixture containing a hazardous material that has a quantity at any one time above the thresholds described in Section 25507(a) (1) through (6).

Compliance with all applicable local, State, and federal laws, including but not limited to Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations implemented by Title 13 of the CCR, as well as Health and Safety Code Section 25507, would ensure a **less than significant** impact from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

 b) Less Than Significant Impact. There are no recognized environmental conditions on or proximate to the Project site. As set forth the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I ESA, Appendix D3):

"This Phase I ESA has revealed no evidence of [Recognized Environmental Conditions] RECs in connection with the Property. No apparent or potential threat of past or present hazardous material releases exists regarding the Property based on the EDR [governmental database] Report and the Agency Contact and Database Search, including the 14 sites identified within the ASTM-specified search radii surrounding the Property. A Vapor Encroachment Condition does not exist or is not likely to exist in connection with the Property. No RECs, including CRECs, were identified on, at, in, or to the Property. No significant data gaps...or unusual circumstances where greater certainty is required regarding RECs."

Based upon the site reconnaissance, historical review, regulatory records review, and other information, the *Phase I ESA* identified no obvious evidence of RECs in connection with the subject property and no further investigation was recommended.

Although they are not considered RECs, the *Phase I ESA* did recommend the waste material piles present along the western bank of the creek be removed during site preparation. Similarly, the site once supported a single-family residence with a septic tank system – if any remnant foundation or septic tank materials are found during grading, they should be removed and disposed of in an approved manner per City and County requirements.

During construction there is a potential for accidental release of petroleum products in sufficient quantity to pose a significant hazard to people and the environment. Such an occurrence shall be managed pursuant to a project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be implemented as part of the mandated National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. As stated in the permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) shall be implemented to reduce/eliminate accidental release of hazardous materials resulting from development.

The Project site development plan proposes only office and supporting warehouse uses. Hazardous materials anticipated during operations are anticipated to be those most commonly associated with office and business park-type uses and landscaping which include cleaning products, petroleum products, etc. These types of hazardous materials are not potentially hazardous to large numbers of people, especially at the scale they would be stored and used in conjunction with an office or warehouse use. Therefore, the Project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Based on this information, any impacts are considered **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

c) *No Impact or Does Not Apply.* The schools closest to the Project site are Ysabel Barnett Elementary School (in Temecula) 1.8 miles to the east; Buchanon Elementary located at 40121 Torrey Pines

Road 2.0 miles to the northeast; Warm Springs Middle School located at 39245 Calle Fortuna 2.2 miles to the northeast; James Day Middle School (in Temecula) located 3.0 miles to the southeast; and Murrieta Elementary School located at 24725 Adams Avenue approximately 3.6 miles to the northwest. There are no existing or proposed schools within 0.25 mile of the Project site due to the non-residential nature of the surrounding area. Therefore, the Project would have **no impact** in this regard.

- d) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project site is undeveloped but is surrounded by roads, commercial, industrial, and vacant land. The City's General Plan EIR does not identify the Project site or surrounding areas as sources of hazardous materials. A search of the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor data base, which includes all hazardous sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and the California Environmental Protection Agency "Cortese List," completed in conjunction with the Phase I ESA, indicates there are no sites of concern regarding hazardous materials on the Project site or in the immediate vicinity of the Project site. Since the Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, no impact related to this issue will occur.
- e) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project site is located approximately 3.5 miles southwest of the French Valley Airport and thus is outside of the French Valley Airport Master Plan. In addition, the Project site is not located near any private airstrip. Therefore, **no impact** relative to these issues will occur.
- Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located at the southwest intersection of Madison f) Avenue and Golden Gate Circle in the southern portion of the City. Access to the surrounding areas west of the I-15 Freeway is via Jefferson Avenue just west of the site, and regional access is provided by the I-15 Freeway via ramps both north and south of the site. The City plans and maintains roadways, intersections, and transportation-related facilities in accordance with the City's Comprehensive Emergency Management Program to ensure a coordinated and effective planned response by the City Police and Fire Departments to extraordinary emergency situations and disasters and also to ensure the provision of adequate vehicular access. Construction activities that may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic would be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any temporary road closures. Primary access (ingress/egress) will be provided via a private driveway connection along Madison Avenue. These construction and design elements are standard conditions of approval for the City pursuant to Title 10, Vehicles and Traffic of the MDC and are not considered unique mitigation. Adherence to these City conditions would result in less than significant impacts related to emergency access for the Project site and no mitigation is required.
- g) Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City's General Plan Safety Element, the Project site is not located in a High Fire Zone. Due to past disturbances at the Project site, it presently has a low fuel load, and it is surrounded by existing development and roadways. The Project would be constructed in accordance with the 2016 CBC, including Chapter 7 of the code, which requires all on-site structures to incorporate construction techniques and materials such as roofs, eaves, exterior walls, vents, appendages, windows, and doors hardened to provide resistance to and/or to perform at high levels against ignition during the exposure to burning vegetation from wildfires. The City reviews all proposed development to ensure compliance with applicable provisions of its Development Code, the Uniform Fire Code, California Fire Code, and California Uniform Building Code requirements. The City's Fire Department shall review the Project and require the necessary code requirements in order to reduce any potential wildland fire hazard impacts to a less than significant level. This is a standard condition and not considered unique mitigation under CEQA. Any impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:		incorporated		
a) Violate any water quality standards or				
waste discharge requirements or otherwise				
substantially degrade surface or ground			X	
water guality? (References 6, 25, 26, 27)				
b) Substantially decrease groundwater				
supplies or interfere substantially with				
groundwater recharge such that the Project			v	
may impede sustainable groundwater			~	
management of the basin? (References 2,				
15, 25, 26, 28, 29)				
c.i) 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			X	
surfaces, in a manner which would result in				
substantial erosion of silitation on- of oil-				
c ii) Substantially alter the existing drainage				
nattern of the site or area, including through				
the alteration of the course of a stream or				
river or through the addition of impervious				
surfaces, in a manner which would			Х	
substantially increase the rate or amount of				
surface runoff in a manner which would				
result in flooding on- or offsite? (References				
6, 25, 27)				
c.iii) Substantially alter the existing drainage				
pattern of the site or area, including through				
the alteration of the course of a stream or				
river or through the addition of impervious				
surfaces, in a manner which would create			Х	
or contribute runoil water which would				
exceed the capacity of existing of planned				
substantial additional sources of polluted				
runoff? (References 6, 25)				
c.iv) 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			Х	
surfaces, in a manner which would impede				
or redirect flood flows? (References 6, 25,				
27)				
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche				v
zones, risk release of pollutants due to				X
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation				
of a water quality control plan or sustainable				
aroundwater management				X
plan? (References 2, 25)				

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) establishes the framework for regulating municipal storm water discharges (construction and operational impacts) via the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program. A project would have an impact on surface water quality if discharges associated with the Project would create pollution, contamination, or nuisance as defined in Water Code Section 13050, or that cause regulatory standards to be violated as defined in the applicable NPDES storm water permit or Water Quality Control Plan for a receiving water body.

For the purpose of this specific issue, a significant impact could occur if the Project would discharge water that does not meet the quality standards of the agencies which regulate surface water quality and water discharge into storm water drainage systems. Significant impacts could also occur if the project does not comply with all applicable regulations with regards to surface water quality as governed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). These regulations include preparation of a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to reduce potential post-construction water quality impacts. In addition to a Project *Hydrology Report* (*Hydro Report*, **Appendix G2**), a WQMP was also prepared for this Project (*WQMP*, **Appendix G1**).

In addition, the Regional Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer System (MS4) Permit requires that a project-specific WQMP be prepared for all development projects within the Santa Margarita Region (SMR) that meet the "Priority Development Project" categories and thresholds listed in the SMR Water Quality Management Plan. All new development in the City of Murrieta is required to comply with provisions of the NPDES program, including Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), and the City's Municipal Separate Sewer Permit (MS4) as enforced by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Board (SDRWQCB).

Beneficial Uses and Impaired Water Bodies. The Project site along with the entire City of Murrieta is located in the Santa Margarita Watershed, which drains to the Santa Margarita River and into the Pacific Ocean as it extends through the Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base in northern San Diego County. The Project site is adjacent to Warm Springs Creek which flows into Murrieta Creek which in turn flows into the Santa Margarita River and eventually to the Pacific Ocean approximately 25 miles downstream. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) maintains a list of impaired water bodies under the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Each of the three local channels is sensitive to a variety of domestic and industrial wastes depending on its physical and chemical characteristics as well as the beneficial uses for which each is designated by the USEPA. **Table 10-1**, *Local Receiving Waters*, identifies those drainages that could be affected by pollutants in runoff from the Project site.

Receiving Waters	USEPA Approved 303(d) List Impairments	Designated Beneficial Uses ¹
Warm Springs Creek	Chlorpyrifos, Indicator Bacteria, Iron, Manganese, Nitrogen, Phosphorus	MUN, AGR, IND, PROC, REC2, WARM, WILD
Murrieta Creek	Indicator Bacteria, Iron, Manganese, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Toxicity	MUN, AGR, IND, PROC, REC2, WARM, WILD
Santa Margarita River (upper)	Indicator Bacteria, Iron, Manganese, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Toxicity	MUN, AGR, IND, PROC, REC2, WARM, WILD
Santa Margarita River (lower)	Benthic Community Effects, Chlorpyrifos, Indicator Bacteria, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Toxicity	MUN, AGR, INC, REC1, REC2, WARM, COLD, WILD, RARE

Table 10-1 Local Receiving Waters

Source: WQMP (Appendix G1)

AGR = Agriculture, COLD = Cold water fish habitat, INC = xx, IND = Industrial processes, MUN = Municipal water supply, PROC = xx, RARE = Rare species habitat, REC1 = Recreation contact, REC2 = Recreation non-contact, WARM = Warm water fish habitat, WILD = Wildlife habitat **Project Improvements.** To protect these downstream resources, the *Hydro Report* identifies a number of improvements the Project will make to eliminate or reduce the potential for pollutants from the Project from reaching Warm Springs Creek or other downstream drainages. The Project proposes to develop a two-story commercial office building, a storage building, a storage yard, access driveways, and a biofiltration basin. The site is surrounded by other buildings of similar size to that being proposed, and some undeveloped lots. The site is currently vacant undeveloped land with a 100 percent (100%) pervious earthen surface. Drainage runoff currently sheet flows from the upper (north-northeast) portion of the site down to the southeast and south toward Warm Springs Creek. The proposed drainage pattern for this site will be generally the same as the existing, historical drainage pattern. The high point will continue to be located near the northeast corner of the property line and the outlet point will continue to be at the southeast corner of the property. The site will continue to have one overall basin and one main outfall point. The property will continue to outfall directly into Warm Springs Creek. A summary of the proposed drainage strategy for each sub-basin is described in **Table 10-2**, *Project Drainage Strategies* and shown in **Figure 10-1**, *Project Drainage Plan*.

Sub-Basin	Description	Proposed Drainage Strategy
А	Madison Avenue Road Improvements	The road improvements for Madison Avenue will include a berm to prevent off-site run-on from entering the property.
В	Off-site Runoff	The offsite runoff will be captured in a lined ditch to prevent it from entering the developed property. The runoff will be directed toward the street improvements.
С	Development Area - Upper Pad	The roofs of the commercial office building will drain into the parking spaces (constructed of permeable asphalt), then will sheet flow to the asphalt driveway surrounding the building. The asphalt driveway will be sloped to the perimeter gravel area. Catch basins (18" Brooks Boxes) will be constructed in the gravel areas to receive overflow runoff. The stormwater will then be piped to the Biofiltration Basin, design for hydromodification and pollutant control, then piped directly to Warm Springs Creek.
С	Development Area – Lower Pad	The outer driveway, which provides access to the storage building/storage yard, will sheet flow to the gravel area at the southern portion of the site. The roof of the storage building will drain to the gravel area toward the southeast corner of the building. Catch Basins will be constructed in this gravel area that will collect the overflow drainage and then pipe it into to the Biofiltration basin, and ultimately be outlet to Warm Springs Creek, which is the historical drainage pattern.
D	Natural Slope	The natural slope will remain and will sheet flow to the creek, as is the existing condition.

Table 10-2Project Drainage Strategies

Source: Hydro Report (Appendix G2)

The clearing and grading phases of Project site construction would disturb surface soils along with brush and vegetation potentially resulting in erosion and sedimentation. If left exposed and with no vegetative cover, the Project site's bare soil would be subject to wind and water erosion which could flow directly into Warm Springs Creek.

Since the Project involves more than one acre of ground disturbance, it is subject to NPDES permit requirements for the preparation and implementation of a project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Adherence to NPDES permit requirements and the measures established

in the SWPPP are routine actions conditioned by the City and will ensure applicable water quality standards are appropriately maintained during construction of the proposed Project.

According to the *Hydro Report* and the current Project site plan, one biofiltration basin (PCBMP #1) will be constructed in the southeastern portion of the site near the outlet point to Warm Springs Creek. Runoff generated by the new development will flow toward the biofiltration basin and then outlet directly into Warm Springs Creek after treatment. The *Hydro Report* states the pipes and orifice sizes are calculated to allow the runoff to flow at a lower rate than occurs for the existing condition. This Project also includes several run-off collection areas and pervious surfaces such as landscape areas, gravel areas, and permeable asphalt. These pervious areas will allow for onsite infiltration while any runoff will then sheet flow to the biofiltration basin.

According to the *Hydro Report*, the increase in overall runoff volume from the site is mitigated by the biofiltration basin which also acts as a detention basin during times of peak flow, so development of this site will actually result in a decrease in the ten-year storm event (Q10) when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed Project will not substantially alter the historical and existing drainage pattern of the area.

With the use of a biofiltration basin and low-impact development features, there will be no runoff to off-site parcels, and therefore no downstream flooding will occur due to the development this Project. The proposed improvements will not increase the volume or velocity of surface flows to the detriment of downstream landowners and/or facilities.

This page left blank for pagination purposes.



This page left blank for pagination purposes.

Best Management Practices. In addition to Project improvements, the *WQMP* for the Project identifies a number of Low Impact Development (LID) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be implemented to assure that Project runoff will have no significant impacts on "impaired water bodies" as outlined in **Table 10-3**, *Best Management Practices*.

Pollutant Source	Structural Source Control BMPs	Operational Source Control BMPs
Onsite storm drains	Private drains will show markers if possible.	Maintain markers and provide information to maintenance personnel.
Trash Storage Areas	Show areas that are covered and paved and will prevent runoff.	Inspect trash areas regularly and prevent spills. Refer to CASQA Fact Sheet SC-34 (see Appendix 10) of WQMP.
Vehicle and Equipment Cleaning Areas	Washing of vehicles will be performed indoors.	Wash water from vehicle and equipment washing operations shall not be discharged to the storm drain system.
Vehicle and Equipment Maintenance/Repair Areas	No vehicle repair or maintenance will be done outdoors. There are no floor drains. There are no tanks, containers or sinks to be used for parts cleaning or rinsing.	 The following restrictions apply to use this site: No person shall dispose of, nor permit the disposal, directly or indirectly of vehicle fluids, hazardous materials, or rinse water from parts cleaning into storm drains. No vehicle fluid removal shall be performed outside a building, nor on asphalt or ground surfaces, whether inside or outside a building, except in such a manner as to ensure that any spilled fluid will be in an area of secondary containment. Leaking vehicle fluids shall be contained or drained from the vehicle immediately. No person shall leave unattended drip parts or other open containers containing vehicle fluid, unless such containers are in use or in an area of secondary containment.
Outdoor Storage Areas	Maintain a detailed description of materials that are stored and provide structural features to prevent pollutants from entering storm drains.	Refer to CASQA Fact Sheet SC-31 (see Appendix 10) of WQMP.
Material Storage Areas	Maintain a detailed description of materials that are stored and provide structural features to prevent pollutants from entering storm drains.	Refer to CASQA Fact Sheets SC-31 and SC-33 (see Appendix 10) of WQMP.
Material Storage Areas (cont'd)	 Where appropriate, reference documentation of compliance with the requirements of Hazardous Materials Programs for: Hazardous Waste Generation Hazardous Materials Release Response and Inventory California Accidental Release (CalARP) Aboveground Storage Tank Uniform Fire Code Article 80 Section 103(b) & (c) 1991 Underground Storage Tank www.cchealth.org/groups/hazmat/ 	Refer to CASQA Fact Sheets SC-31 and SC-33 (see Appendix 10) of WQMP.
Fire Sprinkler Test/	A means will be provided to drain the fire	See CASQA Fact Sheet SC-41 (see Appendix 10) of WQMP.
Plazas, Sidewalks and Parking Lots	spinikier lest water to the sanitary water.	 Sweep plazas, sidewalks, and parking lots regularly to prevent accumulation of litter and debris. Collect debris from pressure washing to prevent entry into the storm drain system. Collect washwater containing any cleaning agent or degreaser and discharge to the sanitary sewer, not to a storm drain

Table 10-3Best Management Practices

Source: WQMP (Appendix G1)

Adherence to the measures identified in the Project-specific *WQMP* and other requirements identified and required by the City would ensure that the proposed Biofiltration Basin will satisfy the estimated

detention volume needed post-development for the proposed Project. This basin will provide biofiltration/passive treatment and infiltration and is also designed to prevent overflow of potentially polluted water to the creek during anticipated storm conditions. This will prevent the migration of pollutants of concern (i.e., chlorpyrifos, indicator bacteria, iron, manganese, nitrogen, and phosphorus per **Table 10-1**) into Warm Springs Creek and possibly downstream during periods of high flow. Therefore, proper engineering design and construction in conformance with the requirements of the City, the intent of the NPDES Permit for Riverside County and the City's Municipal Separate Sewer Permit within the Santa Margareta Watershed (MS4 permit), the measures established in the SWPPP, and Project-specific recommendations outlined in the *WQMP* will ensure that impacts related to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements will be **less than significant** and no mitigation is required.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located within the water service boundary of the Rancho California Water District (RCWD) and within the wastewater/sewer service boundary of the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). Projected domestic water demand in the City is expected to increase from 39,179 acre-feet per year in 2011 to 54,811 acre-feet per at buildout in the year 2035. According to the City's General Plan EIR, buildout of the City's General Plan would require only 2.36 percent of the 2030 combined water supply of the four water districts serving the City.

RCWD would provide water service for the Project site's proposed development plan. RCWD gets its water from a variety of sources. The natural sources include precipitation, untreated import water recharge basins, and regional groundwater (aquifers). RCWD also purchases treated water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). MWD imports water from Northern California and the Colorado River. Water delivered to homes and businesses within the RCWD service area is a blend of well water (50%) and imported water (45%). The RCWD-managed groundwater basins are estimated to hold over 2 million acre-feet of water. The annual safe yield of these basins is approximately 30,000 acre-feet per year, which meets nearly half of RCWD's needs.

Surface water from Vail Lake and Lake Skinner is used to help replenish RCWD groundwater supplies through recharge operations. All aquifers managed by RCWD are located in the Santa Margarita Watershed. Oversight of all groundwater production within the Santa Margarita Watershed falls under the continuing jurisdiction of the United States District Court, San Diego and is administered under the auspices of a court appointed water master (the "Santa Margarita Water Master"). Most of the remaining water demands are met with imported water purchased from MWD. According to RCWD's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), over 90 percent of the groundwater used in MWD's service area is produced from adjudicated or managed groundwater basins.

In July and August 2017, a public water supply well was drilled in the northwest portion of the site in August 2017. This well is inactive (capped), but the recorded groundwater depth was 380 feet below ground surface (bgs) on August 2, 2017. In addition, the *Geotechnical Investigation* indicated that groundwater was not encountered in either of the two exploratory trenches conducted on the Project site which were advanced to a maximum depth of 10 feet below ground surface on the lower elevation of the site. Based on available information, the potential to directly intercept the groundwater table during development of the proposed Project would be very low.

Additionally, as discussed previously in Threshold 10.a, a biofiltration basin has been designed in the southeast corner of the site that will capture 8,025 cubic feet of storm water runoff which exceeds the required design capture volume which result in a greater infiltration volume post-development for the proposed Project than currently exists. Therefore, post-development storm water runoff volume or time of concentration will not exceed pre-development conditions.

In addition, RCWD's 2015 UWMP concludes that available water supplies would meet projected demands for normal year, single dry year, and multiple dry year scenarios through the year 2040, so potential impacts related to the substantial decrease of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge activities are not applicable to this Project.

No component of the proposed Project would substantially decrease groundwater supplies. The Project design, as depicted on the Project plans and Project-specific *WQMP*, will allow for water to

percolate back into the ground and allow for groundwater recharge. This will offset any impacts from the other non-pervious elements contained in the proposed Project. This standard condition is applicable to all development, so it is not considered mitigation for CEQA implementation purposes.

Based on available information, implementation of the proposed Project will not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

c.i) Less Than Significant Impact. Please reference the discussion set forth in Threshold 10.a, relative to the Project design and the existing drainage pattern of the site and the area. The Project site is adjacent to Warm Springs Creek which flows into Murrieta Creek which in turn flows into the Santa Margarita River and eventually to the Pacific Ocean approximately 25 miles downstream. According to the *Hydro Report*, the increase in overall runoff volume from the developed site is mitigated by the biofiltration basin which also acts as a detention basin during times of peak flow, so development of this site will actually result in a decrease in the ten-year storm event (Q10) when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed Project will not substantially alter the historical and existing drainage pattern of the area.

Furthermore, implementation of the *WQMP* ensures that the post-Project development of the site, which substantially increases the impervious area of the Project site, does not cause or result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation as outlined in Threshold 10.a. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

- c.ii) Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Threshold 10.a, to manage the substantial increase in impervious area associated with the proposed Project development plan, a biofiltration basin that will also provide storm water retention has been designed in the southeast portion of the site. This basin will retain 5,800 cubic feet of storm water runoff which exceeds the required design capture volume thus resulting in a greater infiltration volume post-development for the proposed Project than currently exists. Therefore, implementation of the Project as proposed and documented in the Hydro Report and WQMP will assure that post-development storm water runoff volume or time of concentration will not exceed pre-development conditions. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.
- c.iii) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site will convey onsite flows to a biofiltration basin where the flows will be treated for water quality purposes as well as retain increased runoff. The Project site will ultimately discharge into the existing adjacent Warm Springs Creek. As discussed in Threshold 10.a, the design and implementation of the biofiltration basin will result in less runoff from the Project site than currently exists in the undeveloped condition. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.
- *c.iv)* Less Than Significant Impact. In the existing undeveloped condition, storm water runoff on the Project site sheet flows generally south/southeast towards Warm Springs Creek. Upon completion of the Project site development plan in accordance with the WQMP which provides for a biofiltration basin that also provides retention of storm runoff which will assure that post-development storm water runoff will not exceed pre-development storm water runoff volumes, nor will it impede or redirect flood flows because the Project will not place any structures within the flood limits of the creek. Therefore, any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.
- d) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project site is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency designated flood hazard area or a local City/County designated "Flood Hazard Area." The Project site is located approximately 25 miles east of the nearest coastline (Pacific Ocean), therefore, the risk associated with tsunamis is negligible. The Project site is located adjacent to the Warm Springs Creek, but it is not an impounded body of water and does not contain substantial flows much of the year, therefore, the risk associated with a seiche to the Project site is negligible. Based on the above, the risk of pollutant release due to Project inundation caused by a flood, tsunami, or seiche is not applicable. There will be **no impact**.

e) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project WQMP has been prepared specifically to comply with the Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer System (MS4) Permit for the Santa Margarita Region (SMR), Order No. R9-2010-0016, NPDES No. CAS0108766, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges from the MS4 Draining the County of Riverside, the Incorporated Cities of Riverside County, and the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District within the San Diego Region, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, November 10, 2010. With adherence to, and implementation of the conclusions and recommendations set forth in the WQMP the Project site development plan will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. There will be no impact.
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
11. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the				
Project:				
a) Physically divide an established				Y
community? (References 4, 5, 7)				^
b) Cause a significant environmental impact				
due to a conflict with any applicable land use				
plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with			Х	
jurisdiction-adopted for the purpose of				
avoiding or mitigating an environmental				
ellect? (Relerences 4, 5, 7, 8)				

a) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project site is vacant and bordered by business park uses and vacant land to the north, business park uses to the south and east, and vacant land to the west. The Project proposes to develop a two-story, 11,706 square foot (sq. ft.) office building with a detached, single-story, 4,980 sq. ft. warehouse. The Project will provide an outdoor storage area for the warehouse component. The site is surrounded by other commercial buildings of similar size to that being proposed, and some undeveloped lots. The surrounding community is commercial/industrial by nature with no residential neighborhoods in the immediate area. The Project site is adjacent to Warm Springs Creek to the south-southeast with business park buildings and vacant land surrounding the rest of the site. In addition, the Project site is designated for business park uses and proposes a business park use which is similar to those that surround it at present. No change to the General Plan designation or zoning classification is proposed.

The proposed Project would be served by fully improved public streets (i.e., Madison Avenue and Golden Gate Circle) and other infrastructure and does not involve the subdivision of land or the creation of streets that could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development or established community. Furthermore, proposed improvements to the Project site frontage will be consistent with City standards. Therefore, there will be **no impact** relative to dividing established communities from the proposed Project.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The General Plan designation and zoning classification for the Project site are both Business Park (BP). The Project proposes no change to the either the General Plan designation or zoning classification and will be developed in accordance with the existing land use and zoning designations. Since the Project proposes no changes to the General Plan or zoning, there will be no conflicts with those plans and thus no impacts or environmental impacts from changes related to those plans. The Project will be required to comply with applicable policies of the General Plan regarding the protection of biological and cultural resources, the adjacent Warm Springs Creek, air quality, noise, and other environmental issues. Therefore, the Project will not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. There will be a less than significant impact and no mitigation is required.

The Project site consists of both man-made and natural slopes. Man-made slopes occur on the northerly, and northwesterly portions of the Project site. Approximately 0.3 acres of the site are man-made, and 5.08 acres of the site are natural slope (0.9 acres are within the Warm Springs Creek area). The following analysis addresses the Project's relationship to applicable portions of Section 16.24 (Hillside Development) of the City's Development Code.

Section 16.24.020.A (Hillside Area) states: "The standards contained in this chapter apply to uses and structures within areas that have slopes of twenty (20) percent or greater and/or are designated on the significant features map on file with the department.

According to Chapter 16.24 – Hillside Development, Section 16.24.020 (B. Basis for Slope Determinations) of the City's Municipal Code, slope shall be computed on the natural slope of the

land before grading is commenced, as determined from a topographic map having a scale of not less than one inch equals one hundred (100) feet and a contour interval of not more than five feet.

The average slope on the "hillside" area is calculated to be slightly over 11.13%. A formula for computing average slope is contained in Section 16.24.030 (Definitions), and is presented below:

AVERAGE SLOPE COMPUTATION (NATURAL AREAS)

Contour Interval	1 Foot
Area of Natural Slope	0.0023 Acres
Length of Contours	20,324 Linear Feet

Average Slope = (CI*CL*0.0023)/Acres = (1*20324*0.0023)/4.2 = 11.13%

Reference Figure 11-1, Average Slope Computation for Natural Areas

The Project site is not identified on the significant features map that is on file with the City (see **Figure 11-2**, *Hillside Overlay Zone*).

Section 16.24.020.D states: "The development standards, guidelines and provisions of this chapter shall be applied to those portions of land with a predominance of significant natural slopes exceeding twenty-five (25) percent and areas that are integrally contiguous, or slopes determined as significant by the director." As will be shown below, the Project does not contain a predominance of significant natural slopes exceeding twenty-five (25) percent, and/or areas that are integrally contiguous. It should be noted that natural slopes in excess of 25% constitute only 7.9% of the Project site.

This is supported by a view of the site from Google Maps (see **Figure 6**, *Aerial Photo*, provided on page 8 of this Initial Study). As the "hillside" portion of the site is located along the Warm Springs Creek and internal to the Project site. Natural slope areas exceeding 25% consist of non-contiguous small pockets, which cumulatively amount to less than 7.9% of the property.

Natural vs. disturbed (man-made) portions of the slopes were segregated and further analyzed and tabulated, as follows:

SLOPE RANGES

Man-Made Areas	0.3 Acres	5.6% of Property
Warm Springs Creek	0.89 Acres	16.5% of Property
Natural Slopes (0-25%)	3.76 Acres	70.0% of Property
Natural Slopes (25-50%)	0.77 Acres	6.9% of Property
Natural Slopes (>50%)	0.06 Acres	1.0% of Property
TOTAL SITE	5.38 Acres	100.0% of Property

Section 16.24.030 (Hillside definition) states: "Land with an average rise or fall of twenty-five (25) percent or greater or a vertical rise of thirty (30) feet or more." As stated above, the average slope on the "hillside" area is calculated to be slightly over 11.13%.

FIGURE 11-1 Average Slope Computation for Natural Areas



=OVER 25% SLOPE

FIGURE 11-2 Hillside Overlay Zone



Section 16.24.020.B (Structures on Sloping Parcels) states: "Where the average slope of a parcel is greater than one foot rise or fall in 7 feet of distance from the street elevation at the property line, structure height shall be measured in compliance with Chapter 16.24 (Hillside Development)." The Project does not meet two of the requirements (the 30' max building height and exceeding the building envelope limit). The City can make findings waiving or modifying these requirements pursuant to 16.24.050 C:

"C. Modification of Requirements. The commission may modify or waive a development standard when an improved or more sensitive design will result. Further, where it can be demonstrated that imposing hillside development standards would either render a parcel unbuildable and create a loss of its reasonable economic use, or place an undue restriction on the improvement of the property, development consistent with the general plan shall be allowed subject to approval by the commission, if the following findings can be made:

- The site is physically suitable for the design and siting of the proposed development. The proposed development will result in minimum disturbance of environmentally sensitive areas;
- b. The grading proposed in connection with the development will not result in soil erosion, silting of lower slopes, flooding, severe scarring or other geological instability or fire hazard that would affect health, safety and general welfare as determined by the city engineer;
- c. The proposed development retains the visual quality of the site, the aesthetic qualities of the area and the neighborhood characteristics by utilizing proper structural scale and character, varied architectural treatments, and appropriate plant materials; and
- d. The proposed development is in conformance with the qualitative development standards and guidelines as established in this chapter and is conformance with the goals, objectives and policies of the general plan."

Based on all of these factors, any impacts pertaining to the Hillside Ordinance are considered **less** than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
12. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the				
Project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known				
mineral resource that would be of value to			v	
the region and the residents of the state?			~	
(References 2, 17)				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a				
locally-important mineral resource recovery				
site delineated on a local general plan,				X
specific plan or other land use plan?				
(References 2, 17)				

a) Less Than Significant Impact. Per the General Plan EIR, for industrial materials, the City and its Sphere of Influence are classified as MRZ-4, an area of unknown mineral resource significance. For aggregate resources, most of the City and the Sphere of Influence are classified as MRZ-3a, an area containing known mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. Land west of I-15 is classified as MRZ-1, an area of no mineral resource significance. The Project site is located west of I-15 at the southwest corner of Madison Avenue and Golden Gate Circle, northeasterly of Jefferson Avenue; therefore, per the General Plan EIR, the site is classified as MRZ-1 (an area of no mineral resource significance).

No mineral resources are known to occur on the Project site, nor has the Project site been previously used for mineral extraction. According to the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* (**Appendix F**) prepared for the Project, the Project site is currently in a vacant, undeveloped condition. Historical activities at the Project site are documented in the *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* based on aerial photographs and topographic maps. The aerial photographs reviewed indicate that the Project site has been undeveloped land since at least 1938 and the historical topographic maps reviewed depict the Project site as undeveloped land from at least 1901.

The Project site has minimal potential to be mined in the future because it is surrounded by business, office, and industrial development and is not considered a state designated mineral resource extraction zone. Therefore, development of the Project site would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and residents of the State. Impacts will be **less than significant**.

b) No Impact or Does Not Apply. Exhibit 5.12-1 of the General Plan EIR depicts local mineral resource recovery sites. The Project site is not located within or adjacent to any such site; therefore, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of any locally important mineral resources. **No impacts** will occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
13. NOISE/VIBRATION: Would the Project result in:				
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 or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (References 2, 30, 33)		x		
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (References 2, 30)			x	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels? (References 2, 6, 30)				x

Any Tables or Figures in this Section are from the *Noise Impact Analysis*, unless stated otherwise.

a) Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. A project would normally have a significant effect on the environment related to noise if it would substantially increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas or conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community in which it is located. To support the analysis in this section, a Project specific Noise Impact Analysis (Appendix H) was prepared that measured ambient (existing) noise levels and calculated potential noise impacts from Project construction and operation on nearby sensitive receptors. The closest sensitive receptor to the Project site is a residential property at the southeast corner of Madison Avenue and Elm Street approximately 500 feet north of the site. This nearby sensitive use could potentially be subject to noise-related environmental impacts from construction and operation and operation and operation and operation and operation and operation and operative use could potentially be subject to noise-related environmental impacts from construction and operation and operation and operation and operation and operation and operation and operative use could potentially be subject to noise-related environmental impacts from construction and operation at the Project site.

Fundamentals of Noise

Sound is the mechanical energy of a moving object transmitted by pressure waves through the air that are received by the human ear. Sound pressure is measured in decibels (dB) and has certain measurable characteristics such as frequency (pitch) which is the number of pressure oscillations per second and amplitude (loudness). Frequency relates to the number of pressure oscillations per second (cycles) which is measured in Hertz (Hz). The human ear can hear sounds from 20 Hz up to 20,000 Hz but is most sensitive between 1,000 Hz and 5,000 Hz (called the A-weighted scale) which is typically reported as A-weighted decibels (dBA). Typically, the human ear can barely perceive a noise level change of 3 dB while a 5 dB change is readily perceptible. Decibels are a logarithmic scale so sound energy must be doubled to produce a 3dB increase. As sound propagates from a source it spreads geometrically and attenuates at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance.

Noise is defined as sound that is loud, unpleasant, unexpected, or unwanted. The State Noise Control Act defines noise as "...excessive undesirable sound...". Noise in the environment fluctuates over time. One common measure of area-wide noise is the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) which is the average equivalent A-weighted sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of five (5) decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 to 10:00 p.m. and after addition of ten (10) decibels to sound levels in the night before 7:00 a.m. and after 10:00 p.m.

City of Murrieta Noise Regulations

Noise is regulated in the City of Murrieta by the Noise Element of the General Plan, the City Municipal Code, and the Western Riverside County Multi Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP) relative to biological resources of the adjacent Warm Springs Creek. Applicable policies and standards governing environmental noise in the City are set forth in Table 11-2 of the General Plan Noise Element which provides a land use compatibility matrix for community noise environments. According to the matrix for multi-family residential land uses, noise levels ranging from 50 - 65 dBA CNEL are normally acceptable while levels from 60 – 70 dBA CNEL are conditionally acceptable. The Noise Element states that construction activity is prohibited between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. and on Sundays or legal holidays. During permissible hours of operation, noise levels from construction activity should be limited to 85 dBA at commercial properties and 75 dBA at residential receivers.

The City of Murrieta Municipal Code (MC), Section 16.30.090, specifies noise limits based on land use. Noise levels have been evaluated at the nearest noise-sensitive receivers beyond adjacent roadways and sidewalks. The MC states that noise standards for commercial properties are 60 dBA and 65 dBA for nighttime and daytime hours, respectively. The Municipal Code also states that noise standards for residential properties are 45 dBA and 50 dBA for nighttime and daytime hours, respectively.

Section 16.30.130(A) of the City of Murrieta Noise Ordinance prohibits noise from construction activities between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. and on Sundays and holidays. The Ordinance limits maximum noise levels at affected structures so they will not exceed those listed in **Table 13-1**, *City of Murrieta Construction Noise Standards*. Project construction is anticipated to occur between 7:00 a.m. to 8 p.m. so the standard would be 75 dBA.

Equipment Type	Single-Family Residential	Multi-Family Residential	Commercial
Mobile Equipment			
Daily, except Sundays and holidays, 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.	75 dBA	80 dBA	85 dBA
Daily, except Sundays and holidays, 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.	60 dBA	64 dBA	70 dBA
Stationary Equipment			
Daily, except Sundays and holidays, 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.	60 dBA	65 dBA	70 dBA
Daily, except Sundays and holidays, 8:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.	50 dBA	55 dBA	60 dBA

Table 13-1City of Murrieta Construction Noise Standards

In accordance with the MSHCP Implementation Structure, residential noise limits were applied to the onsite biologically sensitive habitat.

Ambient Noise Environment

Noise in the vicinity of the Project area is mainly the result of traffic on the adjacent streets including Golden Gate Circle, Madison Avenue, and Elm Street, as well as more regional sources such as Jefferson Avenue to the west and the I-15 Freeway to the east. The *Noise Impact Analysis* found the minimum hourly ambient noise level in the Project area to be 41.4 dBA between the hours of 12 a.m. and 1 a.m. while the maximum noise level was 53.7 dBA which occurred between the hours of 1 p.m. and 2 p.m. The average hourly nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) ambient noise level was 48.0 dBA which reflects the relatively rural and quiet local noise environment at nighttime as most of the surrounding land uses are commercial or light industrial and most do not operate at night.

Construction Impacts

According to the City of Murrieta Municipal Code, construction activity is prohibited between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. and on Sundays or legal holidays. During permitted hours of operation, noise levels from construction activity are to be limited to no greater than 75 dBA at residential properties and 85 dBA at commercial properties where feasible. Based on the application of residential noise limits at biologically sensitive properties per the MSHCP, the noise limit of 75 dBA was also applied at the boundary of the sensitive habitat along Warm Springs Creek in the southeast portion of the site.

Calculated construction noise impacts are shown in **Table 13-2**, *Construction Equipment Noise Levels*. Based on the typical noise levels and duty cycles of construction equipment, **Table 13-2** demonstrates that average noise levels are anticipated to remain below 75 dBA at the nearest sensitive habitat receiver to the southeast. Any other receivers are located at a greater distance from on-site activity and therefore would be exposed to lesser noise levels (i.e., residence north of the site).

Activity	Equipment	Average Noise Level (dBA)
Utilities and Grading	Excavator, Backhoe, Water Truck, Grader	66
Foundation	Concrete Mixer Truck, Concrete Pump Truck	56
Paving	Paver, Roller, Dump Truck	62
Framing	Air Compressor, Telescopic Forklift	53

Table 13-2Construction Equipment Noise Levels

The *Noise Impact Analysis* determined noise impacts from construction would be less than significant and outlined a number of "good practice" measures to help reduce potential noise impacts. To err on the side of caution, these practices are incorporated into **Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1**, which will help assure that potential noise impacts to surrounding properties (i.e., adjacent habitat and nearby residences) will not exceed City standards and, therefore, remain at less than significant levels.

MM NOI-1 The following activities shall be implemented by the applicant and their contractors during all construction activities as appropriate and monitored as necessary by City inspectors:

- 1. Staging areas shall be placed as far as possible from sensitive receivers.
- 2. Stationary equipment shall be placed to minimize noise impacts on nearby sensitive receivers.
- 3. Equipment shall be turned off when not in use.
- 4. The use of enunciators or public address systems shall be prohibited except for emergency notifications.
- 5. Equipment used in construction shall be maintained in proper operating condition and all loads should be properly secured to prevent rattling and banging.
- 6. Work shall be scheduled to avoid simultaneous construction activities that both generate high noise levels.
- 7. All mufflers on equipment requiring them shall be maintained in good operating condition.
- 8. The use of backup alarms shall be minimized.

Operational Impacts

Noise levels from the proposed operational activity and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units were calculated at the nearest properties. Delivery and yard activity and HVAC equipment were evaluated for daytime impacts while only HVAC equipment was evaluated for nighttime impacts. The analysis represents a conservative or reasonable worst-case estimate of noise impacts at off-site and sensitive receivers. The analysis determined that noise levels in the southeast portion of the site that contains biological habitat (i.e., the creek) would exceed applicable standards (estimated at 56 dB v. the 50 dB residential standard). Therefore, the *Noise Impact Analysis* recommended installation of a seven-foot tall solid wall which is incorporated into **Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2** (see Figure 13-1). Table 13-3, *Project Operational Noise Impacts – Daytime* and **Table 13-4**, *Project Operational Noise Impacts – Nighttime*, show the calculated operational noise levels around the site after installation of the recommended wall during both daytime and nighttime conditions. Figure 13-1, *Noise Receiver and Barrier Locations* provides the location of the receivers and the location of the recommended seven-foot tall noise barrier.

Receiver ²	Description ²	Noise Standard (dBA)	Calculated Noise Level (dBA)
R1	Sensitive Habitat (Southeast)	50	49
R2	South Property Line 1	65	54
R3	South Property Line 2	65	55
R4	South Property Line 3	65	51
R5	South Property Line 4	65	42
R6	West Property Line	65	52

Table 13-3 Project Operational Noise Impacts – Daytime¹

¹ Assumes site activity and HVAC operation WITH recommended noise barrier per Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2

² See Figure 13-1, Noise Receiver and Barrier Locations.

Table 13-4 Project Operational Noise Impacts – Nighttime¹

Receiver ²	Description ²	Noise Standard (dBA)	Calculated Noise Level (dBA)
R1	Sensitive Habitat (Southeast)	45	23
R2	South Property Line 1	60	26
R3	South Property Line 2	60	25
R4	South Property Line 3	60	26
R5	South Property Line 4	60	23
R6	West Property Line	60	31

¹ Assumes HVAC only WITH recommended noise barrier per Mitigation Measure NOI-2

² See Figure 13-1, Noise Receiver and Barrier Locations.

As shown in **Table 13-3** and **Table 13-4**, noise levels at all receivers are anticipated to comply with the applicable daytime and nighttime noise limits of the City of Murrieta with implementation of the recommended seven-foot high sound attenuation barrier.

FIGURE 13-1 Noise Receiver and Barrier Locations



This page left blank for pagination purposes.

MM NOI-2 Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for the Project, a seven-foot high sound attenuation barrier shall be installed along the southeastern portion of the site (i.e., the entire frontage along Warm Springs Creek) as shown in Figure 6 of the Project Noise Study and Figure 13-1 of the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. This barrier will be sufficient to block noise from Project activities on the adjacent creek.

This barrier shall be solid and constructed of masonry, wood, plastic, glass, fiberglass, steel, or a combination of those materials with no cracks or gaps through or below the wall. Any seams or cracks must be filled or caulked as much as possible. If wood is used, it can be tongue and groove and must be at least 7/8-inch thick or have a surface density of at least 3-1/2 pounds per square foot. Where architectural or aesthetic factors allow, glass or clear plastic may be used on the upper portion of the wall assembly if it is desirable to preserve a view. A solid railing wall made of glass, plexiglass, or any other material detailed above is also sufficient in this location provided there are no gaps between panels. This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Planning Department based on the Project *Noise Impact Analysis*.

Project-Generated Traffic Noise

The *Noise Impact Analysis* also included an analysis of the potential change in traffic noise levels to the surrounding area based on the Trip Generation Letter performed by Darnell and Associates, Inc. (Reference 33). sound energy, which is an increase of 3 dB. Direct impacts are assessed by comparing existing traffic volumes to existing plus project traffic volumes. The Project is anticipated to add 141 average daily trips (ADT) which is added to each of the closest surrounding roadways that would carry this additional traffic. The anticipated increase in noise levels from Project-generated traffic is shown for each area roadway in **Table 13-5**, *Noise Impacts from Project-Related Traffic*.

Poadway/Sogmont	Traffic Volu	Noise Level	
Roadway/Segment	Existing	Project	Increase (dB)
I-15 Freeway	186,000	141	0.0
Madison Avenue			
West of Elm Street	1,000	141	0.6
East of Elm Street	600	141	0.9
Jefferson Avenue	29,000	141	0.0
Elm Street	2,500	141	0.2

Table 13-5 Noise Impacts from Project-Related Traffic

As shown in **Table 13-5**, no direct impacts are anticipated to result from the additional projectgenerated traffic on surrounding roadways, as noise level increases would be less than three decibels.

A secondary analysis was performed for nearby residential properties adjacent to Madison Avenue to determine whether project-generated traffic would cause noise impacts that would exceed standards in the City's Noise Element. According to the Noise Element, traffic noise impacts are considered to be "normally acceptable" to single family residential properties within the range of 50-60 CNEL. Existing traffic noise levels were evaluated at the edge of the right-of-way along the residential property at the southwest corner of Madison Avenue and Elm Street and compared to traffic noise levels anticipated with the increase in traffic volumes on surrounding roadways. **Table 13-6**, *Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts on Nearby Sensitive Receptors*, shows the results of these calculations.

Receiver	Description	Existing Noise Level (CNEL)	Existing + Project Noise Level (CNEL)	Noise Level Increase (dB)
Residential	Madison Avenue	57.0	57.7	0.7

 Table 13-6

 Project-Related Traffic Noise Impacts on Nearby Sensitive Receptors

As shown in **Table 13-6**, traffic noise impacts at the adjacent residential receiver remain in the "normally acceptable" range of noise levels per the City of Murrieta Noise Element to the General Plan with and without the addition of project-generated traffic. For these reasons, project-generated traffic noise impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

During construction, the Project will not result in the 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 City's General Plan or Noise Ordinance with implementation of **Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1**. During operations, the Project will result in the 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 City's General Plan or Noise Ordinance. With the incorporation of **Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2** any impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels. Any impacts caused by the 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 City's General Plan or Noise Ordinance. With the incorporation of **Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2** any impacts will be reduced to less than significant levels. Any impacts caused by the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies will be reduced to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. Ground-borne vibrations consist of rapidly fluctuating motions within the ground that have an average motion of zero. The effects of ground-borne vibrations typically only cause a nuisance to people, but at extreme vibration levels, damage to buildings may occur. Although ground-borne vibration can be felt outdoors, it is typically only an annoyance to people indoors where the associated effects of the shaking of a building can be notable. Ground-borne noise is an effect of ground-borne vibration and only exists indoors, since it is produced from noise radiated from the motion of the walls and floors of a room and may also consist of the rattling of windows or dishes on shelves.

Several different methods are used to quantify vibration amplitude.

PPV – Known as the peak particle velocity (PPV) which is the maximum instantaneous peak in vibration velocity, typically given in inches per second.

RMS – Known as root mean squared (RMS) can be used to denote vibration amplitude.

VdB – A commonly used abbreviation to describe the vibration level (VdB) for a vibration source.

Typically, developed areas are continuously affected by vibration velocities of 50 VdB or lower. These continuous vibrations are not noticeable to humans whose threshold of perception is around 65 VdB. Outdoor sources that may produce perceptible vibrations are usually caused by construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads, while smooth roads rarely produce perceptible ground-borne noise or vibration. To counter the effects of ground-borne vibration, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has published guidance relative to vibration impacts. According to the FTA, fragile buildings can be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels of 0.3 inches per second without experiencing structural damage. There are three main types of vibration propagation: surface, compression, and shear waves.

• Surface waves, or Rayleigh waves, travel along the ground's surface. These waves carry most of their energy along an expanding circular wave front, similar to ripples produced by throwing a rock into a pool of water.

- P-waves, or compression waves, are body waves that carry their energy along an expanding spherical wave front. The particle motion in these waves is longitudinal (i.e., in a "push-pull" fashion). P-waves are analogous to airborne sound waves.
- S-waves, or shear waves, are also body waves that carry energy along an expanding spherical wave front. However, unlike P-waves, the particle motion is transverse, or side-to-side and perpendicular to the direction of propagation.

Construction activities can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent land uses. The construction of the proposed Project would not require the use of equipment such as pile drivers which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The primary vibration source during construction may be from a bulldozer which has a vibration impact of 0.089 inches per second PPV at 25 feet which is perceptible but below any risk to architectural damage.

As vibration waves propagate from a source, the vibration energy decreases in a logarithmic nature and the vibration levels typically decrease by 6 VdB per doubling of the distance from the vibration source. This drop-off rate can vary greatly depending on the soil but has been shown to be effective enough for screening purposes in order to identify potential vibration impacts.

The thresholds from the Caltrans Transportation and Construction Induced Vibration Guidance Manual in **Table 13-7**, *Guideline Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria*, provide general thresholds and guidelines as to the vibration damage potential from vibratory impacts.

	Maximum PPV (in/sec)		
Structure and Condition	Transient Sources	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources	
Extremely fragile historic buildings, ruins, ancient monuments	0.12	0.08	
Fragile buildings	0.2	0.1	
Historic and some old buildings	0.5	0.25	
Older residential structures	0.5	0.3	
New residential structures	1.0	0.5	
Modern industrial/commercial buildings	2.0	0.5	

Table 13-7Guideline Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria

Note: Transient sources create a single isolated vibration event, such as blasting or drop balls. Continuous/frequent intermittent sources include impact pile drivers, pogo-stick compactors, crack-and-seat equipment, vibratory pile drivers, and vibratory compaction equipment.

Table 13-8, *Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment*, gives approximate vibration levels for particular construction activities. This data provides a reasonable estimate for a wide range of soil conditions. At a distance of 80 feet, **Table 13-8** demonstrates that a large bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.025 PPV (in/sec) which is slightly perceptible but sustainably below any risk of damage (0.5 in/sec PPV is the threshold of residential structures). Therefore, the Project will not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second) at 25 feet	Approximate Vibration Level LV (dVB) at 25 feet
Pile driver (impact)	1.518 (upper range)	112
	0.644 (typical)	104
Pile driver (sonic)	0.734 upper range	105
	0.170 typical	93
Clam shovel drop (slurry wall)	0.202	94
Hydromill	0.008 in soil	66
(slurry wall)	0.017 in rock	75
Vibratory Roller	0.21	94
Hoe Ram	0.089	87
Large bulldozer	0.089	87
Caisson drill	0.089	87
Loaded trucks	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small bulldozer	0.003	58

 Table 13-8

 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment¹

¹ From Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Federal Transit Administration, May 2006.

c) No Impact or Does Not Apply. The Project is not located within any hazard safety or planning zone of the French Valley Airport, which is the closest airport to the Project site (3.1 miles to the northeast. Therefore, the Project will not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels from a public use airport. In addition, there are no private use airports within a two-mile radius of the Project site. **No impacts** will occur, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
14. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population				
growth in an area, either directly (for				
example, by proposing new homes and			Y	
businesses) or indirectly (for example,			~	
through extension of roads or other				
infrastructure)? (References 1, 2, 31)				
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing				
people or housing, necessitating the				v
construction of replacement housing				Å
elsewhere? (References 6)				

- a) Less Than Significant Impact. As reported by the State of California Department of Finance, the 2018 population of Murrieta is approximately 113,541. According to Table 5.2-3, Population Estimates and Projections of the General Plan EIR, Murrieta is projected to have a population of 127,962 persons at buildout year 2035. As indicated in Table 5.2-6, Employment Estimates City of Murrieta, the City's current labor market is an estimated 19,888 jobs and according to SCAG, the City's labor market (jobs) is forecast to grow to 31,450 jobs by 2035. The Project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning classification for the site. Any direct increases in population or employment as a result of the Project are insignificant as they are within the growth assumptions estimated by the General Plan. No new, expanded infrastructure is proposed that could accommodate additional growth in the area that is not already possible with existing infrastructure. Impacts will be **less than significant**.
- b) *No Impact or Does not Apply.* The proposed Project site is undeveloped. No existing people or residences would be displaced as a result of this Project; therefore, the Project will not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. **No impacts** will occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply	
15. PUBLIC SERVICES:					
Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of ne physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable se ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
a) Fire protection? (References 1, 2, 6)			Х		
b) Police protection? (References 1)			Х		
c) Schools? (References 1, 18, 32, 33)			X		
d) Parks? (References 1, 8)			X		
e) Other public facilities? (References 8)			X		

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is served by Murrieta Fire & Rescue (MFR). The closest City fire station to the Project site is Station #1 located at 41825 Juniper Street (approximately 2.9 miles northwest of the Project site). Furthermore, the City maintains a mutual aid agreement with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) and Station #3 is located approximately 3.8 miles northeast of the Project.

The proposed Project is not anticipated to require additional fire protection, as the Project site is already within a developed area currently served by the Fire Department. According to the City's General Plan EIR, fire protection for the City at buildout would be feasible based on the existing fire stations and provisions for additional equipment as buildout occurs. The General Plan EIR finding is based on continuing to be able to meet 90 percent of urban calls within a 6.5-minute target response time. The Project site is within a distance (approximately 1½ miles) to where any future calls can be responded to within 6.5 minutes.

All development within the City is required to comply with the latest edition of the Uniform Fire Code (UFC), California Fire Code (CFC), and other applicable building and fire standards. All construction on the Project site would be required to comply with these building codes. Based on review of the Project site plan by the MFR, the Project site would have adequate hydrants to meet fire protection demand, and the proponent has provided both a primary and secondary ingress/egress configuration to ensure adequate Fire Department access to the site.

The MFR is independently funded through a combination of ad valorem tax and parcel assessment. The MFR is a subsidiary district of the City of Murrieta and maintains an independent revenue stream through the tax rolls dating back to 1947. In addition, capital improvements are funded through Development Impact Fees (DIFs) and special Development Agreement Fees. Incremental impacts attributed to the Project would be reduced through the payment of Fire Department DIFs.

With the implementation of General Plan policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, payment of DIFs, and through Fire Department review of the proposed Project, impacts on the demand for additional fire facilities or services would be **less than significant**. No new or altered fire protection facilities would be needed.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is currently vacant, unimproved land in the southwest portion of the City of Murrieta. Law enforcement services are provided by the Murrieta Police Department (MPD). The MPD is located at 2 Town Square (approximately 2.7 miles northwest of the Project site).

In addition, the City maintains mutual aid agreements with the Riverside County Sheriff's Department, the City of Hemet, and the California Highway Patrol. The Sheriff's Department serves the Murrieta Sphere of Influence Area, with a Southwest Station located at 30755-A Auld Road near the French Valley Airport (approximately 7 miles northeast of the Project site). The California Highway Patrol has jurisdiction along I-15 and I-215.

As set forth in the City's General Plan, Safety Element, design of public spaces and the relationships between buildings and public space are important considerations in Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). CPTED is a set of approaches to the design of the built environment that seek to minimize opportunities for crime. The Police Department reviews all plans to ensure use of CPTED in any project's design.

According to the City's General Plan EIR, law enforcement protection for the City at buildout would be feasible based on incremental expansion of the number of officers, and provisions for additional office space at the police station at One Town Square.

The Project site is located within existing patrol routes, and future calls could be responded to within the identified priority call target response times. The City seeks to respond to Priority 1 calls within 6 minutes; Priority 2 calls with 15 minutes; and Priority 3 calls within 35 minutes. Although the City performs slightly below its objectives, review of the proposed Project by the City Police Department would ensure the on-site design features such as multiple ingress/egress routes, perimeter lighting, and surveillance and alarm systems would comply with the General Plan Safety Element goals to enhance community safety, protect life and property, and reduce crime.

The construction of the proposed Project would incrementally increase the need for police protection. The project's potential impacts on law enforcement facilities and staffing would be offset by payment of the DIF at the time of building permit issuance. Funding for continued operation and maintenance will be provided by the City of Murrieta's General Fund and through special revenue funds.

With adherence to on-site security measures required by the City and payment of the City's mandatory DIF fee, the proposed Project would not increase demand for law enforcement services to a point that new or altered police facilities would be required. Impacts will be **less than significant**.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in an incremental impact on the demand for school services as the Project is proposing office and warehouse uses. The proposed Project is located with the Murrieta Valley Unified School District (MVUSD). According to the MVUSD website and the 2019 Facility Assessment, the District which serves grades K-12, was established July 1, 1989 and has grown to an enrollment of approximately 22,700 students.

Impacts to MVUSD facilities will be offset through the payment of impact fees to the MVUSD, prior to the issuance of a building permit. The development impact fee program of the District adequately provides for reducing the impacts of the proposed Project in accordance with California Government Code Section 65995 and California Education Code Section 17620.

As required of all development, the proposed Project would be required to pay applicable development fees established by the District prior to the issuance of permits. Payment of required school development fees sufficiently offsets any impact the proposed Project would have on school services and facilities. Therefore, impacts on school facilities will be **less than significant**.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in an incremental impact on the demand for park services as the Project is proposing office and warehouse uses. Demand for park and recreational facilities are generally the direct result of residential development. Chapter 16.36.020 of the Municipal Code states that a developer shall pay a public facilities development impact fee (DIF) for each building in a non-residential development or new square footage of a building in a non-residential development, in an amount established by resolution of the city council, prior to issuance of a building permit for that building. Payment of the DIF is a standard condition applicable to all new development within the City.

Payment of required public facilities development fees sufficiently offsets any impact the proposed Project would have on park services and recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be **less than significant**.

e) Less Than Significant Impact. The expansion of public services such as libraries or hospitals will not be required. The proposed development will result in an incremental, yet not significant increase the demand of such services.

As the City's population grows, new medical facilities will be required to provide health and medical services for an expanded population. Since the Project as proposed is consistent with the existing City's General Plan Land Use Plan designation of Business Park (BP), the proposed Project would not impact the City/County-wide health and medical facilities to a greater degree than was anticipated in the General Plan. Residential development places a much larger burden on these public services.

Impacts to library services are typically attributable to residential development. Therefore, the proposed Project will result in a very limited impact to library services.

A less than significant impact will occur to libraries and health services as a result of the Project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
16. RECREATION: Would the Project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (References 2, 7, 8)			x	
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (References 7, 8)				x

a) Less Than Significant Impact. Demand for park and recreational facilities are generally the direct result of residential development. The Project is proposing office and warehouse uses.

Chapter 16.36.020 of the Municipal Code states that a developer shall pay a public facilities development impact fee (DIF) for each building in a non-residential development or new square footage of a building in a non-residential development, in an amount established by resolution of the City Council, prior to issuance of a building permit for that building. Payment of the DIF is a standard condition applicable to all new development within the City.

Payment of required public facilities development fees sufficiently offsets any impact the proposed Project would have on park services and recreational facilities and since the Project is business in nature, it will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; any impacts will be **less than significant**.

b) No Impact or Does Not Apply. Demand for park and recreational facilities are generally the direct result of residential development. The Project is proposing office and warehouse uses. Therefore, the proposed Project will not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. **No impacts** will occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
17. TRANSPORTATION: Would the Project:				
a) Conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? (References 1, 2, 33, 44, 46, 48)			x	
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (References 1, 2, 11, 33, 34, 46, 48)			x	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (References 6, 7)			x	
d) Result in inadequate emergency access? (References 7, 8)			x	

Any Tables in this Section are from the *Traffic Scoping Agreement*, unless stated otherwise.

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Murrieta has established its own "Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines" (TIAPG) to determine if a private development project requires preparation of a full Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). The *Traffic Scoping Agreement* (Appendix I) contains the TIAPG analysis which is summarized in this section. The first step requires the estimation of project trip generation compared to the TIAPG criteria.

Trip Generation

Project trip generation using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition. **Table 17-1**, *Project Trip Generation*, summarizes the trip generation rates, land uses and density, and daily, AM and PM peak hour trips generated by the proposed Project.

Trip Generation Rates ¹											
			AM Peak Hour				Ρ	PM Peak Hour			
Land Use	ITE Code	Daily		Rate		In: Out Ratio		Rate	•	In: Out Ratio	
Office	710	See footnote	(2)	See footnote (2)	88:12		See footnote (2) 16:			
Warehouse	150	1.74 Trips/ K	SF	0.17/KSF		77:23		0.19/KSF		27:73	
			Tri	p Generation	Calcula	tions					
		Density		AM Peak Hour				PM I	Peak Hou	ır	
Land Use	ITE Code	Density	ADI	In	Out	Total		In	Out	Total	
Office	710	11,706 S.F.	132	34	4	38		3	12	15	
Warehouse	150	4,970 S.F.	9	1	0	1		1	0	1	
Total: 141 35 4 39 4 12 16											

Table 17-1 Project Trip Generation

Note: KSF = 1,000 square feet,

The trip rates for the Project's land uses are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE)s Trip Generation Manual 10th Edition Publication,

² The fitted curve equations for a general office building are Ln(T) = 0.97Ln(x) + 2.50 for daily trips, T = 0.94(x) + 26.49 for AM peak hour trips, and Ln(T) = 0.95Ln(x) + 0.36 for PM peak hour trips.

Level of Service Assessment

The second step is to compare the Project trip generation shown on **Table 17-1** to the TIAPG to determine if a Level of Service (LOS) Analysis is required. The TIAPG indicates that a TIA is not required to include a LOS analysis if the project generates 100 or less peak hour trips that would be distributed onto the local roadway network. As shown on **Table 17-1**, the proposed Project will generate 141 total daily trips with 39 AM peak hour trips and 16 PM peak hour trips. Since the 39 AM and 16 PM peak hour trips are less than the 100 peak hour vehicle trips threshold, an LOS assessment is not required. Therefore, traffic impacts are expected to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Within the Project study area, Class II on-street bicycle lanes exist on Jefferson Avenue a quartermile west of the Project site, but there are no bicycle lanes on Elm Street, Madison Avenue, or Golden Gate Circle in the vicinity of the site. There are sidewalks or graded shoulders for pedestrian access along Jefferson Avenue, and sidewalks on the east side of Madison Avenue and the north side of Golden Gate Drive adjacent to the Project site. Sidewalks and curb ramps at intersections are generally present where development has occurred within the study area, and absent where development has yet to occur. The lack of bicycle and pedestrian improvements generally reflects the overall rural and industrial nature of this portion of the City. Eventually, when Madison Avenue is extended south across Warm Springs Creek, the Murrieta General Plan Circulation Element indicates that Class II on-street bicycle lanes and sidewalks are planned to be installed.

Existing Public Transit Services

The City of Murrieta is served by the Riverside Transit Agency which provides local and regional bus service throughout Riverside County. However, the Project area has no local bus service routes or bus stops, at this time. The closest bus routes to the Project site are Routes 205, 206, and 208 which provide express service along the I-15 Freeway east of the Project site. There are no other transit facilities within one-quarter mile of the proposed Project site. The general lack of bus service reflects the overall rural and industrial nature of this portion of the City. Eventually when Madison Avenue is extended south across Warm Springs Creek, it is possible bus service would be extended to connect Murrieta Hot Springs Road to the north and Rancho California Road to the south to serve this portion of the City west of the I-15 Freeway.

General Plan

The proposed Project does not involve a zone change or General Plan Amendment from the current zoning and General Plan land use designation of Business Park (BP).

Traffic Impact Mitigation

Transportation improvements throughout the County of Riverside are funded through a combination of direct Project mitigation, fair share contributions or development impact fee programs such as the City's adoption of the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program and the City of Murrieta Development Impact Fee (DIF) program. The proposed Project will be subject to the TUMF and the City's DIF. Identification and timing of needed improvements is generally determined through local jurisdictions based upon a variety of factors.

The Project's contribution to the aforementioned transportation impact fee programs or as a fair share contribution towards a cumulatively impacted facility not found to be covered by a pre-existing fee program should be considered sufficient to address the Project's fair share towards mitigation measure(s) designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.

The TUMF program is administered by the Western Riverside Council of Governments based upon a regional Nexus Study completed in early 2002 and updated in 2005, 2009, 2015 and 2017 to address major changes in right of way acquisition and improvement cost factors. The TUMF program

identifies network backbone and local roadways that are needed to accommodate growth through 2035. The regional program was put into place to ensure that developments pay their fair share, and that funding is in place for the construction of facilities needed to maintain an acceptable level of service for the transportation system. The TUMF is a regional mitigation fee program and is imposed and implemented in every jurisdiction in Western Riverside County.

TUMF is imposed on new residential, industrial and commercial development through application of the TUMF fee ordinance and fees are collected at the building or occupancy permit phase.

The proposed Project will participate in the cost of off-site improvements through payment of TUMF fees based on the current fees at the time of construction of the proposed Project. Payment of TUMF is a standard requirement and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

The proposed Project is located within the City of Murrieta and will therefore be subject to the City's Development Impact Fees (DIF). The City's DIF program includes facilities that are not part of the regional TUMF program.

The proposed Project will participate in the cost of off-site improvements through payment of City DIF fees based on the current fees at the time of construction of the proposed Project. Payment of DIF is a standard requirement and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

With payment of TUMF and DIF as part of the City's standard conditions of approval, Project impacts related to traffic generation and indirect impacts on local streets and intersections will be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Lastly, pursuant to the requirements of the City Development Review Committee, design of the proposed Project includes sufficient roadway and access improvements and would be consistent with the General Plan and Circulation Element. However, the Project area is not adequately served by bike lanes, sidewalks, or bus routes at present due to its non-residential land uses and lack of general infrastructure. When the area more fully develops, it is likely that more continuous bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements will be installed (e.g., when Madison Avenue is extended south across Warm Springs Creek).

Therefore, the proposed Project would have a **less than significant** impact related to applicable plans, ordinances, or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for performance of the City's circulation system.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. In the fall of 2013, Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) was passed by the legislature and signed into law by the governor. For some parts of California (and eventually the entire state), this legislation will change the way that transportation studies are conducted for environmental documents. In the areas where SB 743 is implemented, delay-based metrics such as roadway capacity and level of service will no longer be the performance measures used for the determination of the transportation impacts of projects in studies conducted under CEQA. Instead, a new performance measure based on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) will be used.

The City's TIAPG does not require the Project to prepare a detailed traffic impact study, however, the Project will add jobs to a community that is considered housing rich, so it is considered generally consistent with the requirements of SB 743 and the latest CEQA Guidelines regarding VMT. In December 2018, CEQA Guidelines were updated to include a threshold for evaluating traffic impacts using the VMT methodology. This new methodology is required to be used statewide for projects beginning in or after July 2020 unless a lead agency adopts the VMT thresholds earlier. The City of Murrieta has not yet adopted VMT thresholds. The *AQ/GHG Impact Study* (**Appendix B**) based on the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) v2016.3.2 developed and maintained by the South Coast Air Quality Management District did not estimate VMT for this Project. However, it is estimated that the Project would generate approximately 2,820 daily VMT based on the total 141 daily trips times a worst case estimated trip length (2-way) of 20 miles.

The City's TIAPG states that the City's most recent General Plan Update and the Technical Advisory supporting SB 743 implementations concluded that local serving projects help decrease the number of trips and/or the distance these trips that local residents travel are considered to be "VMT-Reducing Projects". The proposed land uses are consistent with the City's Business Park zoning and General Plan land use designation and will help reduce vehicle miles travelled outside of the City by providing local serving uses. The Project will generate 141 daily trips which is 31 trips greater than the City's 110 daily trip thresholds to screen out VMT analysis. However, the Project's trip generation (see Table 17-1) indicates the proposed Project will generate 39 AM and 16 PM peak hour trips resulting in 61 fewer AM peak hour trips (100 - 39 = 61) and 84 fewer PM peak hour trips (100 – 16 = 84) trips compared to the City's TIAPG criteria which states that projects generating 100 peak hour trips or less do not require a full TIA. Based on the low number of AM peak and PM peak hour trips that will be generated, and full TIA and no additional VMT analysis is warranted. The Project's number of total daily trips, AM peak hour and PM peak hour trips, qualifies it for a Traffic Impact Analysis Exemption as outlined in the TIAPG, therefore, no additional traffic impact analysis is needed. The Project is consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) regarding VMT. Impacts are less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. Vehicle traffic to and from the Project site would utilize the existing network of regional and local roadways that serve the Project site. Public vehicle access to the Project site would be provided via an entry driveway off an extension of Madison Avenue south of Golden Gate Circle on the northeast side of the site. A 40-foot driveway will provide public and emergency access to the site. The design of roadways must provide adequate sight distance and traffic control measures. Roadway improvements in and around the Project site would be designed and constructed to satisfy all City requirements for street widths, corner radii, intersection control, parking, as well as incorporate design standards tailored specifically to site access requirements.

The proposed Project would provide a planned extension of Madison Avenue south of Golden Gate Circle that would dead-end at the Project access, at present. At some time in the future, Madison Avenue will eventually be extended across Warm Springs Creek to provide more direct access into this portion of the City. The Project will not introduce any new roadways or introduce a land use that would conflict with existing urban land uses in the surrounding area. Proposed improvements to the Project site (i.e., new asphalt, curb, gutter, and sidewalk features) will be consistent with the General Plan. Design of the proposed Project, including curb cuts, ingress, egress, traffic signage, and other streetscape changes, are subject to review and approval by the Traffic Engineering Department as part of the plan review process. Therefore, impacts related to increased hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed Project is required to design, construct, and maintain structures, roadways, and facilities to provide for adequate emergency access and evacuation. Primary access to the Project site would be provided via a 40-foot wide entry driveway off an extension of Madison Avenue south of Golden Gate Circle on the northeast side of the site. This driveway will also provide emergency access to the site.

The proposed Project will be constructed pursuant to the 2016 California Fire Code as adopted and amended by the City. The proposed Project structure will include installation of an automatic fire sprinkler system in accordance with Title 16, Section 16.18.050 of the Murrieta Development Code and would be subject to inspection and approval by the City Fire Department prior to occupancy. Sufficient space and turning radius for fire trucks would be provided on the Project site around the proposed building. The proposed Project design would be submitted to and approved by the City's Fire and Police Departments prior the issuance of building permits.

Construction activities, which may temporarily restrict vehicular traffic, would be required to implement adequate and appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. As part of the plan review process, the City would require the developer to submit a Traffic Management Plan that would provide appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

the emergency access measures required by the City would ensure impacts related to this issue would be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
18. 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, 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:				
a.i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? (References 13, 35, 36)		x		
a.ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. (References 13, 10)		x		

a.i) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014 (i.e., Assembly Bill 52 or AB 52), requires Lead Agencies evaluate a project's potential to impact "tribal cultural resources." Such resources include "sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources." A B 52 also gives Lead Agencies the discretion to determine, supported by substantial evidence, whether a resource qualifies as a "tribal cultural resource."

CEQA defines a "historical resource" as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) is listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) is listed in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC §5020.1(k); (3) is identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC §5024.1(g); or (4) is determined to be a historical resource by a project's Lead Agency (PRC §21084.1 and *State CEQA Guidelines* §15064.5[a]).

"Local register of historical resources" means a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution. "California Native American tribe" is defined as "a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a nonfederally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC).

Per AB 52, Native American consultation is required upon request by interested California Native American tribes that have previously requested that the City provide them with notice of such projects. Senate Bill (SB 18) requires cities and counties to consult with California Tribal Governments anytime a city or county amends or adopts its General Plan. This Project is proposing a General Plan Amendment; therefore, SB 18 notices are also required.

The City disseminated notices of the proposed Project to five California Native American tribes listed below on July 15, 2020 (**Appendix D2**).

- 1. Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians
- 2. Morongo Band of Mission Indians
- 3. Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians
- 4. Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians
- 5. Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians

Of the five Tribes contacted, three Tribes (Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, and Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians) requested consultation.

On September 10, 2020, the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians requested to initiate formal consultation with the City pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21080.3.1. The City held an AB 52 meeting and provided the proposed Mitigation Measures for the Project to the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians on January 14, 2021. The Tribe reviewed and concurred with the Mitigation Measures and concluded consultation on March 22, 2021.

On August 19, 2020, the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians ("Rincon Band") sent correspondence informing the City that the Project site is within the Territory of the Luiseño people, and is also within Rincon's specific area of Historic interest. The Rincon Band stated that they have no knowledge of cultural resources within the Area of Potential Effects, however, that does not mean that none exist. The Rincon Band recommended that the City reach out to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians as they are closer to the Project and may have pertinent information. The Rincon Band also requested that a portion of the *Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment (CRA*, **Appendix D1**) that was prepared for the Project be revised to more accurately reflect Luiseño history; the *CRA* was revised, as requested. Consultation with the Rincon Band concluded on January 8, 2021.

On July 30, 2020, the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians requested to initiate formal consultation with the City pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21080.3.1. The City held an AB 52 meeting and provided the proposed Mitigation Measures for the Project to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians on January 12, 2021. The Tribe reviewed and concurred with the Mitigation Measures and concluded consultation on March 22, 2021.

Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1 through **MM CUL-4** are prescribed pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21080.3.2 to ensure any Tribal Cultural Resources which may be inadvertently encountered during construction are managed in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15126.4(b) with input from interested California Native American tribes. Additionally, **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-5** and **MM CUL-6** are prescribed to ensure any human remains encountered are treated with dignity and managed pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-6** (listed in 18.a.ii) impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, would be reduced to a level of **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

a.ii) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. CEQA defines a "historical resource" as a resource that meets one or more of the following criteria: (1) is listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register); (2) is listed in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC §5020.1(k); (3) is identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of PRC §5024.1(g); or (4) is determined to be a historical resource by a project's Lead Agency (PRC §21084.1 and State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5[a]).

A resource may be listed as a historical resource in the California Register if it meets any of the following National Register of Historic Places criteria as defined in PRC §5024.1(C):

- A. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage.
- B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

- C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
- D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A "substantial adverse change" to a historical resource, according to PRC §5020.1(q), "means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired."

CEQA Guidelines do not preclude identification of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Sections 5020.1(j) or 5024.1. Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5[c][4], if an archaeological resource is neither a unique archaeological nor a historical resource, the effects of the project on those resources shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. It shall be sufficient that both the resource and the effect on it are noted in the Initial Study, but they need not be considered further in the CEQA process.

As detailed in response to Threshold 5.a, a Project-specific Cultural Resources Assessment was conducted for the Project site and included archaeological and historical records search, a Sacred Lands File search, and an intensive pedestrian survey of the Project site. No cultural resources were observed within the Project area and no further field work is necessary. Despite the apparent lack of cultural resources that could be defined as historical resources pursuant to PRC section 15064.5, **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-6** are required in the event unanticipated cultural resources are unearthed.

- MM CUL-1 The Project permittee/owner shall retain a Riverside County-certified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown cultural resources. Prior to grading, the Project permittee/owner shall provide to the City verification that a certified archaeologicalmonitor has been retained. Any newly discovered cultural resource deposits shallbe subject to a cultural resources evaluation.
- MM CUL-2 Archaeological Monitoring: At least 30-days prior to grading permit issuance and before any grading, excavation, and/or ground-disturbing activities on the site takeplace, the Project permittee/owner shall retain a Riverside County-certified archaeological monitor to monitor all grounddisturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources.
 - 1. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with consulting tribes, the permittee/owner, and the City, shall develop a Cultural Resources Management Plan to address the details, timing, and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the Project site. Details in the plan shall include:
 - a. Project grading and development scheduling.
 - b. The development of a schedule in coordination with the permittee/owner and the Project Archeologist for designated Native American Tribal Monitors from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation and ground- disturbing activities on the site: including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American Tribal Monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all Project archaeologists.
 - c. The protocols and stipulations that the permittee/owner, City, tribes, and Project Archaeologist will follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resource evaluation.

- 2. A final report documenting the monitoring activity and disposition of any recovered cultural resources shall be submitted to the City of Murrieta, Eastern Information Center and the consulting tribes within 60 days of completion of monitoring.
- MM CUL-3 Native American Monitoring: Native American Tribal monitors shall also participatein monitoring of ground-disturbing activity. At least 30 days prior to issuance of grading permits, agreements between the permittee/owner and the Consulting Native American Tribal Government(s) shall be established for tribal cultural resources, and shall identify any monitoring requirements. The monitoring agreement shall address the scope of work, along with the responsibilities, and participation of the Tribal monitors during grading, excavation, and ground- disturbing activities; Project grading and development scheduling.
- MM CUL-4 Disposition of Cultural Resources: In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project, one or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed with the tribes. Evidence of such shall be submitted to the City of Murrieta Planning Department:
 - 1. Preservation-in-place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resource.
 - 2. On-site reburial of the discovered items as detailed in the Monitoring Plan required pursuant to Mitigation Measure MM CUL-2. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed. No cataloguing, analysis, or other study may occur on human remains and grave goods.
 - 3. The permittee/owner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources, and adhere to the following:
 - a. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 Code of Federal Regulations 800 Part 79 and therefore would be curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
 - b. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground disturbing activities on-site, a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the Project Archaeologistand Native American Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the Property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grademeeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All

reports produced will be submitted to the City of Murrieta, Eastern Information Center and consulting tribes.

- MM CUL-5 Inadvertent Finds Protocols: If during ground disturbance activities, unique cultural resources are discovered that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to Project approval, the following procedures shall be followed:
 - i. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the Project Applicant, the Project Archaeologist, the Tribal Representative(s) and the City to discuss the significance of the find.
 - ii. At the meeting, the significance of the discoveries shall be discussed andafter consultation with the Tribal Representative(s) and the Project Archaeologist, a decision shall be made, with the concurrence of the City, as to the appropriate mitigation (documentation, recovery, avoidance, etc.) for the cultural resources.
 - iii. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to the

appropriate mitigation. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of thebuffer area and will be monitored by additional Tribal Monitors if needed.

- iv. Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resources shall be consistent with the Cultural Resources Management Plan and MonitoringAgreements entered into with the appropriate tribes. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through Project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils and/or re-burial on the Project property, so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity as identified in Non-Disclosure of Reburial Location Condition.
- v. If the find is determined to be significant and avoidance of the site has notbeen achieved, a Phase III data recovery plan shall be prepared by the Project archeologist, in consultation with the Tribe(s), and shall be submitted to the City for their review and approval prior to implementation of the said plan.
- MM CUL-6 Human remains: If human remains are encountered, California Health and SafetyCode Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California 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 disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately identify the "most likely descendants(s)" for purposes of receiving notification of discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

With implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-6**, impacts to tribal cultural resources, as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074, would be reduced to a level of **less than significant with mitigation incorporated**.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the Project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (References 2, 25, 26, 28, 29, 37, 38)			x	
 b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (2, 28, 40) 			x	
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (References 2, 29, 14)			x	
d) 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? (References 2, 8, 39)			x	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (References 2, 8, 39)			X	

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located just south of the intersection of Madison Avenue and Golden Gate Circle in the southern portion of the City. The Project site and is currently vacant and zoned for commercial use. The Project proposes a Development Plan (DP) to construct a two-story, 11,706 square foot (sq. ft.) office building with a detached, single-story, 4,980 sq. ft. warehouse with parking, driveways, and an outdoor storage area for the warehouse component.

Water

The Project site is located within the water service boundary of the Rancho California Water District (RCWD). According to the Water Availability letter for the Project site, issued by RCWD on February 26, 2020, the Project site is not currently served by RCWD but is within the RCWD's Sphere of Influence. The Project would have to be annexed into the RCWD's Santa Rosa Service Area. Upon annexation, the developers of the site will need to extend the existing 16" waterline to the site and then an 8" line will be constructed into the site to provide for Fire service. Water service to the Project site would be subject to the RCWD's Rules and Regulations (governing) Water System Facilities and Service, as well as the completion of financial arrangements between RCWD and the property owner. An individual water meter will be required for the Project for potable service, fire service, and landscaping as applicable.

Projected domestic water demand in the City of Murrieta is expected to increase from 39,179 acrefeet per year in 2011 to 54,811 acre-feet per at buildout in the year 2035. According to the City's General Plan EIR, buildout of the City's General Plan would require only 2.36 percent (2.36%) of the 2030 combined water supply of the four water districts serving the City.

RCWD gets its water from a variety of sources. The natural sources include precipitation, untreated import water recharge basins, and regional groundwater (aquifers). RCWD also purchases treated water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD) which imports water from Northern California and the Colorado River. Water delivered to homes and businesses within the RCWD service area is a blend of well water (30%) and imported water (65%). There is no recycled water currently available within the limits established by Resolution 2007-10-5 of which the Project site is a part. Should recycled water become available in the future, the Project site may be required to retrofit its facilities to make use of this availability in accordance with Resolution 2007-10-5. Recycled water service, therefore, would be available upon construction of any required on-site and/or off-site recycled water facilities and the completion of financial arrangements between RCWD and the property owner.

It is estimated the Project will consume approximately 4.5 acre-feet of water per year based on a maximum of 20 total employees consuming up to 200 gallons of water per day (including landscape irrigation) or 1.5 million gallons per year. This represents less than 0.01 percent of the 54,811 acre-feet per year at buildout in the year 2035 for the entire City of Murrieta.

The available supplies and demands for the District's water service area were analyzed in the 2015 *UWMP* to assess RCWD's ability to satisfy demands during three (3) hydrologic scenarios, including: 1) a normal water year, 2) single-dry water year, and 3) multiple-dry water years. The supply-demand balance for each of the hydrologic scenarios within the RCWD was projected for the 25-year planning period 2015 to 2040. Based on the analysis and conclusions set forth in the 2015 UWMP, RCWD will be able to meet 100% of its demand under all three hydrologic scenarios through the year 2040. The water use projections used to prepare the UWMP were based in part on the approved City of Murrieta General Plan land uses. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan designation for the site (business park) so the conclusions of the UWMP are applicable to and accurate for the proposed Project.

Implementation of the proposed Project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. In addition, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, and no new or expanded entitlements are required. The proposed Project will connect to RCWD facilities via the extension of an existing water line located contiguous the Project site in Date Street in the existing roadway and a utility easement. Therefore, any impacts are considered **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

Wastewater/Sewer

The Project site is located within the wastewater/sewer service boundary of the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). According to the *Will Serve Letter - Sewer* for the Project site issued by EMWD; the site is not currently served by EMWD but is within the EMWD's Sphere of Influence. The Project would therefore have to be annexed into the EMWD. Upon annexation, the Project would be served by an existing 8-inch vitrified clay pipe sewer line in an easement at the southwest corner of the Project site. The EMWD indicated that their ability to serve the Project site is subject to limiting conditions, such as regulatory requirements, legal issues, or conditions beyond EMWD's control and the "will serve" determination will expire one year from the date of issue.

The EMWD wastewater collection system includes 1,534 miles of gravity sewer, 53 lift stations, and five regional water reclamation facilities, with interconnections between local collection systems serving each treatment plant. The EMWD facility that provides wastewater treatment for the City of Murrieta, inclusive of the Project site, is the Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (TVRWRF). Wastewater from the Project site would be delivered through EMWD sewers to the TVRWRF. The TVRWRF is a 95-acre facility located in the commercial area of Temecula. While it is the smallest of the EMWD reclamation facilities, its capacity is the second largest. The TVRWRF is currently being expanded from a current capacity of 18 million gallons per day (mgd) to 23 mgd.

In 2016, the typical daily flows were 14 mgd and were projected to reach 18 mgd in 2018. The TVRWRF Expansion accounts for largest single expenditure in the 2017-2022 EMWD capital improvement budget. The TVRWRF facility has an ultimate design capacity of 28 mgd.

It is estimated the Project will generate approximately 2,000 gallons of wastewater per day (0.002 mgd) or 730,000 gallons per year based on a maximum of 20 total employees generating approximately 100 gallons of wastewater per day. This represents 0.007 percent of the 28 mgd ultimate design capacity of the TVRWRF.

The wastewater generation projections used to prepare the EMWD Sewer Master Plan were based in part on the approved City of Murrieta General Plan land uses. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan designation for the site (business park) so the conclusions of the EMWD relative to future sewer service are applicable to and accurate for the proposed Project.

According to the City's General Plan EIR, individual developments are reviewed by the City and the applicable water district to determine if sufficient sewer capacity exists to serve the specific development. The City coordinates with the water districts to make sure that new development does not exceed the capacity of wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities, and that new development pays its fair share to increase capacity of those facilities.

There would be no significant environmental effects specifically related to the installation of on-site wastewater facilities during the Project's construction phase that are not encompassed within the Project's construction footprint and therefore already identified, disclosed, and subject to all applicable mitigation measures, as well as local, State, and federal regulations, as part of this Initial Study.

In summary, sufficient wastewater capacity is available to serve the Project from existing resources and EMWD has issued a signed Will Serve Letter for the Project site. The Project would not require or result in construction or expansion of wastewater facilities that could result in a significant environmental effect. Impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

Stormwater/Drainage

As previously discussed in Threshold 19.a, all new development in the City of Murrieta is required to comply with provisions of the NPDES program, including Waste Discharge Requirements (WDR), and the City's Municipal Separate Sewer Permit (MS4), as enforced by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Board (SDRWQCB).

The Project site is adjacent to Warm Springs Creek which flows into Murrieta Creek which in turn flows into the Santa Margarita River and eventually to the Pacific Ocean approximately 25 miles downstream. According to the *Hydro Report* prepared for the Project (**Appendix G2**), the increase in overall runoff volume from the developed site is mitigated by the biofiltration basin which also acts as a detention basin during times of peak flow, so development of this site will actually result in a decrease in the ten-year storm event (Q10) when compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed Project will not substantially alter the historical and existing drainage pattern of the area.

With adherence to the Project-specific *Hydro Report* and *WQMP* (**Appendix G1**), the proposed Project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, nor will it require new or expanded off-site storm drain facilities. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

Electricity

There is no electricity connection currently serving the Project site in its vacant and undeveloped condition. The Project site development plan proposes a two-story 11,706 square foot (sq. ft.) office building with a detached single-story 4,980 sq. ft. warehouse building which will require electrical service. Electrical services are currently in place to the existing business park development located

adjacent to and in the surrounding area of the Project site. These existing facilities are sufficient to serve the proposed Project as well.

The electrical service provider for the Project site and the greater City of Murrieta is Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE is one of the nation's largest electric utilities providing electrical service to customers within a 50,000-square mile service area covering approximately 15 million people in 11 counties in the southern half of California, including western Riverside County.

The California Energy Commission (CEC) prepares an annual report that presents forecasts of electricity and natural gas consumption and peak electricity demand for California and for each major utility planning area within the state (inclusive of SCE's planning area). The most recent edition is identified as the California Energy Demand (CED) 2018 - 2030 Revised Forecast which supports the analysis and recommendations of the 2017 Integrated Energy Policy Report, including electricity system assessments and analysis of progress toward increased energy efficiency, with goals recently codified in Senate Bill 350 (SB 350, De León, Chapter 547, Statutes of 2015), and distributed generation. According to the CED 2018-2030 Revised Forecast, the total energy consumption within SCE's planning area was slightly under 110,000 GWh in 2016 and is projected to increase to approximately 128,000 GWh over the 12-year projection period ending 2030.

The CED's energy generation projections were based in part on land uses approved at the time by the various cities and counties in the state including the City of Murrieta. The proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan designation for the site (business park) so the conclusions of the CEC relative to future electrical service are applicable to and accurate for the proposed Project.

As outlined, adequate electricity supply is presently available in southern California to meet the incremental increase in demand attributed to the Project. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

Natural Gas

The natural gas provider for the Project site and the greater City of Murrieta is the Southern California Gas Company, also known as The Gas Company. There is no natural gas connection currently in place serving the vacant Project site. The proposed Project will be connected to The Gas Company's natural gas distribution system. Connections are available in adjacent roadways and natural gas service is in place to the existing business park development in the surrounding Project area. Therefore, adequate natural gas supplies are available to meet the incremental increase in demand attributed to the Project. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

Telecommunications

Telephone service to the Project site and the greater City of Murrieta is provided by Verizon which is a private company that provides connection to the communication system on an as needed basis. No expansion of facilities will be necessary to connect the Project to the communication system located adjacent to the Project site. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. As previously discussed in Threshold 19.a, the Project site will be services by RCWD. According to the Hydro Study and RCWD's Will Serve Letter information for the Project site, there are two connection points directly adjacent to the Project site that will provide ample flow to serve the Project site development plan and the Project site engineer (Greene Consulting, Inc.) has determined that no additional offsite water infrastructure is needed to serve the proposed development.

The District's water supply/demand analysis within its service area are set forth in the *2015 UWMP* to assess RCWD's ability to satisfy demands during three (3) hydrologic scenarios, including: 1) a normal water year, 2) single-dry water year, and 3) multiple-dry water years. The supply-demand balance for each of the hydrologic scenarios within the RCWD was projected for the 25-year planning
period 2015 to 2040. Based on the analysis and conclusions set forth in the *2015 UWMP*, RCWD will be able to meet 100% of its demand under all three hydrologic scenarios through the year 2040.

The RCWD UWMP was based in part on the Murrieta General Plan land uses, and the Project is consistent with that designation (business park). Therefore, Implementation of the proposed Project will not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

As outlined under Threshold 19.a, RCWD has sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources and no new or expanded entitlements are required. The proposed Project will connect to RCWD facilities adjacent to the site. Therefore, any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

c) Less Than Significant Impact. As previously discussed in Threshold 19.a, the Project site is located outside of the wastewater/sewer service boundary of the EMWD but the *Will Serve Letter* for the Project site issued by EMWD indicates the EMWD can provide sewer services to the subject project if it is annexed into the District.

Wastewater from the Project site would be delivered through EMWD sewer lines to EMWD's 95-acre Temecula Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (TVRWRF) located in the commercial area of the City of Temecula. While the TVRWRF is the smallest of the EMWD reclamation facilities, its capacity is the second largest. Specifics are summarized under Threshold 19.a. The TVRWRF is currently being expanded from a current capacity of 18 million gallons per day (mgd) to 23 mgd and the expansion accounts for the largest single expenditure in the 2017-2022 EMWD capital improvement budget. The TVRWRF facility has an ultimate design capacity of 28 mgd.

Sufficient wastewater capacity is available to serve the Project from existing resources and EMWD has issued a signed *Will Serve Letter* for the Project. The Project would not require or result in construction or expansion of wastewater facilities that could result in a significant environmental effect. Impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

d) Less Than Significant Impact. Waste Management, Inc. is the municipal waste collection service provider for the City of Murrieta, inclusive of the Project site. There are no collection, processing, or disposal facilities within the City. As set forth in the City's 2035 GPEIR, Section 5.21 (Solid Waste), trash collected within the City is disposed at several landfill sites, but the primary disposal facility is the El Sobrante Landfill (ESL). The ESL is located approximately 25 miles northwest of the Project site in the unincorporated Temescal Canyon area of Riverside County between the City of Lake Elsinore and the City of Corona, east of Interstate 15 and Temescal Canyon Road, and south of Cajalco Road, at 10910 Dawson Canyon Road. ESL is owned and operated by USA Waste of California, a subsidiary of Waste Management, Inc., started disposal operations in 1986. From 1986 to 1998, the landfill was operated pursuant to the original El Sobrante Landfill Agreement, its Amendments and one Addendum.

On September 1, 1998, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors (BOS) approved the El Sobrante Landfill Expansion Project, a vertical and lateral expansion of the landfill, and entered into a Second Agreement. The Second Agreement represents a public/private relationship between the owner/operator of the landfill and the County of Riverside and provides for the Riverside County Department of Waste Resources (RCDWR) to operate the landfill gate, to set the County rate for disposal at the gate with BOS approval, and to operate the Hazardous Waste Inspection Program.

The El Sobrante Landfill facility currently comprises a total area of 1,322 acres which includes a 495acre footprint permitted for landfill operations and a 688-acre wildlife preserve. The operating permit allows a maximum of 16,054 tons per day of waste to be accepted at the landfill, due to limitations on the number of vehicle trips per day. In 2010, the ESL accepted a total of 694,963 tons, or approximately 0.695 million tons of waste generated within Riverside County. The daily average for in-County waste was 2,235 tons during 2010. As of January 2011, the landfill had a remaining in-County disposal capacity of approximately 38.506 million tons. The ESL received an average of 8,596 tons of waste on a daily basis in 2016 which increased to 8,738 tons per day in 2017. This indicates a year over year increase of 1.65% and is substantially below the allowable disposal capacity of 16,054 tons per day permitted pursuant to the current agreement/operating permit, as amended. As of the 2007 Second Amendment date, the landfill had a projected 50-year remaining life through 2036, however, based on 2016 figures, there was 141,192,896 tons of remaining capacity, indicating an approximate 54-year remaining life before the facility reaches capacity. According to the City GPEIR, the El Sobrante facility is estimated to have sufficient capacity until 2045.

The City of Murrieta evaluates solid waste generation for proposed development projects based on a per capita generation rate. As set forth in the City's GPEIR, there are two generation factors - one for Residential Land Use (includes both single-family and multi-family projects) and one for Non-Residential Land Use (i.e., commercial, office and research park, business park, and civic/institutional). Based on General Plan 2035 Final EIR Table 5.1-2, the non-residential generation factor is 6 pounds per 1,000 square feet per day. The Project proposes to build 11,706 square feet of offices and a 4,980 square foot warehouse. Based on the GP factor, the Project site development plan is projected to generate an average of 100.2 pounds (0.1 ton) of solid waste per day or 36,573 pounds (18.3 tons) of solid waste per year.

Individual development projects within the City of Murrieta are required to comply with applicable State and local regulations reducing landfill waste by at least 50 percent, therefore, the Project site is forecast to contribute 500 pounds (0.05 ton) of solid waste per day for disposal at the ESL. This represents approximately 0.0006% (0.05 ton ÷ 8,738 tons) of the estimated average daily solid waste disposed at the landfill during 2017.

Based on the above, development of the Project site as proposed would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the proposed Project's solid waste disposal needs. Impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

e) Less Than Significant Impact. All land uses within the City that generate waste are required to coordinate with the City's contracted waste hauler (Waste Management, Inc.) to collect solid waste on a common schedule as established in applicable local, regional, and state programs.

Additionally, all development within the City is required to comply with applicable elements of Assembly Bill (AB) 1327, Chapter 18 (California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991), AB 939 (CalRecycle), Title 8 of the City Municipal Code, and other local, state, and federal solid waste disposal standards.

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) requires every city and county in the state to prepare a Source Reduction and Recycling Element to its Solid Waste Management Plan, that identifies how each jurisdiction will meet the mandatory state diversion goal of 50 percent by and after the year 2000. The purpose of AB 939 is to "reduce, recycle, and re-use solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible."

All solid waste disposals within the City of Murrieta are subject to the requirements set forth in *Title 8, Health and Safety*, Chapter 8.28 Waste Management, as provided in the Municipal Code. Chapter 8.28 provides integrated waste management guidelines for service, prohibitions, and provisions of service. The provisions of service require that the City of Murrieta shall provide for or furnish integrated waste management services relating to the collection, transfer, and disposal of refuse, recyclables, and compostables within and throughout the City.

The Project site's development plan would be required to comply with applicable elements of AB 1327, Chapter 18 (California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991), AB 939, Title 8 of the City Municipal Code, and other applicable local, State, and federal solid waste disposal standards as a matter of regulatory policy, thereby ensuring that the solid waste stream to the waste disposal facilities is reduced in accordance with existing regulations. Impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
20. WILDFIRE: If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the Project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (References 1, 2, 6, 9, 46)			x	
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? (References 1, 2, 6, 9, 15, 23, 24, 45, 46)			X	
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? (References 1, 2, 6, 9, 46)			x	
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? (References 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 46)			x	

a) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within either a fire responsibility area or a fire hazard area. The Project will take access from existing roadways (i.e., Madison Avenue, Golden Gate Circle). Madison Avenue connects to Elm Street to the north then to Jefferson Avenue to the west. The area also has access to Murrieta Hot Springs Road to the north and Winchester Road/Highway 79 to the south, both of which connect to the I-15 Freeway for regional access. These roadways will connect into part of an adopted emergency response plan/emergency evacuation plan, as implemented by the County of Riverside. The Project will be constructing a business park use as well as roadway and utility connections.

A limited potential exists to interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan during construction. Control of access will ensure emergency access to the site and Project area during construction through the submittal and approval of a Traffic Management Plan. As part of the plan review process, the City would require the developer to submit a Traffic Management Plan that would provide appropriate measures to facilitate the passage of persons and vehicles through/around any required road closures. Requirement of a Traffic Management Plan is a standard condition and not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

Following construction, emergency access to the Project site and area will remain as was prior to the proposed Project. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

b) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within either a fire responsibility area or a fire hazard area. The Project site topography slopes down from the north-northeast to the southsoutheast toward the adjacent Warm Springs Creek. Drainage is currently by sheet flow southsoutheast toward the creek. Elevations on site vary from 1,086 to 1,041 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) (difference = 45 feet). The Project site lies in a largely non-residential area although many vacant parcels presently exist, including several adjacent to the Project site. The Project site is vacant and bordered by business park uses and vacant land to the north, business park uses to the south and east, and vacant land to the west.

The Murrieta area does experience periodic winds sometimes in excess of 30 miles per hour (e.g., Santa Ana winds in the fall). In addition, the site is adjacent to Warm Springs Creek which periodically has to be cleared of giant reed (*Arundo donax*) a very invasive non-native riparian plant, as well as various species of willow (*Salix spp.*) that can create extensive fuel loads within the creek channel. However, the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District maintains this channel regularly to minimize the buildup of flammable materials as well as maintaining flow channels for runoff. The Project site is currently vacant and has a sparce weedy vegetation due to regular weed abatement for fire protection.

The Project would be constructed in accordance with the current California building Code (CBC), including Chapter 7 of the CBC, which requires all on-site structures to incorporate construction techniques and materials such as roofs, eaves, exterior walls, vents, appendages, windows, and doors hardened to provide resistance to and/or to perform at high levels against ignition during the exposure to burning vegetation from wildfires. The City reviews all proposed development to ensure compliance with applicable provisions of its Development Code, the Uniform Fire Code, California Fire Code, and California Uniform Building Code requirements. The City's Fire Department shall review the Project and require the necessary code requirements in order to reduce any potential wildland fire hazard impacts to a less than significant level. This is a standard condition and not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

Based on this information, the Project would not, 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. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

- c) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within either a fire responsibility area or a fire hazard area. The Project does not include and or 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. Road improvements and utilities will be installed in accordance with the respective agency requirements. Therefore, any impacts will be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.
- d) Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within either a fire responsibility area or a fire hazard area. The Project site topography slopes down from the north-northeast to the southsoutheast toward the adjacent Warm Springs Creek. Drainage is currently by sheet flow southsoutheast toward the creek. Elevations onsite vary from 1,086 to 1,041 feet AMSL (difference = 45 feet). The Project site is currently vacant. The Project will include hardscape and landscape improvements that would serve to stabilize the built environment. Based on this information, 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, or drainage changes. Any impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
a) Does the Project have the potential to 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, 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?		X		
b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively con- siderable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X		
c) Does the Project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		x		

The Project proposes the development of an industrial use that is consistent with the General Plan and zoning designation for the Project site. A review of technical studies completed for the proposed Project and CEQA review, per the Appendix G Checklist, indicate no significant unavoidable adverse environmental impacts are forecast to result from construction and/or operation this proposed Project with the implementation of the recommended mitigation.

a) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The Project would require detailed evaluation of water quality impacts and consistency with the City's grading standards and typical Best Management Practices (BMPs) for residential development. The City also would require the Project to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to address potential short-term water quality impacts (including erosion) during construction, and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to address potential long-term water quality impacts (including erosion) during construction, and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to address potential long-term water quality impacts (including erosion) during these conditions of approval, potential short- and long-term impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

The proposed Project's impacts to biological resources and cultural resources were analyzed in this Initial Study, and all direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts were determined to have no impact, a less than significant impact, or reduced to a less than significant impact with the implementation of mitigation measures.

No cultural resources, either historic or archaeological, were identified on the Project site during the intensive pedestrian survey for the Project. Despite the apparent lack of cultural resources, there remains some potential for the proposed Project to unearth previously undocumented resources during construction. Therefore, **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-4** are required in the event that unanticipated cultural resources are unearthed during Project construction.

Small mammals are present on the Project site, and burrowing owl is present in the general surrounding area. Because of this, even though the species was not found on-site, **Mitigation**

Measure MM BIO-2 is recommended to conduct a pre-grading survey for burrowing owl to assure the species is not present on the site at the time Project grading is to begin. **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-3** is recommended to conduct a pre-construction walkover three days prior to any ground disturbing activities or vegetation removal, by a qualified biological monitor to identify any sensitive biological resources to flag for avoidance.

Potential impacts to listed or sensitive species are less than significant due to Project design. Development of the Project would not eliminate significant amounts of habitat for potentially occurring special-status plant or wildlife species, nor would it reduce population size of sensitive plant and/or wildlife species below self-sustaining levels on a local or regional basis. However, onsite vegetation could provide potential nesting sites for common native bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) or the California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3515), so removal of these onsite features could result in a significant impact to habitat of species protected by regulation. With implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM BIO-1** through **MM BIO-3**, potential impacts to nesting birds and burrowing owl will be reduced to a less **than significant impact with mitigation incorporated**.

The only potential aspect of the Project that may affect wildlife movement along Warm Springs Creek would be security and parking lot lighting in the central and southern portion of the site close to Warm Springs Creek. **Mitigation Measure MM BIO-4** will help reduce potential indirect impacts of Project lighting on wildlife movement to **less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated**.

The City of Murrieta is a participant in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) which has established a regional plan to achieve the above-listed goals and help reduce impacts to threatened, endangered, or otherwise sensitive species. As outlined in Threshold 4.f, implementation of **Mitigation Measures MM BIO-5** (MSHCP fee) and **MM BIO-6** (SKR fee) will reduce potential impacts related to conflicts with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources to less than significant levels. Furthermore, **Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1** shall be implemented to help reduce impacts to sensitive receivers during construction and implementation of **Mitigation Measure MM NOI-2** will mitigate noise during operations.

Additionally, based on the finding that the Project site has "a high sensitivity" for paleontological resources, **Mitigation Measure MM GEO-2** shall be implemented during site ground disturbing activities. Any impacts are reduced to a **less than significant level with mitigation incorporated**.

b) Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed Project has either no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated with respect to all environmental issues pursuant to CEQA. Due to the limited scope of direct physical impacts to the environment associated with the proposed Project, the Project's impacts are primarily Projectspecific in nature.

With respect to air quality, no individual project would by itself cause the Basin to be designated as "Non-Attainment" under federal or State ambient air quality standards. In order to be considered cumulatively significant, a project's air pollutant emissions must exceed the emission thresholds established by the regional Air Quality Management District. As depicted in **Tables 3-1** and **3-2** (see Response to Threshold 3.b), development of the proposed Project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds without any mitigation required; therefore, impacts from the proposed are not cumulatively significant.

Because climate change impacts are cumulative in nature, no typical single project can result in emission of such a magnitude that it, in and of itself, would be significant on a project basis. The Project's GHG emissions do not exceed the SCAQMD draft threshold and are in compliance with the reduction goals of the CAP, AB-32, and SB-32. Furthermore, the Project will comply with applicable Green Building Standards and City of Murrieta's policies regarding sustainability as directed by the City's General Plan and CAP. Therefore, the proposed Project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Impacts will be **less than significant**, and no mitigation is required.

Noise impacts are often used in environmental noise impact assessments involving the use of cumulative noise exposure metrics, such as the CNEL, the L_{eq} , or the L_{50} . Project operational noise levels were combined with the existing ambient noise level measurements for the off-site receivers in order to analyze the Project's operational noise level contributions. The difference between the combined Project and ambient noise levels describes the Project noise level contributions. As shown in **Table 13-5**, no direct impacts are anticipated to result from the additional project-generated traffic on surrounding roadways, as noise level increases would be less than three decibels. As shown in **Table 13-6**, traffic noise impacts at the adjacent residential receiver remain in the "normally acceptable" range of noise levels per the City of Murrieta Noise Element to the General Plan with and without the addition of project-generated traffic. For these reasons, project-generated traffic noise impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Based on this information, Project noise would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to sensitive receptors.

The cumulative effects resulting from build out of the City's General Plan were identified in the General Plan EIR; as the Project site has an industrial land use designation. The type, scale, and location of the proposed Project is consistent with City's General Plan and zoning designation and is compatible with the pattern of development on adjacent properties. TUMF fees are imposed on new residential, industrial and commercial development through application of the TUMF fee ordinance and fees are collected at the building or occupancy permit phase.

The proposed Project will participate in the cost of off-site improvements through payment of TUMF fees based on the current fees at the time of construction of the proposed Project. Payment of TUMF is a standard requirement and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

The proposed Project is located within the City of Murrieta and will therefore be subject to the City's Development Impact Fees (DIF). The City's DIF program includes facilities that are not part of the regional TUMF program. Payment of City DIF is based on the current fees at the time of construction of the proposed Project. Payment of DIF is a standard requirement and is not considered unique mitigation under CEQA.

The Project's contribution to the aforementioned transportation impact fee programs or as a fair share contribution towards a cumulatively impacted facility not found to be covered by a pre-existing fee program should be considered sufficient to address the Project's fair share towards mitigation measure(s) designed to alleviate cumulative Project impacts.

Is understood that the cumulative effect of any proposed project could add to the continued loss of tribal cultural resources. The proposed Project, in conjunction with other development in the City, has the potential to cumulatively impact tribal cultural resources. Despite the apparent lack of cultural resources, there remains some potential for the proposed Project to unearth previously undocumented resources during construction. Therefore, **Mitigation Measures MM CUL-1** through **MM CUL-4** are required in the event that unanticipated cultural resources are unearthed during Project construction.

Table 3-1, Regional Significance – Construction Emissions (pounds/day), and Table 3-2, Regional Significance – Operational Emissions (pounds/day), demonstrate that Project-related impacts that could be cumulatively considerable will be at less than significant levels.

c) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The South Coast Air Basin is currently designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Development of the Project would contribute to air pollutant emissions on a short-term basis. The proposed Project is required to comply with applicable SCAQMD Rules, applicable California Code of Regulations, and CalRecycle Sustainable (Green) Building Program regulations, which include implementation of standard control measures for fugitive dust and construction equipment emissions. The construction emissions for the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD's daily emission thresholds at the regional level as demonstrated in Table 3-1, Regional Significance – Construction Emissions (pounds/day), and therefore would be considered less than significant and not cumulatively considerable. The data provided in Table 3-3, Localized Significance – Construction, shows that none of the analyzed

criteria pollutants would exceed the local emissions thresholds at the nearest sensitive receptors. Therefore, local air quality impacts occurring from construction of the proposed Project would be less than significant.

Like all of Southern California, the Project site could be subject to strong ground shaking resulting from large earthquakes. Proper engineering design and construction in conformance with the current California Building Code standards and Project-specific geotechnical recommendations, as required through **Mitigation Measure MM GEO-1**, would ensure that impacts from strong seismic ground shaking and unstable soils would be less than significant.

The analysis provided in response to the Checklist questions details that, with the implementation of appropriate mitigation, no significant environmental impact would result from the construction or operation of the proposed Project. With implementation of mitigation, development of the site as proposed would not directly or indirectly result in substantial adverse effect on any human population. Impacts would be reduced to a **less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated**.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to environmental resource issues addressed in this Initial Study. The City of Murrieta proposes a Mitigated Negative Declaration as the appropriate environmental determination to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act for this Project.