

# COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

**Environmental Assessment (CEQ / EA) Number:** 190095  
**Project Case Type (s) and Number(s):** CUP190021  
**Lead Agency Name:** County of Riverside Planning Department  
**Address:** 4080 Lemon Street 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, Riverside, CA 92501  
**Contact Person:** Tim Wheeler, Project Planner  
**Telephone Number:** 951-955-6060  
**Applicant's Name:** ADMG, Inc. c/o Ash Etemadian  
**Applicant's Address:** 3380 La Sierra Avenue, Suite 104-790, Riverside, CA 92503

### I. PROJECT INFORMATION

**Project Description:** ADMG, Inc. and Adkin Engineers ("Applicant") propose a development for a gas station on 1.5-acres of a 2.8-acre lot, with the residual 1.3 acres to remain vacant. The scope of the proposal includes a canopied fuel pumping station with 16 fueling positions for vehicles, a 3,800 square foot convenience store, and a 1,692 square foot detached drive-thru carwash. The convenience store would include the sale of beer and wine for off-site consumption. To provide sufficient on-site parking for customers and employees, the project site has provided 29 parking spaces including: two ADA and two electrical vehicle parking spaces, and nine parking spaces with vacuum stations, in front of the drive-thru carwash. Landscaping will be included throughout the site, as well as a retention basin. (Project). The Project located on the northeast corner of Van Buren Boulevard and Chicago Avenue in the Woodcrest area of unincorporated Riverside County, California, APN 266-020-001. The Project site is zoned Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S); the Project is permitted in that zone subject to a Conditional Use Permit per Riverside County Ordinance No. 348. The Project site is currently undeveloped (refer to Exhibit A, Conceptual Grading and Site Plan).

Development on the property would occur primarily on the western portion of the triangular-shaped site. The applicant proposes to construct a 3,800 square foot building for the purposes of operating a convenience store, a canopy covering eight fuel pumps with 16 fueling stations, signage, and a detached car wash. A total of 29 parking spaces are proposed, inclusive of two electric vehicle spaces with charging stations, two persons with disabilities spaces, and nine car wash vacuum stalls. The site would be accessed by driveways off of westbound Van Buren Boulevard and Chicago Avenue. The Project would also include two 22,000-gallon underground fuel tanks, one of which would be partitioned as 12,000-gallon premium fuel and 10,000-gallon diesel fuel. The bottom of the tanks would be 16.5 feet below ground surface (bgs).

The Project would be connected to existing utilities. Lighting will be provided consistent with the County of Riverside Outdoor Light Regulations and would be consistent with similar commercial uses in the Project vicinity. Landscaping would be provided in the front and west setbacks in accordance with the County landscape requirements for the C-P-S zone.

The gas station operation would require 3-5 employees on shift at all times and at least one delivery daily. Hours of operation would be 24 hours a day, seven days per week for the gas pumps and convenience store, and 7:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. for the car wash.

The Project involves a proposed Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The following sub- section summarizes the discretionary application that is under consideration by the County of Riverside.

**Conditional Use Permit (CUP)**

The Project requires approval of Conditional Use Permit No. 190021 (CUP 190021) in accordance with Riverside County Ordinance 348 (Providing for Land Use Planning and Zoning Regulations and Related Functions of the County of Riverside).

The Project site is located immediately west of the City of Riverside in unincorporated Riverside County, California, on APN 266-020-001. The Project site is approximately 2.48 acres, of which development will occur on the western end of the parcel. As shown on the following figures, the Project site fronts Van Buren Boulevard and Chicago Avenue and will have entrances on both streets.

The subject property is undeveloped land and consists of various vegetation communities such as streambed, Slender oat Alliance, Mulefat scrub Alliance, other landscape and disturbed habitat. The majority of the site has been disturbed by unauthorized human activities. It is located in Section 30, Township 3 South, Range 4 West, San Bernardino Baseline and Meridian, United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.) 7.5 Minute Topographic Map, Riverside East, California Quadrangle dated 2012. The site is bordered by commercial activity across Chicago Avenue to the west, single-family residential to the north and northeast, and undeveloped areas to the south across Van Buren Boulevard.

The subject property is located in the northern part of the Perris block, a relatively stable, rectangular-in-plan area located between the Elsinore and San Jacinto fault zones in the northern Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province, characterized by the presence of numerous, northwestern trending, small mountain ranges and intervening plains and valleys. The nearest of these northwest trending ranges of the Peninsular Ranges are the San Jacinto Mountains to the east, with the Santa Ana Mountains to the southwest. The intervening valley between the Santa Ana and San Jacinto Mountains is the Perris Plain, a mass of igneous rocks consisting of island-like hills of bedrock surrounded by valleys filled with various ages of alluvium derived from erosion of the surrounding mountain ranges. Most of the local vicinity is covered by a variable thickness of Quaternary alluvial material deposited on Cretaceous and older basement rocks. Review of data for nearby leaking underground storage tank sites at the State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker website indicates that igneous bedrock deposits underlie the subject site below a veneer of Pleistocene alluvial fan deposits and recent alluvium deposited by the adjacent Santa Ana River.

The site is sloping to the north and northwest, depending on the location in the landscape. It occurs at an elevation between 1,560 and 1,584 feet above mean sea level. A majority of the Project site has been disturbed by human-caused disturbances.

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

**B. Total Project Area:**

<b>Residential Acres:</b>	<b>Lots:</b>	<b>Units:</b>	<b>Projected No. of Residents:</b> 0
<b>Commercial Acres:</b> 2.84	<b>Lots:</b> 1	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b> 3,800	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b> 5
<b>Industrial Acres:</b>	<b>Lots:</b>	<b>Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:</b>	<b>Est. No. of Employees:</b>
<b>Other:</b>			

**C. Assessor's Parcel No(s):** 266-020-001

**Street References:** North of Van Buren Boulevard, south of Iris Avenue, east of Chicago Avenue, and west of Little Court.

**D. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description:**  
Township 3 South, Range 4 West, Section 30 Northwest

**E. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the Project site and its surroundings:** The site is bordered by single-family residential (SFR) to the north, commercial and residential to the west, vacant land to the east, and Van Buren Boulevard to the south. The site is approximately 4.45 miles west of Interstate 215 at Van Buren Boulevard and Chicago Avenue.

## **II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS**

### **A. General Plan Elements/Policies:**

- 1. Land Use:** The proposed Project is consistent with the existing Riverside County General Plan land use Foundation Component of Community Development (CD), Area Plan Land Use Designation of Community Retail (CR), and zoning designation of Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). The Project implements Policy LU 4.1, requiring new developments to be located and designed to visually enhance, not degrade the character of the surrounding area. The Project site is not located within a policy area. The Project is located within the City of Riverside sphere of influence. The Project site does not fall within a General Plan Policy Overlay Area.
- 2. Circulation:** Adequate circulation facilities exist and are proposed to serve the proposed Project. The proposed Project meets with all applicable circulation policies of the General Plan.
- 3. Multipurpose Open Space:** The proposed Project does not include any open space areas that would support the General Plan Multipurpose Open Space Policies.
- 4. Safety:** The proposed Project is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone, fault zone, or area with high landslide, mudslide, or liquefaction potential. The Project site is identified by the CalFire Riverside County (West) Fire Hazard Map as being within a very high fire hazard area. Since the Project site is located within a partially developed area, the Project would be required to comply with California Fire Code Chapter 47 and the Riverside County Municipal Code Chapter 8.32, Fire Code, which provides requirements to reduce the potential of fires to a less than significant impact. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to significant risks related to flooding. The proposed Project has also allowed for sufficient provision of emergency response services to the future residents of this Project through the Project design and payment of development impact fees. The proposed Project meets with all other applicable Safety Element policies.
- 5. Noise:** The Project will increase ambient noise levels in the Project area above what currently exists without the Project. The project is anticipated to comply with the County's exterior daytime noise threshold of 65 dBA and the County's nighttime exterior noise threshold of 45 dBA. The Project will not cause an exceedance of noise that would conflict with the standards established in the General Plan or noise ordinance.
- 6. Housing:** The Project does not propose any housing.
- 7. Air Quality:** The Project is located within the South Coast Air Basin. According to the Air Quality report, emissions associated with construction and operation of the Project would not result in a significant air quality impact. Proposed Project is anticipated to meet all South

Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) standards and thresholds with incorporation of various design features and compliance with regulations.

- 8. Healthy Communities:** The Project meets all applicable policies of the Healthy Communities Element of the General Plan. The Project will be providing sidewalk improvements for pedestrian use.

**B. General Plan Area Plan(s):** Lake Mathews/Woodcrest

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

**D. Land Use Designation(s):** Commercial Retail (CR)

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

**F. Policy Area(s), if any:** N/A

**G. Adjacent and Surrounding:**

- 1. General Plan Area Plan(s):** Lake Mathews/Woodcrest
- 2. Foundation Component(s):** Community Development to the west, City of Riverside to the south, and Rural Community to the north and east.
- 3. Land Use Designation(s):** Commercial Retail (CR) to the west, City of Riverside (commercial property) to the south, and Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) (1 acre minimum) to the north and east.
- 4. Overlay(s), if any:** N/A
- 5. Policy Area(s), if any:** N/A

**H. Adopted Specific Plan Information**

- 1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** N/A
- 2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** N/A

**I. Existing Zoning:** C-P-S

**J. Proposed Zoning, if any:** N/A

**K. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:** Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) to the west, City of Riverside to the south, and Light Agricultural (A-1) to the north and east.

### III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

### IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

#### A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

- ☐ I find that the proposed Project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the Project proponent. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

#### A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

- ☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, **NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED** because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed Project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed Project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed Project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed Project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.
- ☐ I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.
- ☐ I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the Project in the changed situation; therefore, a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the Project as revised.
- ☐ I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1)

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

*Timothy Wheeler*

Signature

August 3, 2021

Date

Tim Wheeler  
Urban/Regional Planner IV  
Printed Name

For: John Hildebrand  
Planning Director

## V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>AESTHETICS</b> Would the Project:				
<b>1. Scenic Resources</b>				
a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

---

creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?

---

- c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the Project is in an urbanized area, would the Project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
- 

☐☐☒☐

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure C-8 "Scenic Highways," Project Materials, Google Earth (2020), Site Visit

Findings of Fact:

- A) The Project site is located along in an area of the Woodcrest community, along Van Buren Boulevard, that has not been designated as a Scenic Highway by any government agency including the State of California or the County of Riverside. The area around the Project site consists of single-family homes to the north and northeast, commercial retail activity to the west across Chicago Avenue, and undeveloped land across Van Buren Boulevard to the south.

The proposed gas station, convenience store, and car wash is one-story in height and has a footprint significantly smaller than the 2.48-acre Project site. Project development will primarily be focused on the western portion of the Project site. The Project is not located near a scenic highway corridor. The closest roadway that is County Eligible for a scenic highway designation is El Sobrante Road, which is approximately 3.2 miles southwest of the site. Due to terrain obstructions and distance between the roadway and the site, the site would not be visible from El Sobrante Road. No impact to scenic corridors would occur.

- B) The Project site is not located along an area designated by Riverside County or any other agency as a scenic highway, and no trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings exist on the Project site or in its vicinity. Therefore, such resources would be unaffected by Project implementation. No impacts would occur.

- C) Implementation of the proposed Project would not involve a substantial change to the visual character of the site or its surroundings. The proposed Project involves a commercial use on a property that is zoned for such uses and is currently undeveloped. The site is not of a scale large enough that the overall visual character of the area would be affected by Project implementation, and areas to the north, northeast, and west of the Project site are currently developed. Van Buren Boulevard in the Woodcrest area is a developed major thoroughfare bordered largely by residential and commercial uses. New construction would be limited to a commercial building, a parking lot, fuel pumps, a car wash, security lighting, as well as trash enclosures and other infrastructure associated with commercial development for a single retailer. This is consistent with the nature and intensity of land use along this section of Van Buren Boulevard. Therefore, the visual character of the site and its surroundings would not be degraded as it would generally remain unchanged. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

---

**2. Mt. Palomar Observatory**

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

☐☐☒☐

**Source(s):** GIS database, Ord. No. 655 (Regulating Light Pollution), Google Earth 2020.

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) Mt. Palomar Observatory is located at a straight-line distance of 46 miles from the Project site, just beyond Riverside County Ordinance No. 655 Zone B, which establishes light emissions regulations for a 45-mile radius from the observatory. Light emissions associated with the fuel station canopy and signage would not be of an intensity such that the observatory would be affected due to both the small footprint of the Project, downward facing lighting, and the 46-mile distance from the observatory. The site is outside of Zone B of Ordinance 655. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

---

**3. Other Lighting Issues**

- a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
- 
- b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?
- 

☐☐☒☐☐☐☒☐

**Source(s):** On-site Inspection, Project Application Description, Google Earth 2020.

**Findings of Fact:**

A, B) The County of Riverside Land Use Ordinance No. 348 includes design standards for outdoor lighting that apply to all development in the County. The County's lighting standards govern the placement and design of outdoor lighting fixtures to ensure adequate lighting for public safety while also minimizing light pollution and glare and precluding public nuisances (e.g., blinking/flashing lights, unusually high-intensity or needlessly bright lighting). Those standards would apply to the proposed Project.

The Project site is located in an area that is already subject to nighttime lighting from existing development to the north and west as well as throughout the Van Buren Boulevard corridor in the Woodcrest area, including exterior residential lights, and street lighting in an area considered by the County to be urban/built-up land. Additionally, no buildings or other man-made features currently exist on-site or near the Project site that are constructed of materials that cause substantial glare.

Glare is caused by light reflections from pavement, vehicles, and building materials such as reflective glass and polished surfaces. During daylight hours, the amount of glare depends on intensity and direction of sunlight. Glare can create hazards to motorists and can be a nuisance for pedestrians and other viewers. As identified in the building elevations presented in the



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

Project application materials, exterior surfaces of the proposed building would be finished with a combination of architectural coatings, trim, and/or other building materials (e.g., aluminum and concrete). Windows and glass architectural elements would consist of low-reflective glass. The Project's building materials would ensure that glare does not create a nuisance to on- and off-site viewers of the Project site. During the nighttime hours, the main source of glare would be from vehicle headlights, which is considered a temporary periodic occurrence that is not considered substantial. The Project would not create a new source of substantial glare.

Construction and operation of the Project would introduce additional sources of lighting to the Project site. New permanent sources of light for operations would be introduced into the area in the form of signage, building lighting, and parking lot lighting for nighttime operations, security, and safety. In accordance with the Riverside County ordinances referenced above, the Project would comply with requirements pertaining to lighting to provide adequate illumination for safety and security (minimum of one-foot candlepower across the surface of the parking area), to direct lighting away from adjoining properties and the public right-of-way, and to illuminate the primary structure. The applicant prepared a preliminary photometric plan which demonstrates that the Project would comply with the applicable lighting requirements of the County of Riverside. Compliance with County of Riverside's lighting regulations would reduce other lighting issues to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

#### **AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES** Would the Project:

##### **4. Agriculture**

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

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

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

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

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

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

d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-2 "Agricultural Resources," GIS database, Project Application Materials, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping Program. Riverside County Ordinance No. 625 (Right to Farm)

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

**Findings of Fact:**

A) According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping Program, the Project site is mapped Other/Unclassified land and does not contain prime agricultural land. There are no agricultural uses on the Project site. The Project site is zoned C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial). The land immediately to the northwest of the site is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. It appears that agricultural production (citrus groves) is an ongoing operation on this land. Project implementation would not convert this land to a non-agricultural use. However, the project would be subject to Riverside County Ordinance No. 625 because of the proximity of the Project site to the farmland of Statewide Importance. Compliance with the Ordinance No. 625 would ensure that the agricultural production on the adjacent land would be able to continue and impacts would be considered less than significant.

B) According to Riverside County's Map My County, the Project site is not designated for agricultural use nor is it utilized for agricultural production. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing agricultural zoning, agricultural use or with land subject to a Williamson Act contract or land within a Riverside County Agricultural Preserve. No impact would occur.

C) Refer to threshold response A) above. The project would be subject to Riverside County Ordinance No. 625 because it is within 300 ft. of land designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance. Compliance with the Ordinance No. 625 would ensure that the agricultural production on the adjacent land would be able to continue, farming activities would not be deemed a nuisance, and the Planning Director shall cause a notice to be included on an Environmental Constraints Sheet pursuant to Riverside County Ordinance No. 460. Compliance with Ordinance No. 625 and relevant provisions in Ordinance No. 460 would reduce impacts to farmland to less than significant levels.

D) Refer to analysis above (thresholds A-C). Compliance with County regulations involving agricultural/farmland uses would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-3a "Forestry Resources Western Riverside County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas," Figure OS-3b "Forestry Resources Eastern Riverside

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

County Parks, Forests, and Recreation Areas,” Project Application Materials, Google Earth 2020, Site Visit.

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The Project site is not zoned as forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production, nor is it surrounded by forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production land. There are no lands located within the vicinity of the Project site that are zoned as Timberland Production as surrounding parcels are generally developed with commercial and residential uses on a major thoroughfare of western Riverside County. No impacts would occur.
- B, C) The Project site does not contain a forest and is not designated as forest land; thus, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan (“CAP”), SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Air Quality/Greenhouse Emissions Report by Salem Engineering Group (December 2019) (Appendix A).

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the local agency responsible for the administration and enforcement of air quality regulations for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB). The Project site is located within the SCAB. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has jurisdiction over air quality issues and regulations within the SCAB. The SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the SCAB. The most recently adopted air quality plan in the SCAB is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).

As indicated in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment (prepared by SALEM Engineering Group, December 18, 2019, revised July 16, 2021), emissions associated with construction and operation of the Project would not result in exceedances of SCAQMD thresholds for a criteria air pollutant and would not conflict with AQMP's air quality standards. The proposed Project is consistent with the existing Riverside County General Plan land use designation of Community Development: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) and would implement the General Plan uses for the site. The Project would not significantly increase the County's population and would not require a General Plan Amendment. The Project is an allowable use under the General Plan Land Use designation and consistency with the General Plan Land Use is the foundation for the assumptions used in the AQMP. Therefore, the emissions associated with the Project have already been accounted for in the AQMP and approval of the Project would not conflict with the AQMP. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of an applicable air quality plan and impacts are considered less than significant.

- B) The tables below include projected emissions for all steps of construction, averaged over the Project's projected construction duration. Project construction would include: Grading Site, Site Preparation, Building Construction, Paving, and Architectural Coatings. Note that projected emissions for all pollutants during construction are below both the SCAQMD's Air Quality Significance Thresholds as well as the Localized Significance Thresholds.

During construction, diesel-fired equipment will be operated and will result in the release of diesel particulate matter, which is a listed carcinogen and toxic air contaminant in the State of California. The earthwork phase is the phase of construction in which the majority of diesel-fired equipment will be used.

Because this duration is very short (approximately two months), it is expected that the release of diesel will not have a negative impact to the surrounding land uses which primarily include residential land uses located to the north and west of the Project site.

Construction of the Project would be short-term and temporary, therefore a cumulative increase in the surrounding emissions associated with the area would not result in a significant impact on the ambient air quality. In addition, because emissions are less than the significance levels, they do not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Based on the above Project analysis of the construction phase, the Project construction phase will not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP or applicable portions of the SIP. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Estimated Construction Emissions  
Annual LBS/Day (unless otherwise shown)**

<b>Significance Criteria</b>	75	-	-	150	-	-
<b>Localized Significance Thresholds</b>	-	270	1,577	-	13	8
<b>Project Construction Emissions Phase I</b>						
Retail Development Summer Peak	19.37	14.35	7.98	0.0149	2.79	1.61
Retail Development Winter Peak	19.37	14.35	7.94	0.0149	2.79	1.61
<i>Significant?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>

**Estimated Operational Emissions  
Annual LBS/Day (unless otherwise shown)**

<b>Significance Criteria</b>	75	-	-	150	-	-
<b>Localized Significance Thresholds</b>	-	270	2,075	-	4	3
<b>Project Construction Emissions Phase I</b>						
Retail Development Summer Peak	23.14*	5.7	39.98	0.04	1.29	0.39
Retail Development Winter Peak	23.14*	5.7	30.25	0.02	1.29	0.39
<b>Significant?</b>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
*Operation – The ROG calculation includes the gasoline vapor that may escape the vapor recovery system of the gasoline pump. Throughput is estimate at 416,667 gallons per month. The vapor escape factor ratio is estimate at 0.9 per 1000 gallons per day.						

The table above presents the results of the CalEEMod emission calculations in lbs/day for operations, as an annual average considering the Project's design features, along with a comparison with the SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds for Operations. SCAQMD, the air district in which the Project is located, publishes significance thresholds at the regional level as well as Local Significance Thresholds (LSTs) that are specific to certain geographic areas of the District's footprint. As show in the table, the Project would not exceed either regional thresholds or LSTs for any of the six criteria pollutants during operations. The calculation assumed that the Project would be constructed to current Title 24 buildings.

Based on the estimates of the emissions associated with Project operations, the emissions are below the significance criteria. In addition, because the emissions are less than the significance levels, they would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). It should be noted that the emissions from vehicles are projected to decrease with time due to phase-out of older, more polluting vehicles and increasingly stringent emissions standards.

Projects involving traffic impacts may result in the formation of locally high concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO), known as CO "hot spots." It is not anticipated that the Project would have a significant impact on traffic in the area, and no intersections would degrade to unacceptable levels. The intersections in the Project area would therefore operate at an acceptable LOS, consistent with County General Plan policies, and would not experience CO "hot spots" because traffic congestion would not result. This has been confirmed in the traffic study for this Project and development.

The gas station operations will follow and be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 461, including compliance with applicable SCAQMD Rules, including, but not limited to, Rule 201 – Permit to Construct, Rule 203 – Permit to Operate, and Rule 1401 – New Source Review of Toxic Air Containments. Rule 461 is of particular importance as it applies to the transfer of gasoline from any tank truck, trailer, or railroad tank car into stationary storage tanks or mobile fuelers, as well as transfer from those tanks or fuelers to cars and trucks at the pump. Compliance with this rule is required for fueling stations such as the one proposed. In addition, SCAQMD has implemented rules related to Enhanced Vapor Recovery Systems at fueling stations such that Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) are limited to the extent possible by implementing such systems. The proposed Project would implement such systems in order to ensure compliance with SCAQMD regulations by limited the emissions of VOCs and TACs to the extent possible. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) requires that fuel dispensing facilities (pumps) must be located more than 50 feet from any sensitive receptor. The closest sensitive receptor to the fueling facilities is a single-family residence north of the Project site and

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

is approximately 165 feet away. The Project complies with this requirement as the proposed pumps are over 50 feet from the closest sensitive receptor.

Construction of the Project would be short-term and temporary. Thus, the emissions associated with construction would not result in a significant impact on the ambient air quality. The Project's long-term operation as a fuel station and associated convenience store were also analyzed using the CalEEMod model, the outputs of which were compared to SCAQMD regional and local significance thresholds. Although emissions would occur during Project operations, it was found that these would not exceed adopted thresholds. Because emissions are less than the significance levels for both construction and operations, they would not conflict or obstruct the implementation of the AQMP or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

- C) CalEEMod quantifies mobile source emissions (e.g., trip visits by patrons) associated with operating a gasoline service station. CalEEMod does not quantify the operational stationary source emissions from the storage tanks and fueling equipment.

Sensitive receptors are people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants. Sensitive receptors include schools, daycare centers, nursing homes, elderly care facilities, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The proposed Project has the potential to expose nearby residents located within 25 meters of the proposed Project to toxic air contaminants, such as benzene, which is a known carcinogen. The potential health impacts to sensitive receptors from the exposures to benzene during the operation of the proposed Project have been reviewed and based on the SCAQMD health risk tool, as stated in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment, the gas station throughput of gasoline at 416,667 gallons per month or 5.0 million gallons per year will not have a significant impact to the sensitive receptors in this area.

Pursuant to the Sierra Club v. Friant Ranch Supreme Court Ruling (Case No. S219783, December 24, 2018), which found on page 6 of the ruling that EIRs need to "make a reasonable effort to substantively connect a Project's air quality impacts to likely health consequences." Also, on page 24 of the ruling it states "The Court of Appeal identified several ways in which the EIR could have framed the analysis so as to adequately inform the public and decision makers of possible adverse health effects. The County could have, for example, identified the Project's impact on the days of nonattainment per year." The Air Basin has been designated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the national standards as a non-attainment area for ozone (O3), fine particulate matter (PM2.5), and partial non-attainment for lead. In addition, respirable particulate matter (PM10) has been designated by the State as nonattainment. It should be noted that VOC and nitrogen oxides (NOx) are O3 precursors, as such they have been considered as non-attainment pollutants. According to the Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, prepared by SCAQMD, March 2017, in 2016 the total emissions of: VOC was 500 tons per year; NOx was 522 tons per year; sulfur oxides (Sox) was 18 tons per year; and PM2.5 was 66 tons per year. The Project contribution to each criteria pollutant in the South Coast Air Basin is shown below.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Less than  
Significant  
with  
Mitigation  
Incorporated

Less  
Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

### Project's Contribution to Criteria Pollutants in the South Coast Air Basin

Emissions Source	Maximum Daily Emissions (pounds/day)					
	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
Project Emissions <sup>1</sup>	23.14	4.6	30.62	0.02	1.29	0.39
Total Emissions in Air Basin <sup>2</sup>	1,000,000	1,044,000	4,246,000	36,000	132,000	132,000
Project's Percent of Air Emissions	0.002314%	0.00044%	0.00072%	0.000055%	0.00097%	0.00029%

Notes:

1 From the project's total operational emissions.

2 Since the Final 2016 AQMP did not provide the total PM10 annual emissions in the Air Basin, the PM2.5 emissions, which is a subset of PM10 was utilized instead.

Source: SCAQMD, 2017.

As shown above, the Project would increase criteria pollutant emissions by as much as 0.00097 percent for PM10 in the South Coast Air Basin. Due to these nominal increases in the Basin-wide criteria pollutant emissions, no increases in days of non-attainment are anticipated to occur from operation of the proposed Project. As such, operation of the Project is not anticipated to result in a quantitative increase in premature deaths, asthma in children, days children will miss school, asthma-related emergency room visits, or an increase in acute bronchitis among children due to the criteria pollutants created by the proposed Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

In reviewing the Project data, a cumulative increase in emissions associated with the Project would not result in a significant impact on the ambient air quality. In addition, because emissions are less than the significance levels for both regional and local levels as defined by SCAQMD, they do not expose the nearby single-family residential uses to the north and west of the Project site (sensitive receptors) to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.

- D) Odors are generally regarded as an annoyance rather than a health hazard. However, manifestations of a person's reaction to foul odors can range from the psychological (e.g., irritation, anger, anxiety) to the physiological (e.g., circulatory and respiratory effects, nausea, vomiting, headaches).

Neither the state nor the federal government has adopted rules or regulations for the control of odor sources. The SCAQMD investigates odor complaints from the public. These complaints and the results of SCAQMD investigations are recorded and kept on file. A review of SCAQMD records from the last 10 years shows no complaints logged by SCAQMD for odors associated with the Project site and no notices of violations related to any issue related to releases of potential odors.

During construction, diesel equipment operating at the site may generate some nuisance odors; however, due to the distance of sensitive receptors to the Project site and the temporary nature of construction, odors associated with Project construction would not be significant.

Land uses associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding operations. These land uses are not proposed for this Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES** Would the Project:

**7. Wildlife & Vegetation**

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source(s): GIS database, Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (WRMSHCP), Biological Resources Survey (Appendix B), Burrowing Owl Survey, DBESP prepared by Gonzales Environmental, Google Earth 2020, Site Visit, Site Photos.

Findings of Fact:



A-D) Based on habitat requirements for specific special-status plant and wildlife species and the availability and quality of habitats needed by each species, it was determined that the Project site does not provide suitable habitat for special-status plant or wildlife species known to occur in the area and are presumed absent.

Although heavily disturbed, the Project has the potential to provide minimal foraging and nesting habitat for year-round and seasonal avian residents, as well as migrating songbirds that could occur in the area that are adapted to disturbed environments. Further, the open disturbed areas supported by the site provide potential nesting habitat to ground-nesting birds. A pre-construction nesting bird clearance survey shall be conducted prior to ground disturbance to ensure no nesting birds will be impacted from site development.

Nesting birds are protected pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.3, 3511, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit the take, possession, or destruction of birds, their nests or eggs). In order to protect migratory bird species, a nesting bird clearance survey should be conducted prior to any ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities that may disrupt the birds during the nesting season. Consequently, if avian nesting behaviors are disrupted, such as nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort, it is considered “take” and is potentially punishable by fines and/or imprisonment.

If construction occurs between February 1<sup>st</sup> and August 31<sup>st</sup>, a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be conducted within seven (7) days of the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, construction activities shall stay outside of a no-disturbance buffer. The size of the no-disturbance buffer will be determined by the wildlife biologist and will depend on the level of noise and/or surrounding anthropogenic disturbances, line of sight between the nest and the construction activity, type and duration of construction activity, ambient noise, species habituation, and topographical barriers, but typically under the MBTA the buffer is 300 feet for most species and 500 feet for raptors. These factors will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis when developing buffer distances. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest will be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers; and construction personnel will be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. A biological monitor should be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, construction activities within the buffer area can occur.

The Project site is located within the boundaries of the Western Riverside County MSHCP, within the Lake Mathews/Woodcrest Area Plan of the MSHCP but is not located within any Criteria Cells or MSHCP Conservation Areas. Additionally, the Project site is located within the designated survey area for burrowing owl.

Based on the results of the burrowing owl focused survey, no burrowing owl or sign was observed on the Project site. Out of abundance of caution and to ensure burrowing owl remain absent BIO-3 shall be implemented prior to ground disturbing activities. Further, while the onsite analysis for burrowing owl did not produce results that the species is actively utilizing the site,

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

as the owls will move and potentially occupy sites, BIO-3 shall be incorporated into the project. Mitigation measure BIO-3 will ensure that no later than 30 days prior to ground disturbance, the site will again be evaluated for burrowing owl presence. If any species are found onsite, appropriate relocation protocols based on the latest requirements will be adhered to. Therefore, any impacts to burrowing owl will remain less than significant.

E-F) The County is a permittee under the MSHCP and, while the Project is not specifically identified as a Covered Activity under Section 7.1 of the MSHCP, public and private development that are outside of Criteria Areas and Public/Quasi-Public (PQP) Lands are permitted under the MSHCP, subject to consistency with MSHCP policies that apply to area outside of Criteria Areas. As such, to achieve coverage, the Project must be consistent with the following policies of the MSHCP:

- The policies for the protection of species associated with Riparian/Riverine areas and vernal pools as set forth in Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP; and
- The requirements for conducting additional surveys as set forth in Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP.

Based on the proposed site plan approximately 0.027-acre (388 linear feet) of USACE and RWQCB jurisdictional Waters of the United States will be impacted, and approximately 0.110 acre (388 linear feet) of CDFW jurisdictional habitat and MSHCP 6.1.2 riparian/riverine habitat will be impacted from Project implementation.

Delineation studies found MSHCP Section 6.1.2 habitat [0.156 acres of streambed (riverine) and 0.004 acres of mulefat alliance (riparian)], totaling 0.160-acre on the Project site. Based on the proposed site plan, approximately 0.110 acre of MSHCP Section 6. 1.2 riparian/riverine habitat will be impacted from Project implementation. A Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) was prepared, in accordance with the MSHCP, to address the loss of the function and value of the riparian/riverine habitat from Project implementation, and the mitigation measures to compensate for the loss of riparian/riverine habitat. Specifically, the DBESP found that impacts to both riparian habitat and riverine areas would occur on the site due to grading activities. However, this is mitigated by one-time fee for the purposes of acquiring 1.0 acre via the Riverside-Corona Resource Conservation District in order to offset Project impacts. Prior to site development, mitigation measure BIO-2 shall be completed to compensate for the loss of MSHCP Section 6.1.2 riparian/riverine habitat.

With payment of the MSHCP mitigation fee, and approval of the DBESP for impacts to riparian/riverine habitat under Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, development of the Project site will be fully consistent with the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3 detailed below will ensure that impacts are less than significant.

No state or federally protected wetlands were documented on-site. The Project site has not been identified as occurring in a wildlife corridor or linkage. The proposed Project will be confined to existing areas that have been heavily disturbed or developed, are isolated from regional wildlife corridors and linkages. As such, implementation of the proposed Project is not expected to impact wildlife movement opportunities. Therefore, impacts to wildlife corridors or linkages are not expected to occur. Project implementation would not conflict with any local policies or ordinance protecting biological resources.

G) There are no tree preservation policies or ordinances that would apply to the Project site as no protected trees are present as detailed in the biological resources survey prepared by Gonzales Environmental.

Mitigation:

BIO-1. Nesting birds are protected pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (Sections 3503, 3503.3, 3511, and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit the take, possession, or destruction of birds, their nests or eggs). In order to protect migratory bird species, a nesting bird clearance survey shall be conducted prior to any ground disturbance or vegetation removal activities that may disrupt the birds during the nesting season. Consequently, if avian nesting behaviors are disrupted, such as nest abandonment and/or loss of reproductive effort, it is considered a “take” and is potentially punishable by fines and/or imprisonment.

If construction occurs between February 1<sup>st</sup> and August 31<sup>st</sup>, a pre-construction clearance survey for nesting birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within seven (7) days of the start of any vegetation removal or ground disturbing activities to ensure that no nesting birds will be disturbed during construction. The biologist conducting the clearance survey shall document a negative survey with a brief letter report indicating that no impacts to active avian nests will occur. If an active avian nest is discovered during the pre-construction clearance survey, construction activities shall stay outside of a no-disturbance buffer. The size of the no-disturbance buffer shall be determined by the qualified biologist and will depend on the level of noise and/or surrounding anthropogenic disturbances, line of sight between the nest and the construction activity, type and duration of construction activity, ambient noise, species habituation, and topographical barriers. These factors shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis when developing buffer distances. Limits of construction to avoid an active nest will be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or other appropriate barriers; and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. A biological monitor shall be present to delineate the boundaries of the buffer area and to monitor the active nest to ensure that nesting behavior is not adversely affected by the construction activity. Once the young have fledged and left the nest, or the nest otherwise becomes inactive under natural conditions, construction activities within the buffer area can occur.

BIO-2. Permits/Agreements for activities within the onsite drainage feature shall be required by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit) RWQCB (Clean Water Act 401 Water Quality Certification), and California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement) prior to site development. Additionally, the Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation shall be reviewed and approved by the County of Riverside and relevant wildlife agencies.

The Project shall purchase 0.50 acres of wetland rehabilitation credits from River Park prior to the issuance of grading permits. Should sufficient wetland rehabilitation credits not be available for purchase at the time the Project is implemented, then the Developer must prepare and submit for review and approval another Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation. The plan must meet County of Riverside requirements, as well as requirements of other resource and wildlife agencies.

BIO-3. In accordance with the *Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan*, a pre-construction burrowing owl clearance

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

survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to ground disturbing activities to verify presence or non-presence on the Project site.

**Monitoring:** Monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in coordination with the Riverside County Biologist and relevant wildlife agencies.

#### **CULTURAL RESOURCES** Would the Project:

##### **8. Historic Resources**

a) Alter or destroy a historic site?

☐
☐
☐
☒

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?

☐
☐
☐
☒

**Source(s):** On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Archaeological Associates Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (2019) (Appendix C), and 2020: White, Robert PDA07095 A Cultural Resources Assessment of a 3.32-acre Proposed Commercial Site Located Immediately Northeast of the Intersection of Van Buren Boulevard and Chicago Avenue, Community of Woodcrest, Riverside County.

#### **Findings of Fact:**

A, B) At the request of Salem Engineering, Archaeological Associates has undertaken a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of a 3.32-acre Project site as shown identified as APN 266-020-001. The property is located immediately northeast of the intersection of Van Buren Boulevard and Chicago Avenue in the community of Woodcrest, Riverside County.

The records search and field survey failed to indicate the presence of any historic resources within the boundaries of the study area. Only one historic site has been documented within the 1-mile record search area.

Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property it has been determined that there will be no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the Project site

The primary purpose of archaeological monitoring is to ensure that if cultural resources are encountered during earthmoving operations that a qualified archaeologist has the opportunity to ascertain the importance of the find(s). If archaeological material is encountered during construction grading activities that cannot be readily or easily evaluated during the course of monitoring, then the Project archaeologist should have the authority to temporarily stop or redirect grading and/or construction in that area until the significance of the find(s) can be made.

In the event that human remains are encountered during the course of any future development, California State Law (*Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Section 5079.98 of the Public Resources Code*) states that no further earth disturbance shall occur at the location of the find until the Riverside County Coroner has been notified. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

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

The Project site has very low to no potential for buried prehistoric resources due to the age and composition of the surface associated with the soil, as discussed in Appendix E. Surficial mixing associated bioturbation and minimal alluvial deposition associated with extreme weather events may shallowly bury artifacts. However, sites located on this formation will be near-surface and likely have a surface expression.

The sensitivity range for this area includes moderate because the sediments underlying this part of Project were deposited during the Prehistoric period. The depth of these Holocene deposit to the underlying late-Pleistocene material is unknown and, therefore, it is not possible to define the vertical extent of this unit and the depth at which resources may be found. The buried late-Pleistocene sediments will have no potential as the upper surface is erosional. A low end of the range was provided because the aggregational depositional processes are often high-energy and result in the displacement of cultural features and artifacts. In this environment, deposits are often the result of mass-wasting, or debris flows which will often erode a surface prior to deposit anywhere from several centimeters to meters of new fill. Sites will be found associated only surfaces strata surfaces in this environment if capped by a low energy overbank event. As such, this depositional environment preserves site integrity poorly. No impact would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

<b>9. Archaeological Resources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source(s):** On-Site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Archaeological Associates Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment (2019) (Appendix C), Site Visit.

Findings of Fact:

A, B) Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a Riverside County approved archaeologist, Robert White on January 15, 2019, it has been determined that there are no archaeological resources within the Project site. The results of the survey are provided in a report titled, *"A Cultural Resources Assessment of a 3.32-acre Proposed Commercial Site Located Immediately Northeast of the Intersection of Van Buren Boulevard and Chicago Avenue, Community of Woodcrest, Riverside County"*, dated May 07, 2020.

However, the record search identified thirty-six prehistoric bedrock milling sites located within the 1-mile record search area. Based on the archaeological sensitivity of the area there is the potential for subsurface resources to be present that were not identified during field surveys and

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

do not have a surface expression. This could result in impacts to significant cultural resources. Avoidance or reduction of this potentially significant impact on subsurface or otherwise unidentified cultural resources would be achieved by implementing mitigation measures CUL-1.

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

#### Mitigation:

**CUL-1 Cultural Resources Monitoring Program (CRMP):**  
Prior to issuance of grading permits: The applicant/developer shall provide evidence to the County of Riverside Planning Department that a County certified professional archaeologist has been contracted to implement a Cultural Resource Monitoring Program (CRMP). A CRMP shall be developed that addresses the details of all activities and provides procedures that must be followed in order to reduce the impacts to cultural and historic resources to a level that is less than significant as well as address potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources associated with this Project. This document shall be provided to the County Archaeologist for review and approval prior to issuance of the grading permit. The CRMP shall contain at a minimum the following: Archaeological Monitor An adequate number of qualified archaeological monitors shall be onsite to ensure all earth moving activities are observed for areas being monitored. This includes all grubbing, grading, and trenching onsite and for all offsite improvements. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined and directed by the Project Archaeologist.

**Cultural Sensitivity Training** - The Project Archaeologist and if required, a representative designated by the Tribe shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the contractors to provide Cultural Sensitivity Training for all construction personnel. Training will include a brief review of the cultural sensitivity of the Project and the surrounding area; the areas to be avoided during grading activities; what resources could potentially be identified during earthmoving activities; the requirements of the monitoring program; the protocols that apply in the event unanticipated cultural resources are identified, including who to contact and appropriate avoidance measures until the find(s) can be properly evaluated; and any other appropriate protocols. This is a mandatory training and all construction personnel must attend prior to beginning work on the Project site. A sign-in sheet for attendees of this training shall be included in the Phase IV Monitoring Report.

**Unanticipated Resources** - In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, the Archaeological and/or Tribal Monitor(s) shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of

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

discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the Tribal monitor, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. The County Archaeologist must concur with the evaluation before construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area. Further, before construction activities are allowed to resume in the affected area, the artifacts shall be recovered, and features recorded using professional archaeological methods. The Project Archaeologist shall determine the amount of material to be recovered for an adequate artifact sample for analysis. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field and the monitored grading can proceed.

Artifact Disposition- the landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources that are unearthed on the Project property during any ground-disturbing activities, including previous investigations and/or Phase III data recovery. The Professional Archaeologist may submit a detailed letter to the County of Riverside during grading requesting a modification to the monitoring program if circumstances are encountered that reduce the need for monitoring.

#### Human Remains

If human remains are found on this site, the developer/permit holder or any successor in interest shall comply with State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5.

Monitoring: Archaeological Monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist in coordination with the Riverside County archaeologist.

#### ENERGY Would the Project:

##### 10. Energy Impacts

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

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

#### Findings of Fact:

- A) The Project's construction process would consume electrical energy and fuel. Project-related construction would represent a "single-event" electric energy and fuel demand and would not require on-going or permanent commitment of energy or diesel fuel resources for this purpose. The aggregate fuel consumption rate for all equipment is estimated at 18.5 horsepower hours per gallon (hp-hr-gal), obtained from the cited fuel consumption rate factors presented in Table D-24 of the Moyer guidelines. Construction workers also would consume fuel traveling to and from the site. An aggregated fuel economy of light duty automobiles (vehicle class within the California sub-area for a 2019 calendar year) are calculated to have a fuel efficiency of 28.17 miles per gallon (MPG). Indirectly, construction energy efficiencies and energy conservation would be achieved through the use of bulk purchases, transport, and use of construction materials. The 2018 Integrated Energy Policy Report (2018 IEPR) adopted February 20, 2019

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

by the California Energy Commission (CEC) continues to work towards improving electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel energy use in California. The 2018 IEPR focuses on a variety of topics such as including the environmental performance of the electricity generation system, landscape-scale planning, the response to the gas leak at the Aliso Canyon natural gas storage facility, transportation fuel supply reliability issues, updates on Southern California electricity reliability, methane leakage, climate adaptation activities for the energy sector, climate and sea level rise scenarios, and the California Energy Demand Forecast.

The amount of energy and fuel use anticipated by the Project's construction activities would be typical for the type of construction proposed because there are no aspects of the Project's proposed construction process that are unusual or energy-intensive, and Project construction equipment would conform to the applicable CARB emissions standards as well as Riverside County's Climate Action Plan (CAP), acting to promote equipment fuel efficiencies and mitigate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. CCR Title 13, Title 13, Motor Vehicles, Section 2449(d)(3) Idling, limits idling times of construction vehicles to no more than 5 minutes, thereby precluding unnecessary and wasteful consumption of fuel due to unproductive idling of construction equipment. Enforcement of idling limitations is realized through periodic site inspections conducted by County building officials, and/or in response to citizen complaints. As supported by the preceding discussions, Project construction energy consumption would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary.

#### *Riverside County Climate Action Plan*

The County's CAP is a document establishing goals and policies that incorporate environmental responsibility into the daily management of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional growth. The CAP includes GHG inventories of community-wide and municipal sources based on the most recent data available for the year 2008. Sources of emissions include transportation, electricity and natural gas use, landscaping, water and wastewater pumping and treatment, and treatment and decomposition of solid waste.

Because the proposed Project is under 3,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions, no Screening Table compliance is required as 3,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e is considered less than significant under CEQA. CAP policies related to transportation, energy, wastewater, solid waste, etc. do not apply to this development as it is not a transportation Project and is under the limit of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions. As a result, the implementation of the proposed Project would not conflict with the transportation, energy, or other GHG categories with specific policies as detailed in the CAP.

#### *Transportation Energy Demands*

Energy that would be consumed by Project-generated traffic is a function of total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and estimated vehicle fuel economies of vehicles accessing the Project site. Fuel would be provided by commercial vendors, which are required to comply with state and federal requirements regarding energy efficiency. Trip generation and VMT generated by a gas station with 10 fueling pumps, an approximately 3,800 square foot (sf) convenience store, and a 70-foot tunnel car wash on the Project site would be consistent with other commercial uses similar in scale and configuration as reflected in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10th Ed., 2017); and CalEEMod v2016.3.2. That is, the Project does not propose uses or operations that would inherently result in excessive and wasteful vehicle trips and VMT, nor associated excess and wasteful vehicle energy consumption.



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

Enhanced fuel economies realized pursuant to federal and state regulatory actions, and related transition of cars and trucks to alternative energy sources (e.g., electricity, natural gas, biofuels, hydrogen cells) would likely decrease future gasoline fuel demands per VMT. Location of the Project proximate to regional and local roadway systems tends to reduce VMT within the region, acting to reduce regional vehicle energy demands. The Project would involve implementation of site-adjacent sidewalks that would provide convenient access to nearby sidewalks, trails, and bicycle paths, and encourage pedestrian and bicycle access and subsequently reduce VMT and associated energy consumption. Therefore, the Project's transportation energy consumption would not be considered inefficient, wasteful, or otherwise unnecessary.

#### *Facility Energy Demands*

The proposed food mart, gas station, and car wash, and associated maintenance activities would result in the consumption of natural gas and electricity. Natural gas would be supplied to the Project by Southern California Gas Company and electricity would be supplied to the Project by Southern California Edison (SCE).

Energy use in buildings is divided into energy consumed by the built environment and energy consumed by uses that are independent of the construction of the building such as plug-in appliances. In California, the California Building Standards Code Title 24 governs energy consumed by the built environment, mechanical systems, and some types of fixed lighting. Non-building energy use, or "plug-in" energy use can be further subdivided by specific end-use (refrigeration, cooking, appliances, etc.).

Therefore, implementation of the Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during Project construction or operation and impacts would be less than significant.

- B) The proposed Project is under 3,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. This precludes any CAP Screening Table compliance because anything under 3,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e is considered less than significant pursuant to the CAP. Because the Project would not conflict with the CAP. Energy consumption from new Projects that do not include residential uses, such as the proposed Project, are primarily controlled by Title 24, Part 11 California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen), which provides minimum requirements for bicycle parking, carpool/vanpool/electric vehicle parking spaces, use of water-efficient plumbing and landscaping fixtures, and recycling and use of recycled materials in building products. Because the Project will comply with all relevant aspects of CalGreen and is under the CAP threshold of 3,000 metric tons, impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

#### **GEOLOGY AND SOILS** Would the Project directly or indirectly:

##### **11. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones**

- a) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State

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

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

Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group (2019) (Appendix H).

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The Project site is located in the Peninsular Range, which has historically been a province of relatively high seismic activity. The nearest faults to the Project site are associated with the San Jacinto fault system located approximately 11 miles from the site. There are no known active fault traces in the Project vicinity. Based on mapping and historical seismicity, the seismicity of the Peninsular Range has been generally considered high by the scientific community.

The Project area is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault (Special Studies) Zone and will not require a special site investigation by an Engineering Geologist as soils on site are classified as Site Class C in accordance with Chapter 16 of the California Building Code. The proposed structures are determined to be in Seismic Design Category D.

The site is not within a currently established State of California Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. No active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture due to faulting occurring beneath the site during the design life of the proposed development is considered low. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

**12. Liquefaction Potential Zone**

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

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction," GIS database, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group (Appendix H).

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) Soil liquefaction is a state of soil particles suspension caused by a complete loss of strength when the effective stress drops to zero. Liquefaction normally occurs under saturated conditions in soils such as sand in which the strength is purely frictional. Primary factors that trigger liquefaction are: moderate to strong ground shaking (seismic source), relatively clean, loose granular soils (primarily poorly graded sands and silty sands), and saturated soil conditions (shallow groundwater). Due to the increasing overburden pressure with depth, liquefaction of granular soils is generally limited to the upper 50 feet of a soil profile. However, liquefaction has occurred in soils other than clean sand.

The soils encountered within the depth of 24 feet on the Project site consisted predominately of soft to stiff sandy silt; and loose to very dense clayey sand, silty sand, poorly graded sand, and well-graded sand. However, it should be noted that the materials encountered greater than about 1 to 5 feet below site grade are considered very dense (N-values greater than 50 blows per foot). The very dense materials encountered are consistent with tonalite bedrock material mapped in the vicinity of the site.

The historically highest groundwater is estimated to be at a depth of approximately 12 to 15 feet below ground surface according to nearby monitoring well data. Based on the presence of very dense material encountered it is anticipated that the groundwater depth reported is due to perched water conditions. Low to very low cohesion strength is associated with the sandy soil. A seismic hazard, which could cause damage to the proposed development during seismic shaking, is the post-liquefaction settlement of the liquefied sands. Riverside County GIS shows the site to be in a very low liquefaction potential area.

Furthermore, based on the very dense soil/rock conditions encountered the liquefaction potential of the site is considered to be low due the relatively dense/stiff soil conditions. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

### 13. Ground-shaking Zone

a) Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

☐
☐
☒
☐

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), GIS database, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group (Appendix H).

#### Findings of Fact:

- A) The Project site is located in a seismically active area of southern California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking during the lifetime of the proposed Project. The ground shaking risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties in the southern California area.

Based on the 2016 California Building Code (CBD), a Site Class C was selected for the site based on soil conditions encountered and our experience in the vicinity of the subject site. Table 9.2.1 includes design seismic coefficients and spectral response parameters, based on the 2016 California Building Code (CBC) for the Project foundation design.

Based on Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) Seismic Design Maps, the estimated design peak ground acceleration adjusted for site class effects (PGAM) was determined to be 0.6g (based on both probabilistic and deterministic seismic ground motion).

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

Based upon data collected during the geotechnical investigation, and as stated in the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation report prepared by Salem Engineering Group, it is determined that the Project site is suitable for the proposed development as long as the recommendations contained in the report are incorporated into the Project design and construction. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

#### 14. Landslide Risk

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

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

**Source(s):** On-site Inspection, Riverside County General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope," GIS database, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group (Appendix H).

#### Findings of Fact:

- A) The Project site is relatively flat. Grading in support of the Project is not anticipated to result in the creation of any new substantial slopes on-site that could be subject to landslide. Grading of the site would not pose a landslide threat to adjacent properties, future site workers, or the proposed buildings. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not create and would not be exposed to any risk of a landslide. According to the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation cited above, as well as site visits and photographs, no slopes capable of producing landslides exist on or near the Project site. The Geotechnical Engineering Investigation further states that there are no known landslides at the site, nor is the site in the path of any known potential landslides. Graded slopes on the site would be 2 ft horizontal to 1 ft vertical and would be no more than 10 ft in height. No aspect of Project construction or operations would create slopes such that landslides could occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

#### 15. Ground Subsidence

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

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-7 "Documented Subsidence Areas Map," Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group, Riverside County Office of Information Technology Geographic Information Systems (GIS).

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

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) According to Riverside County GIS (Map My County), the Project site is located in an area that is prone to ground subsidence. According to the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared for the Project, the engineer stated that they are not aware of subsidence issues in the immediate Project site vicinity. No impact would occur.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

**16. Other Geologic Hazards**

- a) Be subject to geologic hazards, such as seiche, mudflow, or volcanic hazard?

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

**Source(s):** On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group (Appendix H).

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The site is not located within a coastal area. Therefore, tsunamis (seismic sea waves) are not considered a significant hazard at the site. Seiches are large waves generated in enclosed bodies of water in response to ground shaking. No major water-retaining structures are located immediately up gradient from the Project site. Flooding from a seismically induced seiche is considered unlikely due to the lack of seiche-producing water bodies in the Project area as determined by the Geotechnical Investigation cited above. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

**17. Slopes**

- a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?
- b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?
- c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

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

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

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

**Source(s):** Riv. Co. 800-Scale Slope Maps, Project Application Materials, Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group (Appendix H), Conceptual Grading Plan by Adkan Engineers.

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

**Findings of Fact:**

A-C) The site is relatively flat, and no grading would occur with a slope steepness greater than 2:1 (horizontal to vertical). The proposed bio retention basin in the northwest corner of the site would be approximately 3.5 feet in depth and would have slopes ranging from 2:1 to 4:1. The proposed overflow basin in the eastern portion of the site will have a slope that is approximately 13 feet in height, but would not be steeper than 2:1, so the exceedance of 10 feet in height would be less than significant. All grading shall conform to the 2016 California Building Code Chapters 17, 18 and Appendix-J as amended by Ordinance No. 457. The Conceptual Grading Plan by Adkan Engineers (2020) does not propose grading that would exceed 2:1 slope. No sewage disposal systems would be negated because none exist on site and the Project would be connecting into the existing 10-inch sewer line located within Van Buren Blvd. right-of-way. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

<b>18. Soils</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2019), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source(s):** U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Surveys, Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection Geotechnical Engineering Investigation performed by Salem Engineering Group (Appendix H).

**Findings of Fact:**

A) Construction activities associated with the Project would involve earth movement and the exposure of soil, which would temporarily increase erosion susceptibility. In the long-term, development of the subject property would increase impervious surface cover in the form of the building footprint, parking, and bioretention basin. The Project would be required to adhere to standard regulatory requirements, including, but not limited to, requirements imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order WQ 2017-0023-DWQ as well as the California Construction General Permit for site development activities and the associated State order for ongoing operations. In addition, a Project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) that includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented to minimize water pollutants including sedimentation in stormwater runoff and no significant loss of topsoil would occur. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- B) According to USDA's Web Soil Survey, the Project site is underlain with nine different soil types, most of which are either sand or loamy sand. These soils generally have a "Low" shrink swell potential (USDA, n.d.). As a result, the Project is not located on an expansive soil. Impacts would be less than significant.
- C) The Project would not install any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems with the exception of temporary serviced portable toilets during harvest season and would connect with existing sewer infrastructure. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

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

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

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

Findings of Fact:

- A) Based on Salem's soil boring logs for the subject site, surface soils consist predominantly of soft to stiff sandy silt; and loose to very dense clayey sand, silty sand, poorly graded sand, and well-graded sand. Soils of this composition and consistency have been shown to possess good resistance to wind erosion. According to the County of Riverside General Plan Figure S-8, *Wind Erosion Susceptibility Areas*, the Project site appears to be located within a Moderate Wind Erodibility Rating area. The Project would be required to implement Best Management Practices for controlling fugitive dust during construction. During operation, the site would be mostly covered by buildings, pavement and landscaping, which would minimize long-term wind erosion and blowsand potential. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS** Would the Project:

**20. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

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

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

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

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan, Riverside County Climate Action Plan (“CAP”), Project Application Materials, Air Quality/Greenhouse Emissions Study by Salem Engineering Group (2019, revised 2021) (Appendix A).

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The County of Riverside’s Climate Action Plan Update (CAP) describes Riverside County’s Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions for the year 2017 and forecasts how these emissions will increase into 2020, 2030, and 2050. It also includes strategies to reduce emissions to a level consistent with the State of California’s emissions reduction targets. The CAP sets a target to reduce community-wide GHG emission emissions by 15 percent from 2008 levels by 2020, 49 percent by 2030, and 83 percent by 2050.

The Riverside County CAP also states that projects that do not exceed the CAP’s screening threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year are considered to have less than significant GHG emissions and are consistent with the County’s CAP. Therefore, to determine whether the Project’s GHG emissions are significant, the analysis in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment uses the SCAQMD local agency Tier 3 threshold for all residential and commercial land uses under CEQA. For the purpose of this evaluation, a threshold of 3,000 CO<sub>2</sub>e is used to assess significance of greenhouse gas emissions. Projects that do not exceed emissions of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year are also required to include the following efficiency measures:

- Energy efficiency matching or exceeding the Title 24 requirements in effect as of January 2017, and
- Water conservation measures that matches the California Green Building Code in effect as of January 2017.

Projects that are over emissions of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year are required to use Screening Tables to reduce GHG emissions impacts. Projects that garner 100 points would be consistent with the reduction quantities anticipated in the County’s CAP and impacts would be considered reduced to less than significant levels.

According to the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment that was conducted for the Project, the proposed Project would generate an estimated total of 73.4 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions during construction. The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of construction emissions to operational emissions over the Project lifetime. Amortized over 30 years, the construction of the Project will generate approximately 2.44 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e on an annualized basis.

According to the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions study prepared for this Project and appended to this document, the proposed Project would generate an estimated total of 72 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions during construction. The SCAQMD recommends amortizing construction emissions over a period of 30 years to estimate the contribution of construction emissions to operational emissions over the Project lifetime. Amortized over 30 years, the construction of the Project will generate approximately 2.4 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e on an annualized basis.

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the Project would generate a total of 508 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions annually from operations. By adding the amortized construction



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

emissions results with the operational annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions the Project will produce 510.4 metric tons over a 30-year period. This cumulative level is below the SCAQMD's recommended Tier 3 threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions for residential and commercial land uses as well as the targets set forth in Riverside County's Climate Action Plan. Therefore, the Project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment and impacts are considered less than significant.

B) The California State Legislature adopted AB 32 in 2006, which requires the state's GHG emissions by 2020 to meet the GHG emissions level created in 1990, and adopted AB 197 and SB 32 in 2016, which require the state's GHG emissions to be 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

Based on an evaluation of the methodology to determine GHG emissions calculations in the legislation above, the Project does not have the potential to conflict with their provisions nor the goals of any other applicable GHG reduction plan or policy. Because the Project is not expected to have a significant impact on greenhouse gas emissions, there would be no conflicts with applicable plans, policies, or regulations regarding such emissions. This includes the Riverside County's Climate Action Plan, which details GHG reduction programs and regulations. The CAP specifically addresses GHG emissions in the County with respect to emissions from transportation, energy consumption, area source emissions, solid waste generation, agricultural land uses, and industrial Projects. The 2019 CAP includes an update to the County's GHG inventory for the year 2017 and sets a target to reduce communitywide GHG emissions by 15 percent from 2008 baseline levels by 2020, 49 percent by 2030, and 83 percent by 2050.

Based on the results of the CalEEMod Model, the Project would generate a total of 508 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions annually from operations. By adding the amortized construction emissions results with the operational annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions the Project will produce 510.4 metric tons over a 30-year period. This cumulative level is below the SCAQMD recommended Tier 3 threshold of 3,000 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions for residential and commercial land uses and therefore not in conflict with the provisions detailed in the Riverside County CAP. Impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

#### HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the Project:

##### 21. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

☐
☐
☒
☐

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐
☐
☒
☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter (1/4) mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source(s):** Project Application Materials, Department of Toxic Substances Control GeoTracker database (accessed in July 2020) and the Phase I ESA prepared by Salem Engineering Group (Appendix E).

#### Findings of Fact:

- A) Construction of the proposed Project would involve the use of construction-related chemicals. These include but are not limited to hydraulic fluids, motor oil, grease, runoff, and other related fluids and lubricants. The construction activities would involve the disposal and recycling of materials, trash, and debris. The County's General Plan Safety Element addresses potential hazards in the County and identifies goals and policies to reduce risks and damages associated with hazards, including disposal of hazardous materials due to human activities.

The proposed Project has the potential to expose nearby residents located within 25 meters of the proposed Project to toxic air contaminants, such as benzene, which is a known carcinogen. The potential health impacts to sensitive receptors from the exposures to benzene during the operation of the proposed Project have been reviewed and based on the SCAQMD health risk tool the Gas Station throughput of Gasoline at 416,667 gallons per month or 5.0 million gallons per year will not have a significant impact to the sensitive receptors in this area.

The proposed Project would construct a convenience store and gas station on-site. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the Project would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control regulations, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Project and relevant fueling facilities would require that review and approval would be conducted by Riverside County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Branch to verify compliance with applicable California Health and Safety codes, County of Riverside Ordinances and other applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the County of Riverside Hazardous Materials and Management Branch prior to the installation of the fueling facilities. In addition, as part of any removal of construction-generated hazardous waste from the Project site, hazardous waste generators are required to use a

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

certified hazardous waste transportation company, which must ship hazardous waste to a permitted facility for treatment, storage, recycling, or disposal.

During operation, the gas station would require the routine transport of petroleum fuels to the Project site to refuel the underground storage tanks (USTs) that would supply the fuel pumps. On the Project site, tanker trucks would transfer fuels to USTs, which would be permitted by the County of Riverside's Department of Environmental Health's Hazardous Materials Management Branch (HMMB). Permitting requires the submission of UST plans to the HMMB prior to installations, modifications, repairs, or removals. Although inadequate maintenance of USTs may result in leaks, CCR Title 23, Chapter 16 and Riverside County Ordinance 617 mandate regular monitoring, maintenance, and inspection of USTs, which would ensure the safe and appropriate operation of these facilities. Gas station patrons would regularly use hazardous materials while dispensing gasoline from fuel pumps. Refueling activities release benzene into the air; however, benzene emissions can be reduced by more than 90 percent by the vapor recovery systems required at fuel pumps. Nevertheless, benzene emissions may result in near source health risk (CARB 2005). CARB recommends siting sensitive landuses, such as residences, at least 50 feet from typical gasoline dispensing facilities and at least 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities (i.e., facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) (CARB 2005). The nearest residence to the fueling facilities is approximately 165 feet north of the Project site, which exceeds 50 feet and the distance reduces impacts to less than significant levels.

According to SCAQMD Public Notification Procedures for Facilities under the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588) and Rule 1402, updated October 2020, facility owners or operators subject to AB 2588 must submit a comprehensive air toxics emissions inventory every four years. Based on this update, along with other parameters such as receptor distance, potency, and multi-pathway exposures, the SCAQMD staff conducts further auditing to verify the Total Facility Score. If the Total Facility Score is greater than 10, the facility does not pass and SCAQMD staff notifies the facility that they are subject to Rule 1402 and they will be required to prepare an Air Toxics Inventory Report and Health Risk Assessment as well as notify the public pursuant to SCAQMD's Public Notification Procedures.

The preliminary Health Risk Table below, as indicated in the AQ/GHG study by Salem Engineering Group, shows that the Project passes the below 10 Total Facility Score and would not increase Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk (MICR) for nearby sensitive receptors. Because the MICR value is less than 10, and "passes" the Total Facility Score as highlighted below in green, MICR is not considered significant per the model.

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

# **GASOLINE DISPENSING SERVICE STATION**

(Procedure Version 8.1 & Package N, September 1, 2017) - Risk Tool V1.1

AN: Gas Station

Facility Name: Gas Station Woodcrest

Deem Complete Date: 2020

Storage Tank Type: Underground  
 Annual Throughput: 5 million gallons /year  
 T-BACT: YES

MET Station: Riverside Airport  
 Distance to Resident: 47 meter  
 Distance to Commercial: 10 meter

MICR Calculation: MICR = MICR per 1 Million gallons/yr x Annual Throughput (Million gallons/yr)  
 HIA & HIC Calculation: Negligible compared to Cancer risk and is not calculated.

MICR Result

	Resident	Commercial
MICR	9.868	1.705
MICR ≤ 10	<b>PASS</b>	<b>PASS</b>

Interpolation for MICR from Nearest Distances

	Residential			Commercial		
	near	actual	far	near	actual	far
Distance (meter)	25	<b>47</b>	50	10	<b>10</b>	25
MICR (per 1 million gasoline gallon throughput per year)	4.141	<b>1.9736</b>	1.678	0.341	<b>0.341</b>	0.341

Look up from Table 12 - MICR for Underground Storage Tank

Station	Receptor	Downwind Distance (m)							
		25	50	75	100	200	300	500	1000
Riverside Airport	Resident	4.141	1.678	0.922	0.588	0.177	0.088	0.038	0.013
	Commercial	0.341	0.138	0.076	0.049	0.015	0.007	0.003	0.001

With mandatory regulatory compliance with federal, state, and local laws, potential hazardous materials impacts associated with long-term operation of the Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

- B) The proposed Project would construct a convenience store and gas station on-site. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the Project would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. In addition, as part of any removal of construction-generated hazardous waste from the Project site, hazardous waste generators are required to use a certified hazardous waste transportation company, which must ship hazardous waste to a permitted facility for treatment, storage, recycling, or disposal.

During operation, the gas station would require the routine transport of petroleum fuels to the Project site to refuel the underground storage tanks (USTs) that would supply the fuel pumps. On the Project site, trucks would transfer fuels to the USTs, which would be permitted by the County of Riverside's Department of Environmental Health's Hazardous Materials Management Branch (HMMB). Permitting requires the submission of UST plans to the HMMB prior to installations, modifications, repairs, or removals. Further, Riverside County Ordinance No. 617 mandates regular monitoring, maintenance, and inspection of

USTs, which would verify the safe and appropriate operation of these facilities. Fueling station customers would regularly use hazardous materials while dispensing gasoline from fuel pumps. Refueling activities release benzene into the air; however, benzene emissions can be reduced by more than 90 percent by the vapor recovery systems required at fuel pumps. Nevertheless, benzene emissions may result in near source health risk. CARB recommends siting sensitive land uses, such as residences, at least 50 feet from typical gasoline dispensing facilities and at least 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities (i.e., facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) (CARB 2005). Improper handling of gasoline and other auto-related chemicals on-site may result in spills. However, the transport, use and storage of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations, such as requirements that spills be cleaned up immediately and all wastes and spills control materials be properly disposed of at approved disposal facilities. Therefore, the proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

- C) The proposed Project is in a developed area and is well-served by existing roads. No construction equipment or operations would necessitate lane closures. All Project connections to existing sewer and water infrastructure would not necessitate lane closures such that any emergency plan be disrupted as the connections would occur entirely on-site with the exception of trenching short distances to connect to existing utilities in the northern right-of-way along Van Buren Boulevard and the undergrounding of existing elevated power lines along a short portion of Chicago Avenue. The contractor would be required to maintain adequate emergency access for emergency vehicles during construction activities. As a result, construction of the proposed Project would have no impact on emergency response or evacuation plans. Project operation would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan because the existing roadways that would provide access to the site would not change significantly and would continue to function. Impacts would be considered less than significant.
- D) The proposed Project is within one-quarter mile (property line to property line) of Woodcrest Christian School, located to the east of the Project site on the south side of Van Buren Boulevard. However, compliance with all federal, state, and local laws with respect to fuel stations, detailed above, would ensure that the school is not impacted by either the construction or operation of the proposed Project. Utilizing Google Earth, a measurement was taken from the approximate location of the fueling facilities within the Project site to the western property boundary of Woodcrest Christian School and the result measured 0.27 mile, which is over a quarter mile from the school property. Further, the Health Risk Table above demonstrates Project compliance with MICR risk factors at nearby sensitive receptors. Impacts would be considered less than significant.
- E) The Phase I ESA for the Project found no evidence of aboveground or underground storage tanks and did not identify any environmental concerns associated with the historical land uses at the Project site or surrounding properties (GCI, 2019, p. 4). SALEM's review of historical aerial photographs indicates that the subject property has historically been undeveloped land since at least 1931. Based upon SALEM's review of historical aerial photographs, and a site reconnaissance, there is a low potential for Recognized Environmental Concerns (RECs) to

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

exist in connection with the historical use of the subject property. Accordingly, a less than significant impact would occur with respect to 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 associated with the existing conditions at the Project site.

According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control GeoTracker database and the Phase I ESA, there are no hazardous materials sites on or adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

<b>22. Airports</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two (2) miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

A-D) There are no airports or heliports within two miles of the Project site that could cause a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area. However, the site does lie within the authority of the March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. The Project site is located within Zone E of the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which requires Project review by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). A letter dated September 12, 2019 from ALUC stated that they reviewed the Project and found it to be consistent with the 2014 March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan provided that the County of Riverside applies conditions presented in the letter. Should the Project plans change, further ALUC review shall be required. Compliance with ALUC's conditions would reduce airport hazard impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> Would the Project:				
<b>23. Water Quality Impacts</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk the release of pollutants due to Project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-9 "Special Flood Hazard Areas," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database, Preliminary Hydrology Report prepared by Adkan Engineers (Appendix I).

Findings of Fact:

- A) The Project would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements to cover removal of vegetation, grading, excavation, or any other activity that causes disturbance of one acre or more. The permit requires the developer to reduce or eliminate non-storm water discharges into stormwater systems and to implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP would identify pollutant sources that may affect the quality of discharges of stormwater associated with construction activities. The SWPPP also requires the use of stormwater pollution control measures to reduce pollutants in stormwater discharges from the site.

Further, a NPDES permit requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), which was prepared for the Project by Adkan Engineers in August 2019. The Preliminary WQMP was prepared to comply with Riverside County Ordinance No. 827. The WQMP includes mandatory

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

compliance with BMPs and NPDES permit requirements. The County would review and approve the WQMP to verify all potential pollutants of concern are minimized and treated prior to being discharged from the Project site into the existing storm drain system. Compliance with the regulations above would reduce water quality impacts to less than significant levels and the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.

- B) The proposed Project would create impervious surfaces beyond existing conditions on portions of the site as it is currently undeveloped. This would include the footprint of the retail store as well as associated access, parking, pump stations, and car wash. However, the Project will occupy only portions of the 2.48-acre site ensuring that groundwater recharge occurring through pervious surfaces on the site would not be significantly reduced as compared to existing conditions upon Project implementation.

The Project is located within the service area of Western Municipal Water District (WMWD). According to WMWD's Draft 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), WMWD uses local groundwater from seven different groundwater basins. Each of the basins is either adjudicated and managed by a Watermaster or managed by a Groundwater Sustainability Agency to ensure long term reliable supply, even in dry years. The Project is relatively small in size (under three acres) and it is not anticipated to substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. The Project is consistent with the existing Riverside County General Plan Land Use Foundation Component of Community Development (CD), the Area Plan Land Use Designation of Community Retail (CR), and the zoning designation of Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). Development of the Project is anticipated in the County's General Plan. Water Districts typically utilize General Plan buildout projections to account for water supply demands, which include groundwater use. Because of the management measures described in WMWD's UWMP, long term groundwater reliability would not be an issue (as projected out to year 2045). Therefore, the Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Impacts would be less than significant.

- C) According to the Preliminary Hydrology Report prepared by Adkan Engineers (March 2020), only a portion of the lot will be developed in order to conserve the existing hydrology with regard to the offsite flows that drain onto the lot and into the existing drainage pipe that drains offsite flows into the shallow ravine north of Iris Ave. The developed area drains northwest, conserving the natural drainage pattern where it enters a bio-retention basin that is sized for water quality purposes, and with additional underground storage for basin routing purposes. The bioretention portion of the basin was designed taking off-site improvement area into account. The bioretention is oversized to over mitigate on-site for off-site improvements. Details regarding this design can be found in the preliminary water quality management plan (PWQMP). Impacts would be less than significant.

The additional underground storage was provided given that the site exists within an area classified as susceptible to hydrologic conditions of concern (HCOC) per the PWQMP. As a result, a unit hydrograph analysis of the pre-developed and post-developed site was also done in addition to a rational hydrology analysis to size drainage pipes and structures. Ultimately, the basin storage project design features took into account the storage provided by the water quality feature (proposed bio-retention storage in the northwest portion of the site) in addition to the proposed storage that would be provided by underground detention units such as proprietary Eco-Rain Tanks. The existing drainage pattern would not be altered and would



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

continue to flow in its existing pattern. There would be enhancements to the existing drainage pattern with project implementation because of proposed water quality and detention facilities. The project would not alter the course of a typical constant water flowing stream or river because none of those water features exist on site. Impacts to riparian/riverine habitat will be mitigated to less than significant levels (see Biological Resources section). Therefore, the Project would not 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

- D) Erosion of soils could occur due to a storm event during Project development. Development of the Project would disturb a portion of the site and therefore is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Permit for discharges of storm water associated with construction activity. Various construction activities would include, but may not be limited to, clearing, grading, and disturbances to the ground such as stockpiling or excavation. The SWRCB General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must list Best Management Practices (BMPs) so that soil erosion would be minimized. Compliance with BMPs is anticipated to ensure that the Project does not cause substantial erosion/siltation on-site or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

- E, F) According to the County's GIS (Map My County), the Project site is not within a delineated Riverside County Flood Control flood hazard area. The WQMP states that through Project development, post development will maintain the existing drainage pattern to keep the runoff draining to the north to an existing shallow ravine north of Iris Avenue.

A hydrology study was prepared for the Project. It found that the proposed basin and drainage facilities will convey the 10- and 100-year storm events. It seems that the post-development flow rate increases slightly in comparison to the pre-development for the 10-year and 100-year analyses, but this is because only a portion of the entire site is being developed. An emergency spillway is provided as part of the bioretention basin to allow runoff to overflow off-site in case the primary bioretention overflow catch basin becomes clogged.

Sufficient basin storage is proposed designed with an orifice that is sized to route the storm flows to simulate the predeveloped 2-year 24-hour storm event in order to provide the mitigation as required by the Santa Ana Region Water Quality Management Plan requirements to address hydrologic conditions of concern (HCOCs).

The additional underground storage was provided given that the site exists within an area classified as susceptible to hydrologic conditions of concern per the PWQMP. As a result, a unit hydrograph analysis of the pre-developed and post-developed was also done in addition to a rational hydrology analysis to size drainage pipes and structures. Ultimately, the basin storage took into account the storage provided by the water quality feature (the bio-retention storage) in addition to the storage that would be provided by underground detention units such as proprietary Eco-Rain Tanks. This was sized and routed to outlet the pre-developed 2-year 24-hour flow rate in the post-development scenario. It should also be noted that the off-site improvement area was included in the proposed unit hydrograph analysis to over-mitigate on-site for HCOCs. which are land conditions that are anticipated to cause hydromodification impact. That is, the on-site storage volume was increased, and the outlet orifice sized to

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

accommodate the additional impervious area due to off-site street improvements (widening of Van Buren and Iris Ave) based on the basin routing calculations.

The Project would be required to comply with the Preliminary WQMP and hydrology study recommendations, as well as other permitting/approving agencies conditions. The Project is not anticipated to substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on-site or off-site. The Project would not create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

- G) As discussed in the hydrology and water quality analysis above, the hydrology study performed for this Project indicates that the site would not have significantly different surface hydrology as a result of Project implementation. The Project would not propose structures or facilities that would impede or redirect flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant.
- H) The proposed Project is located inland, approximately 30 miles northeast of the Pacific Ocean. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood maps, the Project site is located an area of minimal flood hazard. There are no bodies of water in the vicinity of the site that could experience seiche conditions. No impacts would occur.
- I) The WQMP includes mandatory compliance of BMPs as well as compliance with NPDES Permit requirements. The County would review and approve the WQMP, which would ensure that all potential pollutants of concern are minimized or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the Project site. The review and approval of the WQMP BMPs would verify that the Project does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan. As stated above, groundwater supplies are expected to remain constant until 2045. The Proposed Project does not include a General Plan Amendment and groundwater supplies have been accounted for by WMWD as projected in the County's General Plan. Therefore, Project implementation with the proposed uses is anticipated in the General Plan. Impacts would be considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

#### LAND USE/PLANNING Would the Project:

##### 24. Land Use

- a) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- b) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

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

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

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

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The land use at the Project site is governed by the County of Riverside General Plan Land Use Element as well as the County's zoning ordinance. Both the Land Use Map and zoning ordinance designate the Project site for commercial land uses such as the fuel station and convenience store proposed. The C-P-S zone allows retail uses such as the proposed gas station, convenience store, and car wash with a Conditional use Permit (CUP). No impacts would occur.
- B) The Project site consists of undeveloped land surrounded by existing roadway right-of-way, commercial, open space, and residential land uses. The completion of the Project would not divide the existing community because the existing vehicular circulation system will remain the same. The Project proposes a meandering sidewalk along Van Buren Boulevard and improved sidewalks along Chicago Avenue and Iris Avenue, which is anticipated to improve pedestrian connectivity in the area. The Project would not create any physical barriers such as storm channels, bridges or easements that would divide the existing community. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

<b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b> Would the Project:				
<b>25. Mineral Resources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Potentially expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing, or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

**Findings of Fact:**

A-C) The Project site is designated as a built-up area by the California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology. This designation indicates that the area does not have the capacity to produce mineral resources. The Project site and its surroundings are not currently being mined for mineral resource extraction and no mines or quarries are proposed or exist on the site or within the site vicinity that could potentially expose people or property to hazards from existing or abandoned quarries or mines. The Riverside County General Plan's Multipurpose Open Space Element discusses the presence of mineral resources in the County and goals, policies, and objectives for their conservation and extraction, as well as maps the aforementioned Mineral Resource Zones. Project implementation would not affect mineral resources in Riverside County as the Project site is not a known site of significant mineral deposits and Project implementation

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

would therefore not affect any goal, policy, or objectives regarding mineral resources in the relevant sections of the General Plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**NOISE** Would the Project result in:

**26. Airport Noise**

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

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

☐
☐
☐
☒

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure S-20 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map, Project Noise Study by Salem Engineering Group (2019) (Appendix D).

Findings of Fact:

A-B) There are no public or private airports within two miles of the Project site. March Air Reserve Base is approximately four miles to the east of the Project site, and the Project lies in Zone E of the associated Airport Land Use Plan. However, the ALUC determined in September 2019 that Project implementation would be consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**27. Noise Effects by the Project**

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

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

#### Findings of Fact:

A, B) The methodology for the following analysis, including all figures and maps detailing findings, can be found in Appendix D.

Project construction would generate an average noise level of approximately 67 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at the nearest commercial property and 74 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at the nearest residential property. As shown in Table 2, ambient noise levels in the Project site vicinity range between 55 dBA  $L_{eq}$  along Chicago Avenue and 76 dBA  $L_{eq}$  along Van Buren Boulevard. Therefore, construction noise would generate a temporary increase in ambient noise levels at the nearest residential and commercial properties along Chicago Avenue and Iris Avenue. However, construction noise levels at the nearest residential and commercial properties would not exceed the FTA daytime 8-hour construction noise thresholds of 80 dBA  $L_{eq}$  for residential uses and 85 dBA  $L_{eq}$  for commercial uses. In addition, construction would not occur during the RMC's prohibited hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September and 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May. Therefore, impacts from construction noise would be less than significant.

The Project would introduce on-site stationary sources of operational noise, including HVAC equipment and a carwash. Assumptions for these sources are discussed in Section 3.1, *Methodology*. Daytime and nighttime noise levels at the nearest properties from each of the noise sources and their combined noise levels are shown in the tables below. Receiver locations and noise level contours are shown on Figure 4 of Appendix D.

Combined operational activities on the Project site would generate daytime noise levels up to 45.6 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at nearby residential properties and 35.6 dBA  $L_{eq}$  at nearby commercial properties. The combined operational noise from the HVAC units and the car wash would not exceed the County's daytime exterior and interior noise standards at Receivers R1 through R7 or the City of Riverside daytime exterior noise standards at Receivers R8 and R9. The City of Riverside Noise Standards are relevant as the Project site borders City boundaries, and the residents in those areas are protected by City rather than County noise standards. In addition, as shown below, the combined operational noise from the HVAC units would not exceed the County's nighttime exterior and interior noise standards at Receivers R1 through R7 or the City of Riverside nighttime exterior noise standards at Receivers R8 and R9. Therefore, operational noise impacts would be less than significant. In addition, as shown below, the combined operational noise from the HVAC units as well as car wash noise level during both the day and night would not exceed the County's nighttime exterior and interior noise standards at Receivers R1 through R7 or the City of Riverside nighttime exterior noise standards at Receivers R8 and R9 according to the Project Noise Study. Therefore, operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

The Project would generate new vehicle trips that would increase noise levels on nearby roadways, which would occur primarily on Chicago Avenue and Van Buren Boulevard. The increase in roadway noise with the addition of Project traffic is shown in Table 10. Existing noise levels along Van Buren Boulevard currently exceed the County's 60 dBA  $L_{dn}$  exterior land use compatibility standard; however, existing noise levels along Chicago Avenue do not exceed the County's standard. Project-related traffic would generate a noise level increase of approximately 0.1 dBA  $L_{dn}$  on Van Buren Boulevard and 4.0 dBA  $L_{dn}$  along Chicago Avenue. Therefore, the Project's traffic noise level increase along Van Buren Boulevard (a location in excess of 60 dBA

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

Ldn for exterior areas) would not exceed 3 dBA, and the Project's traffic noise level increase along Chicago Avenue (a location not subject to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA Ldn for exterior areas) would not exceed 5 dBA.

To summarize the above discussion and the associated tables from the noise study prepared for the Project and appended to this document, there are no significant impacts associated with Project construction, stationary long-term operational sources, or ambient increases on adjacent roadways as a result of Project construction. This is based on the FICON approach to noise impact evaluation, which is based on 5 dBA increase if the Project is under 50 dBA CNEL, 3 dBA for 60-65 CNEL, and 1.5 dBA if over 65.

In addition, Riverside County General Plan Policy N.4.1 addresses exterior noise levels, specifically that they must not exceed 45 dBA Leq from 10 p.m. – 7:00 a.m. and 65 dBA Leq from 7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m. As shown in the noise study and the tables in this document, the Project would comply with this policy.

Impacts would be less than significant.

Receiver	Land Use Designation	Exterior Noise Level (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )		Combined Daytime Exterior Noise Level (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )	Daytime Exterior Noise Threshold (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> ) <sup>1</sup>	Threshold Exceeded?	Combined Daytime Interior Noise Level (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	Daytime Interior Noise Threshold (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> ) <sup>3</sup>	Threshold Exceeded?
		HVAC	Car Wash						
R1	Retail Commercial	11.6	19.2	33.5	N/A	N/A	8.5	N/A	N/A
R2	Retail Commercial	13.7	20.8	34.9	N/A	N/A	9.9	N/A	N/A
R3	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	16.3	21.5	24.8	57.2	No	< 1.0	47.2	No
R4	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	20.6	45.4	45.6	57.2	No	20.6	47.2	No
R5	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	16.9	31.5	34.6	57.2	No	9.6	47.2	No
R6	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	8.0	23.2	25.3	57.2	No	< 1.0	47.2	No
R7	Retail Commercial	4.3	35.0	35.6	N/A	N/A	10.3	N/A	N/A
R8*	Commercial	4.7	16.8	21.7	65	No	< 1.0	N/A	No
R9*	Commercial	10.8	21.9	25.7	65	No	< 1.0	N/A	No

\* = City of Riverside, N/A = not applicable

<sup>1</sup> Based on the County's exterior sound level standards in Table 4 for R1 through R7 and the City's exterior noise standards shown in Table 5 for R8 and R9. The County's exterior sound level standards were converted from L<sub>eq</sub>[10] to L<sub>eq</sub>[1h] to provide an appropriate comparison with the modeled noise levels.

<sup>2</sup> Standard construction techniques for wood-frame construction buildings required under the California Building Code typically achieve a minimum 25-dBA reduction from exterior sources at interior locations when the windows are in a closed position. Therefore, interior noise levels assumed a 25 dB reduction from the building facades.

<sup>3</sup> Based on the County's interior noise standards shown in Table 4. The County's interior sound level standards were converted from L<sub>eq</sub>[10] to L<sub>eq</sub>[1h] to provide an appropriate comparison with the modeled noise levels.

Note: Daytime hours are defined as 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Daytime noise levels assumed operation of the HVAC units and car wash.

See Figure 4 for receiver locations.

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Less than  
Significant  
with  
Mitigation  
Incorporated

Less  
Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

Receiver	Land Use Designation	HVAC Exterior Noise Level (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> )	Nighttime Exterior Noise Threshold (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> ) <sup>1</sup>	Threshold Exceeded?	Nighttime Interior Noise Level (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> ) <sup>1</sup>	Nighttime Interior Noise Threshold (dBA L <sub>eq</sub> ) <sup>2</sup>	Threshold Exceeded?
R1	Retail Commercial	11.6	N/A	No	< 1.0	N/A	No
R2	Retail Commercial	13.7	N/A	No	< 1.0	N/A	No
R3	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	16.3	37.2	No	< 1.0	32.2	No
R4	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	20.6	37.2	No	< 1.0	32.2	No
R5	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	16.9	37.2	No	< 1.0	32.2	No
R6	Rural Community – Very Low Density Residential	8.0	37.2	No	< 1.0	32.2	No
R7	Retail Commercial	4.3	55	No	< 1.0	N/A	No
R8*	Commercial	4.7	55	No	< 1.0	N/A	No
R9*	Commercial	10.8	55	No	< 1.0	N/A	No

\* = City of Riverside, N/A = not applicable

<sup>1</sup> Based on the County's exterior sound level standards in Table 4 for R1 through R7 and the City's exterior noise standards shown in Table 5 for R8 and R9. The County's exterior sound level standards were converted from L<sub>eq</sub>[10] to L<sub>eq</sub>[1h] to provide an appropriate comparison with the modeled noise levels.

<sup>2</sup> Standard construction techniques for wood-frame construction buildings required under the California Building Code typically achieve a minimum 25-dBA reduction from exterior sources at interior locations when the windows are in a closed position. Therefore, interior noise levels assumed a 25 dB reduction from the building facades.

<sup>3</sup> Based on the County's interior noise standards shown in Table 4. The County's interior sound level standards were converted from L<sub>eq</sub>[10] to L<sub>eq</sub>[1h] to provide an appropriate comparison with the modeled noise levels.

Note: Nighttime hours are defined as 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Nighttime noise levels assumed operation of HVAC units only.

See Figure 4 for receiver locations.

Construction activities would require the operation of construction vehicles that are known sources of vibration. However, no development is immediately adjacent to the site, and construction would be temporary in nature. No construction activities would occur close enough to existing occupied structures such as residences such that they could be affected by construction-generated vibration.

Operational activities at the site would be limited to truck trips servicing the commercial/retail location and typical traffic from employees and customers, discussed below. However, as stated above, no operational activities would occur close enough to existing occupied structures such that they could be affected by operational-generated vibration. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES:</b>				
<b>28. Paleontological Resources</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature?				

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity," Riverside County Map My County Environmental Layer.

**Findings of Fact:**

Riverside County's Map My County Geographic Information Systems interface was consulted to determine the likelihood of paleontological resources that could be found on the site. According to the County's General Plan and Map My County, this site has been mapped as having a "Low Potential" for paleontological resources. This category encompasses lands for which previous field surveys and documentation demonstrates a low potential for containing significant paleontological resources subject to adverse impacts. As such, this project is not anticipated to require any direct mitigation for paleontological resources. However, the Project will be conditioned to follow the procedures below should fossil remains be encountered during site development:

1. All site earthmoving shall be ceased in the area of where the fossil remains are encountered. Earthmoving activities may be diverted to other areas of the site.
2. The owner of the property shall be immediately notified of the fossil discovery who will in turn immediately notify the County Geologist of the discovery.
3. The applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist approved by the County of Riverside.
4. The paleontologist shall determine the significance of the encountered fossil remains.
5. Paleontological monitoring of earthmoving activities will continue thereafter on an as-needed basis by the paleontologist during all earthmoving activities that may expose sensitive strata. Earthmoving activities in areas of the project area where previously undisturbed strata will be buried but not otherwise disturbed will not be monitored. The supervising paleontologist will have the authority to reduce monitoring once he/she determines the probability of encountering any additional fossils has dropped below an acceptable level.
6. If fossil remains are encountered by earthmoving activities when the paleontologist is not onsite, these activities will be diverted around the fossil site and the paleontologist called to the site immediately to recover the remains.
7. Any recovered fossil remains will be prepared to the point of identification and identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible by knowledgeable paleontologists. The remains then will be curated (assigned and labeled with museum\* repository fossil specimen numbers and corresponding fossil site numbers, as appropriate; places in specimen trays and, if necessary, vials with completed specimen data cards) and catalogued, an associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data will be archived (specimen and site numbers and corresponding data entered into appropriate museum repository catalogs and computerized data bases) at the museum repository by a laboratory technician. The remains will then be accessioned into the museum repository fossil collection, where they will be



permanently stored, maintained, and, along with associated specimen and site data, made available for future study by qualified scientific investigators. \* Per the County of Riverside "SABER Policy", paleontological fossils found in the County of Riverside should, by preference, be directed to the Western Science Center in the City of Hemet.

8. The property owner and/or applicant on whose land the paleontological fossils are discovered shall provide appropriate funding for monitoring, reporting, delivery and curating the fossils at the institution where the fossils will be placed, and will provide confirmation to the County that such funding has been paid to the institution.

Compliance with the conditions for inadvertent paleontological finds would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required unless inadvertent paleontological resources are uncovered. In such an instance, monitoring per the condition above would be required.

#### POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the Project:

##### 29. Housing

- a) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?
- c) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

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

#### Findings of Fact:

- A, B) The proposed Project is commercial in nature and does not propose new homes. Employment would not be generated at levels such that new housing would need to be built and, because the site is currently undeveloped, no existing housing would be displaced. Therefore, the proposed Project would not induce population growth, displace housing or people, or create a demand for additional housing. No impacts would occur.
- C) The proposed Project is to be developed as a business that would serve the local community/region. The proposed Project would be a business that would employ several people anticipated to come from the local area and would not result in a population increase above what the General Plan Housing Element has projected. The Project operation is not anticipated to draw a substantial amount of people to the area to the extent that it would necessitate the extension of roads or new public services (fire, police, schools, and other essential services), as

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

discussed in the Public Services section below. Existing infrastructure will not be extended in such a way that population growth would occur. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

**30. Fire Services**

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Safety Element

**Findings of Fact:** The site is served by the Riverside County Fire Department's Station No. 8 at 16533 Trisha Way, approximately 1.5 miles southwest of the Project site. Project features include a fueling station, car wash facilities, parking, signage, lighting, and a bioretention basin would be constructed. None of these Project features change the nature or intensity of population or structures on or adjacent to the Project site. However, the Project does propose both fuel service and storage. These Project features would be subject to strict regulations at the State level, detailed above under "Hazards."

The Project is a business that would attract primarily local customers and periodic customers from outside the region. As a result, no new fire protection facilities would be required, and response times would not be significantly impacted. Impacts would be less than significant as the site is adequately served by fire protection and would not require additional protection upon Project implementation. Further, the Project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to reduce impacts to fire protection services per Riverside County Ordinance No. 659. Payment of development impact fees would reduce impacts to fire services to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**31. Sheriff Services**

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan

**Findings of Fact:** The site is served by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department Perris Station at 137 N. Perris Boulevard. The Project would introduce a new building structure and employees to the Project site, which could result in an incremental increase in demand for police protection services. However, it is not anticipated to require or result in the construction of new or physically altered police facilities because the new facility and uses would not significantly increase demand on such services. The Project would employ several staff, which is not considered significant, and would attract primarily local customers and periodic customers from outside the region such that new demands on sheriff services would not be at a level such that new facilities would need to be built, nor would response times be

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

impacted. The Project site receives adequate police protection service, and its implementation would not result in the need for new or physically altered police facilities. Further, the Project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to reduce impacts to sheriff protection services per Riverside County Ordinance No. 659. Payment of development impact fees would reduce impacts to sheriff services to less than significant levels.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

### 32. Schools

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

**Source(s)**: School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact: Development of the site as proposed by the Project would not create a direct demand for public school services, as the subject property would contain non-residential uses that would not directly generate any school-aged children requiring public education. The addition of employment-generating uses on the Project site would assist the County in achieving its goal to provide a better jobs/housing balance within the County. However, the proposed Project is not expected to draw a substantial number of new residents to the region as employees are likely to be already local and would therefore not indirectly generate school-aged students requiring public education. Because the Project would not directly generate students and is not expected to indirectly draw students to the area, and because the Project would attract primarily local customers, the Project would not cause or contribute to a need to construct new or physically altered public school facilities. Impacts would be less than significant. Further, the Project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees pursuant to SB 50 to reduce impacts to local schools. Implementation of the Project would not result in substantial adverse effects to school facilities and services. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

### 33. Libraries

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

**Source(s)**: Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact: The proposed Project would not induce population growth in the Project area, as discussed above. Population growth creates more demands on library services. The Project would be required to adhere to Ordinance No. 659 the requires development impact fees for impacts to public facilities, including libraries. There would therefore be no need for new or expanded library facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>34. Health Services</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan

**Findings of Fact:** As noted above, the proposed Project is not of a nature that population growth would occur nor is it a land use that would increase the likelihood of an increased need for health services. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

<b>RECREATION</b> Would the Project:				
<b>35. Parks and Recreation</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located within a Community Service Area (CSA) or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The Project proposes to develop the site with commercial retail and a gas station and does not include a residential component that could lead to population growth. The Project also does not propose to construct any new on- or off-site recreation facilities. Additionally, the Project would not expand any existing off-site recreational facilities. Thus, no impacts related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities would not occur with implementation of the proposed Project.
- B) The Project proposes a gas station and convenience store in an area where such uses are conditionally permitted. It does not propose any residential use or other land use that may generate a population that would increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Accordingly, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the increased use or substantial physical deterioration of an existing neighborhood or regional park, thus, no impacts would occur.
- C) The Project site is not in a Community Service Area and would not be subject to Quimby fees. No impacts would occur.

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

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**36. Recreational Trails**

- a) Include the construction or expansion of a trail system?

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure C-6 Trails and Bikeway System

Findings of Fact:

- A) No trails would be required to be constructed or expanded as part of the proposed Project. The Project would provide sidewalks as part of project improvements that would facilitate pedestrian circulation. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

**TRANSPORTATION** Would the Project:

**37. Transportation**

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

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan, Project Application Materials, Traffic Impact Analysis by LSA Associates (January 2020) (Appendix F)

Findings of Fact:

- A, B) Although Level of Services (LOS) measures and traffic delays caused by proposed Projects are no longer considered environmental impacts under CEQA, the LOS discussion below is necessary to ensure Project compliance with Riverside County General Plan policies.

Each county in California is required to develop a Congestion Management Program (CMP) that analyzes at the links between land use, transportation and air quality. The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) is the County of Riverside's Congestion Management Agency. The RCTC prepares and periodically updates the County's CMP to meet federal Congestion Management System guidelines and state CMP legislation.

#### *Project Trip Generation*

The trip generation for the proposed Project was developed using rates from the Institute of Transportation (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition, for Land Uses 945 – "Gasoline/Service Station with Convenience Market." Table 5-A summarizes the Project trip generation.

Gas stations typically draw some of their trips from the adjacent street traffic. Therefore, some of the external Project trips will come from the adjacent street traffic. These trips are not actually "new" trips added to the surrounding circulation system. These trips are referred to as "pass-by" trips and are made as intermediate stops en-route to a destination without diverting from the main route. For the proposed Project, pass-by trips would occur on Chicago Avenue and Van Buren Boulevard en-route to a final destination.

The percentages of pass-by trips have been obtained from the ITE *Trip Generation Handbook* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). Project pass-by trip assignment has been developed based on traffic counts collected on the adjacent street system.

After deducting the pass-by trips from the overall external trips, the net Project trip generation has been obtained. The Project is anticipated to generate 149 net trips in the a.m. peak hour, 167 net trips in the p.m. peak hour, and 2,464 net daily trips.

#### *Project Trip Distribution*

The distribution of Project trips was developed based on the regional roadway network and the locations of residential, employment, and commercial centers in relation to the proposed Project. Trip assignment for Project trips is the product of the Project trip generation and the trip distribution percentages.

#### *Traffic Volumes For "With Project" Scenarios*

Traffic volumes for existing with Project conditions were developed by adding Project traffic to existing traffic volumes. As approved during the County's scoping agreement process, traffic volumes for Project completion with Project conditions were developed by applying an ambient growth rate of 2.0 percent per annum to the existing traffic volumes and by adding Project traffic to these volumes.

Cumulative "with Project" traffic volumes were developed by adding traffic volumes from approved and pending development Projects to Project completion with Project traffic volumes. Information concerning cumulative Projects in the vicinity of the proposed Project was obtained from County staff and from the City of Riverside. The trip generation for cumulative Projects was developed using rates from the ITE *Trip Generation Manual*, 10th Edition. As shown in Table 6-A of Appendix F, the cumulative Projects are expected to generate 1,073 net trips in the a.m. peak hour, 1,021 net trips in the p.m. peak hour, and 11,854 net daily trips. Project trips from

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

these cumulative Projects were assigned to the roadway network based on their locations in relation to surrounding land uses and regional arterials.

#### *Levels of Service (LOS)*

An intersection LOS analysis was conducted for existing conditions using the methodologies previously discussed. Analysis of the existing with Project scenario is provided for CEQA compliance to identify operational deficiencies directly related to the Project if it were to be built and in operation today. This scenario eliminates the effects of ambient growth and other cumulative Projects and deals specifically with Project deficiencies.

An intersection LOS analysis was conducted for existing with Project conditions using the methodologies previously discussed. Table 7-A in Appendix F summarizes the results of this analysis and shows that all study intersections are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under existing with Project conditions.

An intersection LOS analysis was conducted for Project completion with Project conditions using the methodologies previously discussed. Table 7-A of Appendix F summarizes the results of this analysis and shows that all study intersections are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under Project completion with Project conditions.

An intersection LOS analysis was conducted for Project completion with Project conditions using the methodologies previously discussed. Table 7-C of Appendix F summarizes the results of this analysis and shows that all study intersections are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under cumulative with Project conditions.

The proposed Project will include a gasoline station with 16 fueling positions and a 3,800 square foot convenience store with a car wash. The Project is forecast to generate 149 net trips in the a.m. peak hour, 167 net trips in the p.m. peak hour, and 2,464 net daily trips.

All study intersections operate at a satisfactory LOS under existing without and with Project conditions. All study intersections are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under Project completion with Project conditions. All study intersections are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under cumulative with Project conditions. Deficiencies would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Per the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1), Projects that reduce vehicle miles traveled, such as pedestrian, bicycle and transit Projects, should have a less than significant deficiencies. Per the CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2), transportation Projects which reduce vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant deficiency.

The proposed Project is not identified to be a transportation Project, and no significant land use changes are proposed. Although the Project proposes to develop a vacant parcel, the results of the Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix F) determined that no significant deficiencies regarding traffic would occur upon Project implementation. Based on the trip generation provided by LSA Associates, deficiencies would be less than significant as Project traffic would not rise to a level that could conflict with CEQA Guidelines.

#### *Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)*

Pursuant to the County's Transportation Analysis Guidelines, retail uses with proposed building areas of less than 50,000 square feet (sf), which serve the local community and have the potential to reduce VMT, are presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. It is anticipated that this type of small retail facility will serve all the residential units in the vicinity and provide them with the convenience of availing certain amenities close to home. Residents will no longer have to travel long distances to avail such amenities. Therefore, trip lengths will be shortened, and vehicle travel will be reduced. This Project has a much lower square footage (3,800 sf for all uses combined) compared to the 50,000-sf threshold. Therefore, the Project can be considered as a local-serving retail and will not have a significant VMT impact.

- C) The Project does not have design features that would alter existing roadways, and the only paving associated with the Project is a turn in of Van Buren Boulevard, plus the parking lot inclusive of the fuel pumps, car wash, vacuum stalls, and associated parking. No incompatible uses are proposed as the Project is a commercial development on a site designated and zoned for such uses. No impacts would occur.

The Project would be accessed via Van Buren Boulevard and a short segment of Chicago Avenue. No aspect of this access point or trip generation has the ability to interfere with existing emergency access to the Project site or surrounding uses. The site is parked per County guidelines, and no interference with either Van Buren Boulevard or Chicago Avenue would occur during construction staging or ongoing operations. No impacts would occur.

- D) Project construction would be limited to the site itself, which is undeveloped, and therefore existing roads would be unaffected as no improvements to any roads would be necessitated by Project implementation. Trenching to connect to existing utilities in the right of way adjacent to Van Buren Boulevard would not necessitate road improvements. The undergrounding of existing utilities along Chicago Avenue would also not impact that roadway. No impacts would occur.
- E) Project construction would be limited to the site itself. All staging of materials would be located on the Project site. There will be temporary disturbances to Van Buren Boulevard for utility connections. The Project would be required to provide short term traffic control measures for disturbances within Van Buren Boulevard right of way. Implementation of traffic control measures would ensure that the Project would not have an adverse effect during construction. Impacts would be less than significant.
- F) No complete road closures would occur during construction, including during trenching for off-site utility connections in the right-of-way along Van Buren Boulevard. Although the westbound lane adjacent to the Project site along Van Buren Boulevard may be closed temporarily due to trenching, this would be temporary in nature and the road would still be passable by emergency vehicles.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

### **38. Bike Trails**

☐
☐
☐
☒



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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan Figure C-6 Trails and Bikeway System

**Findings of Fact:**

No trails would be constructed or expanded as part of the proposed Project. The Project site is located in a suburban area that is mostly developed with commercial and residential uses. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

**Monitoring:** No monitoring is required.

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

**39. Tribal Cultural Resources**

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?

☐
☒
☐
☐

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? (In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)

☐
☒
☐
☐

**Source(s):** County Archaeologist, AB52 Tribal Consultation

**Findings of Fact:**

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

In compliance with Assembly Bill 52 (AB52), notices regarding this Project were mailed to all requesting tribes on September 18, 2019. No response was received from the Pala Band of

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

Mission Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Colorado River Indian Tribes (CRIT) or the Cahuilla Band of Indians.

Consultations were requested by the Temecula Band of Luiseño Indians (Pechanga), Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians (Rincon), and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians.

Consultation with Pechanga was initiated and on May 18, 2020. During a telephone conference on May 20, 2020 Pechanga informed Planning that the Project is within a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR). No specifics were provided as to what the TCR consists of or if the Project was impacting this TCR. Pechanga also requested that our typical set of conditions of approval be applied to this Project. In a follow-up telephone conference Pechanga asked that Planning revise our conditions of approval and that they would conclude consultation. The County of Riverside reviewed Pechanga's proposed revisions to the conditions and carefully considered the revisions in light of the potential impact to cultural resources that may occur based on the analysis provided to date. Based on that analysis, Planning decided not to incorporate all of Pechanga's revisions to our conditions because they were not required as the standard mitigation would ensure any impacts to such resources remained less than significant. The County has elected to revise the Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) condition to state that the plan will be developed in coordination with the consulting tribe as well as mandatory tribal involvement in the Cultural Resources Sensitivity Training (see attachment). The County further understands that the remaining current conditions avoid, protect or mitigate any potential impacts appropriately. Consultation was concluded with Pechanga on October 22, 2020.

Consultation with Rincon was requested in a letter received by Planning on October 8, 2019. On May 18, 2020 the cultural report and the conditions of approval were provided to the tribe. In a meeting on June 18, 2020 Rincon agreed to the conditions and concluded consultation the same day.

Soboba requested to consult in a letter dated October 24, 2020. Although this was after the 30-day period in which to request, a meeting was held and consultation was initiated on February 26, 2020. Soboba requested the full set of conditions which were provided to them on May 18, 2020. Consultation was concluded with Soboba on the same day.

No specific tribal cultural resources were identified on the project however the project has been conditioned for a Native American monitor to be present during ground disturbance in the event any unanticipated subsurface tribal cultural resources are identified they will be handled in a culturally appropriate manner. See TCR-1.

With the inclusion of TCR 1, impacts to any unanticipated Tribal Cultural Resources would be less than significant.

#### Mitigation:

TCR- 1 Native American Monitoring  
Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the developer/permit applicant shall enter into an agreement with the consulting tribe(s) for a Native American Monitor. The Native American Monitor(s) shall be on-site during all initial ground disturbing activities and excavation of each portion of the Project site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading and trenching. In conjunction with the Archaeological Monitor(s), the Native American Monitor(s) shall have the authority to temporarily divert, redirect or halt the ground disturbance activities to allow identification, evaluation, and potential recovery of cultural resources.

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

**Monitoring:** Native American Monitoring shall occur in coordination with the Riverside County archaeologist.

**UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS** Would the Project:

**40. Water**

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage systems, whereby the construction or relocation would cause significant environmental effects?

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

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

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

**Source(s):** Project Application Materials, Western Municipal Water District

**Findings of Fact:**

- A) The Project would construct an on-site network of water, sewer, and drainage facilities that would connect to existing infrastructure under the northern shoulder of Van Buren Boulevard. The installation of utility connections as proposed by the Project would result in physical impacts on-site and adjacent to the site for connections; however, these impacts are considered to be part of the Project's construction phase and are evaluated throughout this Initial Study accordingly. As identified throughout this Initial Study, no significant impacts have been identified for the Project's construction phase, and no mitigation is required. The construction of on-site utilities necessary to serve the Project would not result in any significant physical effects on the environment that are not already identified and disclosed as part of this Initial Study. Accordingly, no mitigation measures would be required.

The Project site would be connected to existing water infrastructure located under the northern shoulder of Van Buren Boulevard on the southern boundary of the Project site. The proposed uses on the site would not be water-intensive such that existing supplies would not be able to adequately serve the site, particularly as the car wash would use recycled water and therefore be largely self-contained in terms of water usage. Specifically, the car wash is expected to use 252,000 gallons of water per year, and the convenience store would use 208,050 gallons per year. Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) would provide water service for the Project. The Project would use approximately 460k gallons of water per year, less than 1.5-acre feet of water per year. This is considered a minimal amount of usage. WMWD would have the capacity to accommodate the water use for the Project and would provide a "Will Serve" letter to the applicant stating that WMWD has the water capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant as the Project does not propose activities of a scale that would necessitate an increase in the capacity of existing wastewater systems.

**Mitigation:** No mitigation is required.

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

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

**Source(s):** Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

A-B) The proposed Project is a fuel station and convenience store, a use that is not known to place significant strain on wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the Project would connect to existing sewer lines and would not require the installation of septic tanks. In addition, wastewater generation would be typical of commercial Project of the scale proposed which are not generally producers of significant amounts of wastewater. As a result, existing facilities would be sufficient to handle an increase in wastewater upon Project implementation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

**Source(s):** Riverside County General Plan

Findings of Fact:

A) The construction and operation of the proposed Project would be required to submit a waste recycling plan and a waste reporting form to the Riverside County Building and Safety Department to demonstrate compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code,

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

which mandates construction and demolition recycling. The removal of construction-generated hazardous waste from the Project site would require the use of a certified hazardous waste transportation company, which must ship hazardous waste to a permitted facility for treatment, storage, recycling, or disposal. The closest landfill to the Project site is the El Sobrante Landfill, which currently has the capacity to process 70,000 tons of waste per week. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact to solid waste services as construction and operational waste would not be extensive for a Project of this nature and no demolition is proposed.

- B) The CalGreen Code requires all new developments to divert 65 percent of nonhazardous construction and demolition (C&D) debris for all Projects. In compliance with these regulations, the Project contractor would submit a waste management plan to the County as part of the building or grading permit. The plan would include the estimated volumes or weights of C&D materials that would be generated, diverted, reused, given away or sold, or landfilled, including vendors and facilities that would receive the C&D materials. The Project would comply with the CalGreen Code requirements for C&D diversion. In addition, under long-term operating conditions, the Project would be required to participate in the County's recycling programs and comply with hazardous waste disposal regulations.

The Project would be required to comply with all applicable solid waste statutes and regulations; as such, impacts related to solid waste statutes and regulations would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

### 43. Utilities

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

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

- A-F) The proposed fuel station and convenience store would not require the construction or expansion of infrastructure facilities such as those listed above. It would connect to existing electricity, natural gas, and communications systems along Van Buren Boulevard and all connections would be performed without disturbing public facilities including roads. Therefore, no utilities would need to be constructed or expanded as a result of Project implementation.

Energy consumption in the form of electricity or natural gas would not be of a level such that either Southern California Edison or the SoCal Gas would need new or expanded facilities to service the site. No communications systems would be affected, and the Project

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

would not necessitate the provision of additional off-site street lighting. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

**44. Wildfire Impacts**

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐
☐
☒
☐

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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

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?

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

☐
☐
☒
☐

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

Findings of Fact:

A) The proposed Project is not located within a very high fire hazard severity zone (CAL FIRE January 2020). The proposed construction and operational activities would not result in the impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan within a fire hazard severity zone as the site is not within one. Although the fueling station would include the daily use of flammable liquids such as gasoline and diesel fuel, it would comply with all federal, state, and local requirements governing fuel stations and would be regularly inspected for compliance. Impacts would be less than significant.

B) Although the proposed Project would involve the sale of vehicle fuels, which are highly flammable, the proposed construction and operational activities would not exacerbate wildlife risks or expose the residents and businesses to pollutant from wildfires as the site is largely void of vegetation, high winds, or steep slopes. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- C) The proposed construction and operational activities would not require installation of maintenance of associated structures that would exacerbate wildfire risk as the Project is a fueling facility and would provide standard commercial retail uses. The Project would be served by existing necessary utility services and is also surrounded mostly by existing development. Impacts would be less than significant.
- D) The proposed construction and operational activities would not expose people or structures to risks involving post-fire slope instability, flooding or drainage changes as the site and surroundings are relatively flat. Impacts would be less than significant.
- E) The proposed Project is located on an undeveloped parcel in a suburban area of Riverside County. It does not contain trees of a type or number that would be associated with a risk of wildland fires. There are currently no structures on the site, and the Project will be required to implement fire safety measures by County Fire during the plan check process. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the Project:				
--	--	--	--	--

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

**Source(s):** Staff Review, Project Application Materials

**Findings of Fact:** Implementation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As the site is surrounded by urban areas, of a limited footprint, not been found to contain either protected species or riparian habitat, and streams or other bodies of water are not present, implementation of the proposed Project does not have the potential to affect endangered plants or animals. As presented in the Biological Resources section of this environmental document, any impacts have been reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated.

In addition, the Project site is not known to contain important examples of California history or prehistory, and the mitigation measures proposed above under Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources would ensure the Projection of such examples should they be found during Project construction. As presented

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

in the Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources sections of this environmental document, any impacts have been reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation incorporated.

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

☐
☒
☐
☐

**Source(s):** Staff Review, Project Application Materials

**Findings of Fact:** The Project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable due to the fact that it is a fuel station and associated market and car wash. These do not have the ability to induce future growth in the area such that further environmental impacts could occur under future Projects caused by the proposed Projects. All potential impacts have been shown to be mitigable to less than significant levels, ensuring that the construction and long-term operation of the proposed Project would not lead to future incremental effects with the potential to significantly impact the environment. Cumulative effects that may occur because of Project implementation have been evaluated through this environmental document. The analysis concluded that no impact would occur, impacts would be less than significant or impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with the incorporation of mitigation measures identified in the analysis and included in the Project's conditions of approval.

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

☐
☒
☐
☐

**Source(s):** Staff Review, Project Application Materials

**Findings of Fact:** All potential impacts of the proposed Project have been identified as analyzed throughout this document. Mitigation measures and/or conditions have been provided, where applicable, to reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Also, compliance with mandatory State and federal laws helps to reduce risks to human beings. Upon implementation of mitigation measures, the proposed Project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings either directly or indirectly.

## VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: N/A

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

Location: County of Riverside Planning Department



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

4080 Lemon Street 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92501

Revised: 8/5/2021 3:48 PM  
Y:\Planning Master Forms\Templates\CEQA Forms\EA-IS\_Template.docx

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

## References

Adkan Engineers

2019 Preliminary Hydrology Assessment.

Archaeology Associates

2019 Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment.

California Air Resources Board (CARB)

2018 Area Designations Maps / State and National. Available Online at:

<https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>

2017a 2017 Off-Road Diesel Emission Factors. Available Online at:

<https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/mobile-source-emissions-inventory/road-documentation/msei-documentation-offroad-0>

2016 Ambient Air Quality Standards. Available Online at:

<https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf>.

2010 Final Regulation Order Regulation for in-use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets. Available Online at: <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/regact/2010/offroadlsi10/finaloffroadreg.pdf>

California Department of Conservation (CDC)

1984 Division of Mines and Geology. Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map. Available online at: [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR\\_143/PartVII/](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_143/PartVII/). Accessed February 9, 2020.

2016 California Important Farmland Finder. Available online at:

<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>

2017 State of California Williamson Act Contract Land. Available at:

[ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/2014%20Statewide%20Map/WA\\_2014\\_8.5%20x11.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/2014%20Statewide%20Map/WA_2014_8.5%20x11.pdf). Accessed October 2, 2019.

2019 Earthquake Zones of Required of Investigation. Available at

<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

2019 Biogeographic Information and Observation System (BIOS). Available at:

<https://apps.wildlife.ca.gov/bios/>.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE)

2007 Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Area. Available at:

[https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6827/fhszl06\\_1\\_map.pdf](https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/6827/fhszl06_1_map.pdf).

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

2017 List of eligible and designated State Scenic Highways (XLSX). Available online at:

<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>.

California State Water Resources Control Board

2018 Los Angeles MS4 Permit Low Impact Development (LID) Ordinances and Green Streets Policies. Draft LID Ordinance – City of La Puente. Available at:

[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/lid\\_and\\_greenst/doc/lid/lapuerto\\_draftlid.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/water_issues/programs/stormwater/municipal/lid_and_greenst/doc/lid/lapuerto_draftlid.pdf).

County of Riverside

- 2015 County of Riverside Draft Climate Action Plan. Available online at:  
<https://planning.rctlma.org/General-Plan-Zoning/General-Plan/Riverside-County-General-Plan-2015/General-Plan-Amendment-No960-EIR-No521-CAP-February-2015/Climate-Action-Plan>

County of Riverside

- 2015 County of Riverside General Plan. Available online at:  
<https://planning.rctlma.org/General-Plan-Zoning/General-Plan>

Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

- 2019 EnviroStor. Available online at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>.

ELMT Consulting

- 2020 Peer review of Habitat Assessment, MSHCP Analysis, and Jurisdictional Delineation.

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

- 2019 FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Available Online at:  
<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor>.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

- 2018 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. Available online at:  
[https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123\\_0.pdf](https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf).

Gonzales Environmental Consulting.

- 2020 Habitat Assessment, MSHCP Consistency Analysis, and Jurisdictional Delineation.

Google Maps

- 2020 Google Maps. Available online at: <https://www.google.com/maps>

LSA Associates

- 2020 Traffic Impact Analysis.

Salem Engineering Group

- 2019 and 2021 Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment.

Salem Engineering Group

- 2019 Geotechnical Investigation.

Salem Engineering Group

- 2019 Noise Study.

Salem Engineering Group

- 2019 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment.

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

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

2019 Natural Resources Conservation Service. Web Soil Survey – Map Unit Description. Available online at: <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

2019a ECOS Environmental Conservation Online System. USFWS Threatened & Endangered Species Active Critical Habitat Report. Available online at: <https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77>

2019b National Wetlands Inventory: Wetlands Mapper. Available online at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html>

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

2019 U.S. Quaternary Faults. Available online at: <https://usgs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=5a6038b3a1684561a9b0aadf88412fcf>.

U.S. National Park Service (NPS)

2019 National Register Database and Research. Available online at: <https://www.nps.gov/subjects/nationalregister/database-research.htm>

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

**Appendices**

- A – Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Assessment
- B – Biological Resources Assessment
- C – Jurisdictional Delineation
- D – Noise Study
- E – Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- F – Traffic Impact Assessment
- G – Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment
- H – Geotechnical Investigation
- I – Preliminary Hydrology Assessment