

**ADDENDUM  
TO THE:**

**MESA VERDE  
SPECIFIC PLAN  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT REPORT**

**SCH NO.**

**#2004071045**

**SCREENCHECK**

*prepared for:*

**CITY OF  
CALIMESA**

Contact:  
Keith Gardner

*prepared by:*

**PLACEWORKS**

Contact:  
William Halligan, Esq.  
Principal,  
Environmental  
Services

**OCTOBER 2017**

**ADDENDUM  
TO THE:**

**MESA VERDE  
SPECIFIC PLAN  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT REPORT**

**SCH NO.**

**#2004071045**

**SCREENCHECK**

*prepared for:*

**CITY OF  
CALIMESA**

City of Calimesa  
908 Park Avenue  
Calimesa, CA 92320  
Tel: 909.795.9801

Contact:  
Keith Gardner

*prepared by:*

**PLACEWORKS**

3 MacArthur Place, Suite 1100  
Santa Ana, CA 92707  
Tel: 714.966.9220 • Fax: 714.966.9221  
E-mail: [information@planningcenter.com](mailto:information@planningcenter.com)  
Website: [www.planningcenter.com](http://www.planningcenter.com)

Contact:  
William Halligan, Esq.  
Principal,  
Environmental  
Services

**BETE-03.1E**

**OCTOBER 2017**

## Table of Contents

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND SCOPE.....	1
1.2 PROJECT SUMMARY .....	1
1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES .....	2
1.4 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION.....	3
<b>2. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 PROJECT LOCATION .....	5
2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	5
<b>3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	11
<b>4. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1 BACKGROUND.....	17
4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED.....	19
4.3 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY).....	19
4.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS .....	20
<b>5. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1 AESTHETICS .....	23
5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES .....	26
5.3 AIR QUALITY .....	28
5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	37
5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	44
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	53
5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	58
5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS .....	67
5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	74
5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING .....	81
5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES.....	83
5.12 NOISE.....	84
5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING .....	91
5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES.....	93
5.15 RECREATION .....	98
5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.....	100
5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS .....	121
5.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE .....	126
<b>6. LIST OF PREPARERS .....</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>7. REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>131</b>

## Table of Contents

### APPENDICES

- A. Mitigation Measures from 2007 Certified EIR
- B. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Modeling
- C. Biological Resources Studies
- D. Cultural Resource Studies
- E. Hydrology Study
- F. Focused Traffic Impact Analysis
- G. Water Supply Assessment

#### *List of Figures*

<b>Figure</b>	<b>Page</b>
Figure 1	Regional Location ..... 7
Figure 2	Aerial Photograph..... 9
Figure 3	Land Use Plan ..... 13
Figure 4	Circulation Master Plan..... 15

#### *List of Tables*

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 1	Summary of Changes Between 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project..... 12
Table 2	Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants..... 29
Table 3	Mesa Verde Maximum Daily Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions..... 34
Table 4	Mesa Verde Specific Plan GHG Emissions ..... 64
Table 5	Consistency with SCAG’s 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals..... 65
Table 6	Roadway Segment Vehicle Volume Comparison ..... 87
Table 7	Typical Construction Noise Levels ..... 90
Table 8	Intersection Analysis Locations..... 102
Table 9	Overall Trip Generation Summary ..... 103
Table 10	Project Trip Generation Comparison..... 103

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 BACKGROUND, PURPOSE, AND SCOPE

This document is an Addendum to the certified Environmental Impact Report (2007 Certified EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2004071045) for the Mesa Verde Estates Specific Plan (2007 Approved Project) in the City of Calimesa (City), which was certified in October 2007. The purpose of the addendum is to provide sufficient analysis to ensure that the 2007 Certified EIR, and the information in this addendum, adequately address the impacts from the proposed amendment to the Mesa Verde Estates Specific Plan. (2016 Modified Project)

## 1.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The 2016 Modified Project includes a Specific Plan Amendment to convert existing unbuilt commercial entitlement, a school site, and park space to allow for additional residential units. If the amendment is approved, the Specific Plan would allow for the development of up to 3,650 total housing units and 250,000 square feet of commercial space. Compared to the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would represent an increase of 200 housing units and a reduction of 100,000 square feet of commercial space. The 2016 Modified Project would also remove the “very low residential” density housing previously approved for the site and would redistribute these units to the “low residential” density designation. The 2016 Modified Project would also feature 3.9 fewer acres of roadways and 37.2 additional acres of open space compared to the 2007 Approved Project.

As analyzed in Section 5.4 of this Addendum, the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project have development footprints that are nearly identical. Therefore, the geographic range and severity of impacts to biological resources resulting from the 2016 Modified Project would be substantially similar to those that would result from implementation of the 2007 Approved Project. The 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed impacts related to biological or cultural resources.

As analyzed throughout this Addendum, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project, like the 2007 Approved Project, would result in several indirect adverse impacts on people, including impacts related to air quality, noise, and traffic. However, the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new environmental impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed environmental impacts. Thus, none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines are present and a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR is not required by CEQA.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

Pursuant to Section 21166 of CEQA and Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, when an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent or supplemental EIR or negative declaration shall be prepared for the project unless the lead agency determines that one or more of the following conditions are met:

- Substantial project changes are proposed that 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;
- Substantial changes would occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that require major revisions to 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
- New information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified or the negative declaration was adopted shows any of 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 identified in the previous EIR.
  - 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 proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.
  - D. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponent declines to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

If some changes or additions to the previously-prepared EIR or negative declaration are necessary, but none of the conditions specified in Section 15162 are present, the lead agency shall prepare an addendum (CEQA Guidelines Section 15164[a]). In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, since none of the conditions specified in Section 15162 are present, the City has determined that an Addendum to the 2007 Certified EIR is the appropriate form of environmental review for the 2016 Modified Project.

This Addendum reviews the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project and any changes to the existing conditions that have occurred since the certification of the 2007 Certified EIR. It also reviews any new information related to environmental impacts, mitigation measures and/or alternatives that was not known and could not have been known with exercise of reasonable diligence at the time that the 2007 Certified EIR was certified. It further examines whether, as a result of any changes or any new information, a subsequent

## 1. Introduction

EIR or ND may be required. This examination includes an analysis of the provisions of Section 21166 of CEQA and Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines and their applicability to the 2016 Modified Project.

The Environmental Checklist Form included in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines has been completed by the City and included in Section 4 of this Addendum. The checklist includes findings as to the environmental effects of the 2016 Modified Project as compared with the findings of the 2007 Certified EIR.

### **1.4 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION**

This Addendum relies on environmental analysis in the 2005 DEIR and 2007 Certified EIR (which includes the 2007 Revised and Recirculated DEIR). These three documents, while discussed separately here, are collectively referred to in this Addendum as the 2007 Certified EIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15148 and 15150, this Addendum incorporates the 2007 Certified EIR (and its constituent parts) by reference. A summary of the 2007 Certified EIR and how it relates to this Addendum is provided below. All documents incorporated by reference are available for review at the City of Calimesa Community Development Department located at 908 Park Avenue, Calimesa, CA 92320, Monday through Thursday, 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM, holidays excepted.

## 1. Introduction

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Environmental Setting

---

### 2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

As shown in Figure 1, *Regional Location*, the Mesa Verde Specific Plan Area and 2016 Modified Project site is a 1,493-acre property located in the northwestern portion of the City of Calimesa, immediately west of Interstate 10 (I-10) in Riverside County, California. The northern boundary of the site forms the jurisdictional boundary between the County of Riverside and San Bernardino County to the north. Approximately 29.3 acres of the original Specific Plan area is outside the City in the County of San Bernardino. However, like the 2007 Approved Project, this area is also not part of the 2016 Modified Project. The project site is generally a linear swath of land that is east-west oriented.

Regional access to the project site is provided via I-10. Local access is currently provided from the terminuses of Sandalwood Drive and County Line Road.

### 2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

#### 2.2.1 Existing Land Use

The project site is currently vacant and being used for cattle grazing. Although much of the site has been disturbed, a substantial proportion of the site features natural topography including an alternating sequence of mesas and arroyos. Cattle grazing onsite is generally limited to the flatter eastern portions of the site and ridge tops in the more complicated terrain of site's western portions. An aerial photograph of the project site is shown in Figure 2.

#### 2.2.2 Surrounding Existing Land Use

In general, the project site is surrounded by undeveloped open space and grazing land to the west and growing suburban areas in the Yucaipa Valley to the east. North of the project site is ranchland and a Yucaipa Valley Water District treatment facility. Northeast of the project site are a rural residential neighborhood, Mesa View Middle School, and the Villa Calimesa Mobile Home Park. The easternmost site boundary is adjacent to I-10. Vacant land, including the Garden Air Wash, borders the westerly and southerly property lines. The eastern half of the project site's southern boundary is bordered by the Summerwind Ranch Specific Plan area. Calimesa's downtown and most of the City's urbanized areas are located east of I-10.

## 2. Environmental Setting

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Environmental Setting

### **Figure 1      Regional Location**

## 2. Environmental Setting

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Environmental Setting

### **Figure 2      Aerial Photograph**

## 2. Environmental Setting

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 3. Project Description

---

### 3.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 2016 Modified Project includes a Specific Plan Amendment to convert existing commercial entitlement, a school site, and park space to allow for additional residential units and adjusts the alignment of Streets “C,” “B,” and “G” (formerly Street B). If approved, the amendment would allow development of the Mesa Verde Specific Plan that includes up to 3,650 total housing units and 250,000 square feet of commercial space. A reduction in the amount of land designated for mixed uses, a school site, public parks and private recreation would accommodate this change in uses. Compared to the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would represent an increase of 200 housing units and a decrease of 100,000 square feet of commercial space. The 2016 Modified Project would also remove the “very low residential” density housing previously approved for the site and would redistribute these units to the “low residential” density designation. The 2016 Modified Project would also feature 3.9 fewer acres of roadways and 37.2 additional acres of open space compared to the 2007 Approved Project.

Like the 2007 Approved Project, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would result in the development of interconnected but topographically distinct “villages.” These villages would be divided into individual neighborhoods that would have their own unique identity, including access to one “landmark” amenity such as a public park, HOA-operated recreation center, or school. The proposed Land Use Plan is shown in Figure 3.

Approximately 595 acres, or 40 percent, of the project site would be used for parks, private recreation, and open space. Of those 595 acres, 519 acres would be preserved as natural open space. Like the 2007 Approved Project, buildout of the 2016 Modified Project would also require extensive infrastructure improvements, including water and sewer lines, dry utilities, improvements to existing I-10 interchanges, and an extension of Roberts Road. Details of these improvements are discussed in detail in the revised Specific Plan. The 2016 Modified Project’s Circulation Master Plan is shown in Figure 4.

#### 3.1.1 Comparison to 2007 Approved Project

Table 1 summarizes the changes between the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project. This Addendum analyzes the environmental effects of the change shown in the rightmost column

### 3. Project Description

**Table 1 Summary of Changes Between 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project**

Land Use	2007 Approved Project	2016 Modified Project	Change
<b>Residential Uses</b>			
Very Low Density	104	–	-104
Low Density	282	586	304
Low Medium Density	693	693	–
Medium Density	1,669	1,669	–
Medium High Density	344	344	–
Multifamily	358	358	–
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3,450 units</b>	<b>3,650 units</b>	<b>200 units</b>
<b>Other Land Uses, Amenities, and Facilities</b>			
Commercial (square feet)	350,000	250,000	-100,000
Mixed Use (acres)	62.5	46.5	-16.0
Open Space (acres)	481.8	519.0 <sup>1</sup>	37.2
Public Parks (acres)	57.5	47.9	-9.6
Private Recreation (acres)	12.5	8.2	-4.3
Trails (miles)	21.5	23.1	1.6
Roads (acres)	91.4	87.5	-3.9
Elementary Schools (number of sites)	2	2	–
Middle Schools (number of sites)	1	–	-1

Source: FORMA, et al, 2016

<sup>1</sup> Includes 29.3-acre parcel that is not a part of the proposed project (see Figure 3 of this Addendum).

The 2016 Modified Project no longer features a middle school site, because the Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School District built the Mesa View Middle School just north of the project site in August 2009. The 2016 Modified Project would also feature 3.9 fewer acres of roadways, 37.2 additional acres of open space, and 4.3 fewer acres of private recreation amenities compared to the 2007 Approved Project.

The 2016 Modified Project is within the same land boundaries and proposes the same general development areas accessed by a similar network of proposed roadways. The 2016 Modified Project changes the alignment of Streets “B,” “C,” and “G” (formerly Street “B”). If approved, the Specific Plan would still be dominated (physically and visually) by residential neighborhoods punctuated by arroyos and other open spaces.

### 3. Project Description

**Figure 3      Land Use Plan**

### 3. Project Description

*This page intentionally left blank.*

### 3. Project Description

#### **Figure 4      Circulation Master Plan**

### 3. Project Description

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 4. Environmental Checklist

---

### 4.1 BACKGROUND

---

**Project Title:** Mesa Verde Specific Plan

---

**Lead Agency Name and Address:**

City of Calimesa  
908 Park Avenue  
Calimesa, CA 92320

---

**Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Matthew Evans, City of Calimesa  
909.795.9801

---

**Project Location:**

The project site is an approximately 1,493-acre property located in the northwestern portion of the City of Calimesa, immediately west of Interstate 10 (I-10) in Riverside County, California. The northern boundary of the site forms the jurisdictional boundary between the County of Riverside and San Bernardino County to the north. The project site is generally a linear swath of land that is east-west oriented. Regional access to the project site is provided via I-10. Local access is currently provided by the terminuses of Sandalwood Drive and County Line Road.

---

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

Paul Kim, General Manager of Real Estate Development  
Mesa Verde RE Ventures, LLC  
2 Park Plaza, Suite 1250  
Irvine, CA 92614

---

**General Plan Designation:** Mesa Verde Specific Plan

---

**Zoning:** Specific Plan Area 2

---

**Description of Project:**

See Section 3.1, *Project Description* of this Addendum.

---

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

In general, the project site is surrounded by undeveloped opens space and grazing land to the west and growing suburban areas in the Yucaipa Valley to the east. North of the project site is ranchland and a Yucaipa Valley Water District treatment facility. Northeast of the project site are a rural residential neighborhood, Mesa View Middle School, and the Villa Calimesa Mobile Home Park. The easternmost

---

## 4. Environmental Checklist

site boundary is adjacent to I-10. Vacant land, including the Garden Air Wash, borders the westerly and southerly property lines. The eastern half of the project site's southern boundary is bordered by the Summerwind Ranch Specific Plan area.

---

**Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required** (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

- State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- State of California, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region
- South Coast Air Quality Management District
- United States Army Corps of Engineers

## 4. Environmental Checklist

### 4.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

### 4.3 DETERMINATION (TO BE COMPLETED BY THE LEAD AGENCY)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

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

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

I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not required by CEQA. The City has prepared an addendum to the certified EIR pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a) and 15164.

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Printed Name*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*For*

## 4. Environmental Checklist

### 4.4 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors, as well as general standards (e.g., the project would not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) **Earlier Analyses Used.** Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

## 4. Environmental Checklist

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

## 4. Environmental Checklist

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 5. Environmental Analysis

---

This section provides evidence to substantiate the conclusions in the environmental checklist. The section briefly summarizes the conclusions of the 2007 Certified EIR and discusses the following three questions: 1) whether or not the 2016 Modified Project represents a substantial change in the project that will require major revisions to the 2007 Certified EIR; 2) whether or not substantial changes with respect to circumstances under which the project is being undertaken will require major revisions to the 2007 Certified EIR; or 3) if new information shows any sign of the findings in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a)(3).

Mitigation measures referenced are from the 2007 Certified EIR and listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. Because these measures do not contain numerical prefixes, there are multiple measures with the same identifying number. Measures referenced are those found in the corresponding topical section of the 2007 Certified EIR and Appendix A unless otherwise noted. For example, in Section 5.1, below, references to “Measure 1” can be assumed to refer to the first measure related to aesthetics in the 2007 Certified EIR. In instances where measures from a different topical area are applicable, their origin is noted.

## 5.1 AESTHETICS

### 5.1.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The project site is located in an area that is currently undeveloped and undisturbed. Visual disturbances caused by the 2007 Approved Project would include impacts from the construction and operation of new streets. Development built pursuant to the 2007 Approved Project would also create aesthetic impacts by altering views from local streets and I-10 and creating new sources of light and glare. The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that with proper mitigation, including landscaping and vegetation requirements and measures to reduce ambient lighting, impacts of the 2007 Approved Project would be reduced to a less than significant level.

### 5.1.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				<b>X</b>	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				<b>X</b>	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				<b>X</b>	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				<b>X</b>	

### Comments:

#### a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

##### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Buildout of the 2016 Modified Project would involve an increase of 200 housing units compared to buildout of the 2007 Approved Project, and a decrease of 100,000 square feet of commercial space. The 2016 Modified Project would primarily incorporate the same project design features as the 2007 Approved Project. The overall development footprint and land use pattern of the two projects is nearly identical. For this reason, impacts to scenic vistas would be substantially similar and no new or substantially greater impacts would occur. Furthermore, mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR relating to aesthetics would reduce potential impacts on scenic vistas. These mitigation measures were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project; therefore, they would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to adverse effects on scenic vistas, for the reasons discussed above.

#### b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

##### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

There are no state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site. As discussed in Section 5.1.2(a), above, urban land uses proposed for the site by the 2016 Modified Project would not alter scenic resources on the project site beyond levels already analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR. The overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2016 Modified Project is nearly identical to that of the 2007 Approved Project. As

## 5. Environmental Analysis

under the 2007 Approved Project, no specific scenic resources, such as notable trees, outcroppings, or buildings, would be damaged. Therefore, impacts to the scenic quality of the site's landforms would be similar between the two projects. No new or substantially greater impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to damage of scenic resources, for the reasons discussed above.

### **c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The 2016 Modified Project would generally incorporate the same project design features as the 2007 Approved Project. The overall development footprint and land use pattern of the two projects is nearly identical. For this reason, impacts to visual character and quality would be substantially similar and no new impact would occur. Furthermore, mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR relating to overall aesthetics, Aesthetics Measures 1 and 2, would reduce potential impacts to visual character. They would ensure that landscaping and other vegetation would be constructed in a manner that enhances the visual quality of the project. These mitigation measures were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project; therefore, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to degradation of existing visual character and quality, for the reasons discussed above.

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

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project are nearly identical. The proposed reduction in commercial uses could result in a reduction in nighttime light generated in planning areas designated for mixed uses. Light impacts in residential-only planning areas, which comprise most of the areas proposed for urban uses, would generally be the same. Despite an increase of 200 housing units under the 2016 Modified Project, the geographic range of these units would not be greater than under the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare would be substantially similar and no new or substantially greater impact would occur. Furthermore, mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to light and glare impacts on wildlife habitat, Aesthetics Measures 3 and 4, would reduce potential impacts to designated conservation areas. These mitigation measures were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to new sources of light and glare.

### 5.1.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to aesthetics are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. These measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project and no modifications are necessary.

## 5.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

### 5.2.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The Initial Study for the 2007 Certified EIR found that potential impacts to agricultural or forest resources would be less than significant.

### 5.2.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
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?					<b>X</b>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?					<b>X</b>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?					<b>X</b>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					<b>X</b>

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					<b>X</b>

### Comments:

- 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?**

**No Impact.** According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the City of Calimesa contains no areas of Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland (DOC 2011a). The nearest occurrences of both special-status farmland types are located approximately one mile to the north in San Bernardino County on the north side of Yucaipa Creek (DOC 2011b). Therefore, no impact would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to conversion of farmland.

- b) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** There are no farmland areas in Calimesa that are under a Williamson Act contract (DOC 2012) or zoned for agricultural use. The project site is located in a Specific Plan zone that anticipates development of urban land uses and the site is not conducive to farming activities. Therefore, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts. No impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to agricultural zoning.

- c) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

**No Impact.** The City of Calimesa does not zone for forest or timberland uses. Although eastern portions of the project site contain small areas of oak woodland, these areas do not qualify as “forest land” as defined by

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Public Resources Code section 12220(g) as they do not support 10 percent native tree cover and are not managed for forestry resources. Therefore, no impacts would occur due to rezoning of forest land or timberland. Potential impacts to individual oak trees are discussed in Section 5.4, *Biological Resources*, of this Addendum.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to zoning of forest land.

### **d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** As discussed in the response to Section 5.2(C), above, there is no forest land onsite. Implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would not result in the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to loss or conversion of forest land.

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

**No Impact.** See responses to Sections 5.2(a) and 5.2(c), above. The project site and its immediate vicinity do not contain farmland or forest land. No impact would occur as a result of the 2016 Modified Project.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to conversion of farmland or forest land.

## **5.2.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project**

No mitigation measures related to agricultural or forest resources were identified in the 2007 Certified EIR as the EIR determined that potential impacts to such resources would be less than significant.

## **5.3 AIR QUALITY**

### **5.3.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project**

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that, even after the implementation of mitigation measures, the 2007 Approved Project would result in significant air quality impacts. Criteria air pollutant impacts were compared to the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) significance thresholds. Construction activities of the Approved Project would result in air pollutant levels that exceed SCAQMD's significance thresholds. In addition, long-term operation of the Approved Project would also result in emissions that

## 5. Environmental Analysis

exceed SCAQMD's significance thresholds. The Approved Project would cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB). In addition, the 2007 Certified EIR identified that the Proposed Project may conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality management plan (AQMP). Odor impacts, air toxics, and carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots were found to be less than significant. Although mitigation measures included in the 2007 Certified EIR would reduce air quality impacts of the Approved Project to the extent feasible, air quality impacts were identified as a significant and unavoidable impact of the 2007 Approved Project.

### 5.3.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

#### Environmental Setting

The environmental and regulatory settings for the 2016 Modified Project have changed since certification of the 2007 Certified EIR. The following discussion is provided to update conditions relative to development of the 2016 Modified Project.

The Clean Air Act (CAA) was passed in 1963 by the US Congress and has been amended several times. The 1990 Amendments represent the latest in a series of federal efforts to regulate the protection of air quality in the United States. Geographic areas are classified under the national and California CAA as either in attainment or nonattainment for each criteria pollutant based on whether the ambient air quality standards (AAQS) have been achieved. Both the State of California and the federal government have established health-based AAQS for seven air pollutants: ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), coarse inhalable particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), fine inhalable particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead (Pb). Table 2 shows the most recent AAQS adopted.

The SoCAB is designated as nonattainment for O<sub>3</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM<sub>10</sub> under the California AAQS and nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS (CARB 2014a). SCAQMD prepares an AQMP that details measures taken to achieve the national and California AAQS. The most recent AQMP is the 2012 AQMP.

**Table 2 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	Federal Primary Standard	Major Pollutant Sources
Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> )	1 hour	0.09 ppm	*	Motor vehicles, paints, coatings, and solvents.
	8 hours	0.070 ppm	0.070 ppm	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 hour	20 ppm	35 ppm	Internal combustion engines, primarily gasoline-powered motor vehicles.
	8 hours	9.0 ppm	9 ppm	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> )	Annual Average	0.030 ppm	0.053 ppm	Motor vehicles, petroleum-refining operations, industrial sources, aircraft, ships, and railroads.
	1 hour	0.18 ppm	0.100 ppm	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean	*	0.030 ppm <sup>2</sup>	Fuel combustion, chemical plants, sulfur recovery plants, and metal processing.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 2 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	Federal Primary Standard	Major Pollutant Sources
	1 hour	0.25 ppm	0.075 ppm <sup>1</sup>	
	24 hours	0.04 ppm	0.014 ppm <sup>2</sup>	
Respirable Coarse Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	*	Dust and fume-producing construction, industrial, and agricultural operations, combustion, atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g., wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).
	24 hours	50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
Respirable Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	12 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Dust and fume-producing construction, industrial, and agricultural operations, combustion, atmospheric photochemical reactions, and natural activities (e.g., wind-raised dust and ocean sprays).
	24 hours	*	35 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
Lead (Pb)	Monthly	1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	*	Present source: lead smelters, battery manufacturing & recycling facilities. Past source: combustion of leaded gasoline.
	Quarterly	*	1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
	3-Month Average	*	0.15 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	
Sulfates (SO <sub>4</sub> )	24 hours	25 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	*	Industrial processes.
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 hours	ExCo =0.23/km visibility of 10≥ miles <sup>1</sup>	No Federal Standard	Visibility-reducing particles consist of suspended particulate matter, which is a complex mixture of tiny particles that consists of dry solid fragments, solid cores with liquid coatings, and small droplets of liquid. These particles vary greatly in shape, size and chemical composition, and can be made up of many different materials such as metals, soot, soil, dust, and salt.
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 hour	0.03 ppm	No Federal Standard	Hydrogen sulfide (H <sub>2</sub> S) is a colorless gas with the odor of rotten eggs. It is formed during bacterial decomposition of sulfur-containing organic substances. Also, it can be present in sewer gas and some natural gas, and can be emitted as the result of geothermal energy exploitation.
Vinyl Chloride	24 hour	0.01 ppm	No Federal Standard	Vinyl chloride (chloroethene), a chlorinated hydrocarbon, is a colorless gas with a mild, sweet odor. Most vinyl chloride is used to make polyvinyl chloride (PVC) plastic and vinyl products. Vinyl chloride has been detected near landfills, sewage plants, and hazardous waste sites, due to microbial breakdown of chlorinated solvents.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 2 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standard	Federal Primary Standard	Major Pollutant Sources
Source: CARB 2015.				
Notes: ppm: parts per million; µg/m <sup>3</sup> : micrograms per cubic meter				
* Standard has not been established for this pollutant/duration by this entity.				
1 When relative humidity is less than 70 percent.				
2 On June 2, 2010, a new 1-hour SO <sub>2</sub> standard was established and the existing 24-hour and annual primary standards were revoked. The 1971 SO <sub>2</sub> national standards (24-hour and annual) remain in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2010 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1971 standards, the 1971 standards remain in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2010 standards are approved.				
3 On December 14, 2012, EPA lowered the federal primary PM <sub>2.5</sub> annual standard from 15.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup> to 12.0 µg/m <sup>3</sup> . EPA made no changes to the primary 24-hour PM <sub>2.5</sub> standard or to the secondary PM <sub>2.5</sub> standards.				

### Methodology

Methodology to evaluate air quality impacts under CEQA has also been updated since the 2007 Certified EIR. SCAQMD has published updates on its web site to the Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook that are intended to provide local governments with guidance for analyzing and mitigating project-specific air quality impacts. SCAQMD's most recent air quality analysis model, CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2., was utilized to compare the impacts of the existing entitlements (2007 Approved Project) to the 2016 Modified Project. Resulting operational phase emissions are compared to the significance thresholds adopted by the SCAQMD. Air quality modeling sheets are included in Appendix B.

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X	
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

#### a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

##### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The current air quality plan for the SoCAB region is the 2012 AQMP, which was adopted December 2012 (SCAQMD 2012). Regional growth projections are used by SCAQMD to forecast future emission levels in the SoCAB. For southern California, these regional growth projections are provided by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and are partially based on land use designations included in city/county general plans. Typically, only large, regionally significant projects have the potential to affect the regional growth projections. The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that the 2007 Approved Project would be inconsistent with the AQMP. The 2016 Modified Project would result in a decrease of 482 employees and an increase of 409 residents within the Specific Plan area compared to the Approved Project. However, since certification of the 2007 Certified EIR, SCAG has updated its growth projections to anticipate the 3,450 units associated with the 2007 Approved Project. SCAG forecasts Calimesa's population and households to be 25,800 and 11,000 in 2035 (SCAG 2012), respectively. The 25,800 residents projected for the City in 2035 more than accommodates the City's current population of 8,353 and (DOF 2015b), the growth generated by the 2016 Modified Project (approximately 8,724 residents), and additional growth elsewhere in the City. Similarly, the 11,000 households projected for the City in 2035 more than accommodates the City's current 3,797 housing units (DOF 2015b), the growth generated by the 2016 Modified Project (3,650 households), and additional growth elsewhere in the City.

Since SCAG has updated its growth projections to reflect implementation of the 2007 Approved Project, and the overall projections by SCAG would accommodate the additional units anticipated with the 2016 Modified Project, the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict with strategies in the AQMP to attain the AAQS. Consequently, unlike the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of the AQMP. No changes or new significant information would require major revisions of the 2007 Certified EIR.

#### b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

##### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The following describes changes in regional impacts from short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the 2016 Modified Project compared to construction and operation of the 2007 Approved Project.

### **Construction-Related Impacts**

Construction activities associated with both the 2007 Approved and 2016 Modified Project would result in emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>), CO, oxides of sulfur (SO<sub>x</sub>), PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The 2007 Certified EIR identified that criteria air pollutant emissions generated during construction activities would generate emissions that exceeded the SCAQMD thresholds. Mitigation measures were incorporated into the 2007 Certified EIR to reduce impacts, to the extent feasible. Mitigation measures

## 5. Environmental Analysis

would reduce localized particulate matter (PM) levels to less than significant. However, despite the application of mitigation measures, regional construction emissions would continue to exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. The highest construction emissions would occur during grading activities. The 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project would result in similar grading scenarios because the same amount of land area would be graded. As a result, the types and numbers of construction equipment would generally be the same, and thus VOC/ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions would be similar or reduced. Additionally, the mitigation measures have been revised to require use of Tier 4 equipment, further reducing construction emissions associated with the 2016 Modified Project. Therefore, the 2016 Modified Project would not require major revisions to the 2007 Certified EIR.

### Operation-Related Impacts

Long-term air pollutant emissions generated by the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project were modeled with the new CalEEMod 2016.3.1, and are shown in Table 3. The 2016 Modified Project would result in a net reduction of trips (3,263 fewer trips<sup>1</sup>) than the 2007 Approved Project but would have more residential units and a higher population. As shown in the table, operation of both the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project would exceed the SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. However, as compared to the 2007 Approved Project, all emissions would be reduced with implementation of the 2016 Modified Project. No changes or new significant information would require major revisions to the 2007 Certified EIR.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?**

### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The SoCAB is designated nonattainment for O<sub>3</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> under the California and National AAQS, nonattainment for PM<sub>10</sub> under the California AAQS and nonattainment for lead (Los Angeles County only) under the National AAQS (CARB 2014a). According to SCAQMD methodology, any project that does not exceed or can be mitigated to less than the daily threshold values would not add significantly to a cumulative impact (SCAQMD 1993). As described above, both the Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project would exceed SCAQMD's significance thresholds for construction and operation; and would therefore, cumulatively contribute to the nonattainment designations of the SoCAB. Mitigation measures were integrated in the 2007 Certified EIR to reduce impacts, to the extent feasible. Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would have similar impacts. No changes or new significant information would require major revisions to the 2007 Certified EIR.

---

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Mesa Verde Estates Focused Traffic Study prepared by Urban Crossroads (2016).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 3 Mesa Verde Maximum Daily Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions**

Operational Phase	Criteria Air Pollutants (lbs/Day)					
	VOC	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
<b>2007 Approved Project</b>						
Area	160	61	308	<1	6	6
Energy	4	32	14	<1	3	3
Mobile	110	153	951	3	353	95
Total	273	245	1,274	3	362	104
SCAQMD Regional Significance Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Does 2007 Approved Project Exceed Thresholds?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<b>2016 Modified Project</b>						
Area	161	64	326	<1	7	7
Energy	4	32	14	<1	3	3
Mobile	105	146	918	3	342	92
Total	270	243	1,258	3	351	101
SCAQMD Regional Significance Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Does 2014 Modified Project Exceed Thresholds?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Change from 2007 Approved Project</b>	<b>-3</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-16</b>	<b>&lt;-1</b>	<b>-11</b>	<b>-3</b>

Source: CalEEMod 2016.3.1  
Note: Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.

### d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

#### Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.

The following describes changes in localized impacts from short-term construction activities and long-term operation of the 2016 Modified Project compared to construction and operation of the 2007 Approved Project.

#### Construction-Related Impacts

The 2007 Certified EIR identified that with mitigation, criteria air pollutant emissions generated during construction activities would not exceed the SCAQMD localized thresholds. The highest localized construction emissions of particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) would occur during grading activities. The 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project would result in similar grading scenarios because the same areas would be graded. Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR would ensure localized impacts are less than significant for both the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project. No changes or new significant information would require major revisions of the 2007 Certified EIR.

#### CO Hotspot Analysis

The 2007 Certified EIR identified less than significant impacts to CO hotspots. At the time of the 1993 SCAQMD Handbook, the SoCAB was designated nonattainment under the California AAQS and National AAQS for CO. With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of control technology on industrial facilities, CO concentrations in the SoCAB and in the state have steadily declined. In 2007, the SCAQMD was designated in attainment for CO under both the California AAQS and

## 5. Environmental Analysis

National AAQS.<sup>2</sup> Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix—in order to generate a significant CO impact (BAAQMD 2011). Therefore, CO hotspots are no longer an environmental impact of concern for the 2016 Modified Project. Additionally, daily traffic volumes for the 2016 Modified Project have been reduced as compared to the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, like the 2007 Approved Project, localized air quality impacts related to project-related mobile-source emissions associated with the 2016 Modified Project would be less than significant. No changes or new significant information would require major revisions to the 2007 Certified EIR.

### e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The 2007 Certified EIR identified that the construction and operational activities would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. The 2016 Modified Project would result in an increase of residential units but a decrease in non-residential square footage compared to the Approved Project. However, the land uses proposed would be similar to that identified in the 2007 Certified EIR. The type of facilities that are considered to have objectionable odors include wastewater treatment plants, compost facilities, landfills, solid waste transfer stations, fiberglass manufacturing facilities, paint/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), dairy farms, petroleum refineries, asphalt batch plants, chemical manufacturing, and food manufacturing facilities. Odors generated by new residential and nonresidential land uses are not expected to be significant or highly objectionable and would be required to be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402. Likewise, existing facilities are required to be in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402 to prevent nuisances on sensitive land uses. Therefore, like the 2007 Approved Project, impacts related to objectionable odors of the 2016 Modified Project would be less than significant. No changes or new significant information would require revisions to the 2007 Certified EIR.

### **5.3.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project**

The following mitigation measures were taken directly from the 2007 Certified EIR and are also listed in Appendix A. All of these mitigation measures apply to and would be implemented for the 2016 Modified Project. Modifications to the original mitigation measures to reflect changes in current emission control technologies are identified in ~~strikeout text~~ to indicate deletions and underlined to signify additions.

- 1                    During grading and construction activities, the applicant shall comply with the requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403.
- 2                    The applicant shall apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas.
- 3                    Ground cover shall be replaced in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

<sup>2</sup> As identified in SCAQMD's 2003 AQMP and the 1992 Federal Attainment Plan for Carbon Monoxide, peak carbon monoxide concentrations in the SoCAB were the result of unusual meteorological and topographical conditions and not of congestion at a particular intersection.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- 4 All excavating and grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.
- 5 All haul routes and exposed surfaces shall be watered three times daily except on days when a rain event occurs. Then exposed surfaces would be watered as necessary to meet the intent of Rule 403.
- 6 ~~Construction equipment with low emission factors and high energy efficiency shall be used where possible.~~ Applicants for new development projects within the Mesa Verde Specific Plan shall require the construction contractor to use equipment that meets the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)-Certified emissions standards.
- All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 horsepower shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 4 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine, as defined by CARB regulations.
- Prior to construction, the project engineer shall ensure that all demolition and grading plans clearly show the requirement for EPA Tier 4 or equivalent emissions standards for construction equipment over 50 horsepower. During construction, the construction contractor shall maintain a list of all operating equipment in use on the project site for verification by the Building Official or their designee. The construction equipment list shall state the makes, models, and numbers of construction equipment onsite. Equipment shall be properly serviced and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. Construction contractors shall also ensure that all nonessential idling of construction equipment is restricted to five minutes or less in compliance with California Air Resources Board's Rule 2449.
- 7 Regularly scheduled engine maintenance shall be performed to minimize equipment emissions.
- 8 Alternative fuels, such as ultra-low sulfur diesel or off-road construction vehicles/equipment shall be used where applicable and feasible.
- 9 Electric or diesel-powered equipment shall be used rather than gasoline-powered engines where feasible.
- 10 Applicants for new development projects within the Mesa Verde Specific Plan shall require the construction contractor to use coatings and solvents with a volatile organic compound (VOC) content lower than required under Rule 1113 (i.e., super compliant paints). Where applicable, the application of exterior architectural coatings (i.e., paint, etc.) shall be limited to average no more than 225 gallons per week and/or use "Zero-VOC" paint. Use of low-VOC paints and spray method shall be included as a note on architectural building plans and verified by the Building Official or their designee during construction.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- 11 Construct, contribute, or dedicate land for the provision of on-site bicycle trails linking the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes.
- 12 Provide site improvements such as street furniture, route signs, bus turnouts, and sidewalks or pedestrian paths.
- 13 Build homes that exceed minimum statewide energy construction requirements, such as:
- Use of low emission water heaters. Installation of low emission water heaters shall be verified by the Building Division during plan check.
  - Use of energy efficient appliances. Installation of Energy Star appliances shall be verified by the Building Division during plan check.
  - Use of light colored/earth tone roof tiles
  - ~~Increase insulation beyond~~ Exceed Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and/or offset building energy use through installation of photovoltaic panels on residential and non-residential buildings.
  - Level 2 electric vehicle charging stations in single-family residential garages. The location of the electrical outlets shall be specified on building plans, and proper installation shall be verified by the Building Division prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

### 5.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

#### 5.4.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that development of the project site would have a variety of direct and indirect impacts on the project site, none of them significant upon implementation of mitigation measures. In addition to the project site analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR analyzed the development of a new access road and extension of Roberts Road. Although the 2007 Certified EIR concluded that those new improvements would broaden the scope of potential biological resource impacts, it concluded that those impacts would remain less than significant if mitigation measures from the 2007 Certified EIR were applied.

Development of the 2007 Approved Project would have resulted in the loss of over 1,000 acres of on-site habitat, including non-native grassland, chaparral, buckwheat-dominated coastal sage scrub, and oak woodland. Coastal sage scrub is considered rare by the California Department of Fish and Game. Mitigation for that impact, consistent with the applicable Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), required that coastal sage scrub be preserved. The 2007 Approved Project generally avoided impacts to ACOE and CDFG (now CDFW) Jurisdictional Waters. According to the 2007 Certified EIR, the Roberts Road Extension and Streets G and F would permanently impact 0.20 acres (8,712 square feet) of ACOE jurisdiction, 0.61 of CDFW jurisdiction (23,087 square feet (0.53 acres) of which is riparian), and 0.02 acres (871 square feet) of ACOE jurisdictional wetlands. In addition, there would be temporary impacts to 0.032 acres (1,394 square feet) of ACOE jurisdiction and 0.086 acres (3,746 square feet) of CDFW jurisdiction (496.6 square feet (0.0114 acres) of which is riparian).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

The project site features oak woodland, a rare and sensitive land cover in California. The 2007 Certified EIR explains that a tree survey conducted in July 2005 and updated in 2006 identified 920 oak trees on the project site. Implementation of the 2007 Approved Project would have disturbed and/or removed 308 of those trees and preserved the remaining 612 trees. That impact would represent a direct and permanent loss of native coast live oak woodland. An oak tree mitigation program was included in the 2007 Certified EIR that was determined to reduce the impact of the 2007 Approved Project on oak tree woodland to a less than significant level.

Mitigation measures in the 2007 Certified EIR also addressed criteria and sensitive plant and animal species on the project site. Species included those that are covered by the MSHCP such as the burrowing owl and California gnatcatcher, despite these not being directly observed on the site. Mitigation measures addressing protected species in both documents were largely concerned with MSHCP compliance and with minimizing the disturbance of potential habitat areas. These measures would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project, regardless of changes to the site design or mix of land uses.

### 5.4.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				<b>X</b>	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				<b>X</b>	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				<b>X</b>	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
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?				<b>X</b>	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				<b>X</b>	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				<b>X</b>	

According to the 2016 Addendum Biological Technical Report and MSHCP Consistency Analysis, the 2016 Modified Project would include approximately 3.28 acres of ACOE jurisdictional waters on-site, of which 0.03-acre consist of jurisdictional wetlands, and an additional 0.13 acre off-site, none of which consist of jurisdictional wetlands, as part of the proposed off-site road extension to County Line Road. The 2016 Modified Project would permanently impact 0.45 acre of Corps jurisdictional waters (on- and off-site combined), none of which consist of jurisdictional wetlands, temporarily impact 0.004 acre of Corps jurisdictional waters, none of which consist of jurisdictional wetlands, and impact 0.16 acre of isolated (non-federal) waters, none of which consist of wetlands.

Approximately 5.42 acres of CDFW jurisdiction, of which 1.63 acres consist of CDFW vegetated riparian habitat, were identified on-site. An additional 0.46 acres of CDFW jurisdiction, all of which consist of vegetated riparian habitat, were identified off-site as part of the proposed road extension to County Line Road. The 2016 Modified Project would permanently impact 1.05 acres of CDFW jurisdiction (on- and off-site combined), of which 0.48 acre consists of vegetated riparian habitat, and temporarily impact 0.005-acre of CDFW jurisdiction, none of which consists of vegetated riparian habitat.

The project site features oak woodland, a rare and sensitive land cover in California. The 2007 Certified EIR explains that a tree survey conducted in July 2005 and updated in 2006 identified 920 oak trees on the project site. Implementation of the 2007 Approved Project would have disturbed and/or removed 308 of those trees and preserved the remaining 612 trees. A tree survey conducted in July 2016 identified 924 oak trees on the project site. The 2016 Modified Project impacts 19 fewer oak trees than the 2007 Approved Project. The oak tree program was revised in 2016 and includes preservation of some woodland areas and the planting of 2,023 new oak trees.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

- a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The project site is located within the plan area for the Western Riverside County MSHCP, a regional conservation plan that outlines a strategy for mitigating impacts to special-status species in the plan area. The MSHCP identifies nine “criteria area cells” on the project site. These are areas where specific species or habitats are targeted for conservation. Biological resource studies conducted as part of the 2007 Certified EIR found that six listed and ten unlisted but sensitive plant species have been reported in the vicinity of the project area. Seven listed and twenty-four unlisted wildlife species have been reported in the same area. Although no listed threatened or endangered wildlife species have been identified on the project site, the site contains habitat suitable for the borrowing owl, California gnatcatcher, and other protected species. Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would be required to comply with the MSHCP’s conservation strategy for these and other covered species. Compliance would include conservation of land, payment of applicable fees, and preconstruction surveys. Furthermore, like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would be required to comply with Calimesa General Plan policies related to protection of sensitive species and the City’s Oak Tree and Oak Woodlands Preservation and Protection Ordinance.

The 2007 Certified EIR identified 13 mitigation measures that would mitigate potential impacts to sensitive species and ensure compliance with the MSHCP. They include Biological Resources Measure 5, which requires pre-grading focused surveys of Criteria Area species, and Biological Resources Measure 6, which outlines a detailed protocol for the identification and conservation of burrowing owl habitat. Because Biological Resources Measures 1 through 13 were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. The 2016 Modified Project impacts 19 fewer oak trees than the 2007 Adopted Project.

Compared to the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would involve construction of 200 additional housing units, 100,000 fewer square feet of commercial space, and one fewer school site. The project would also involve minor right-of-way changes to some roadways proposed for the project site. However, in August 2016, Glenn Lukos Associates (GLA) reviewed the updated land plan for the Modified Project and compared it to that for the 2007 Approved Project (see Appendix C of this Addendum). Based upon GLA’s review of the revised land plan, they determined that the project’s footprint and impact areas are consistent with the footprint and impacts to biological resources previously analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR. GLA concluded that the Modified Project would not result in new significant impacts to biological resources.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to special status species.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

**Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The project site contains a system of arroyos that drain toward San Timoteo Creek and contain riparian habitat, including jurisdictional wetlands and riparian habitat. These habitat areas are identified and protected by the Riverside County MSHCP. Mitigation Measures 1 through 13 would apply to the 2016 Modified Project and would ensure that impacts to onsite sensitive natural communities are minimized. Furthermore, the 2016 Modified Project, like the 2007 Approved Project, would be required to comply with all applicable requirements of the MSHCP, including preparation of a Determination of a Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation. Because the 2016 Modified Project would not impact habitat areas outside of those analyzed by the 2007 Certified EIR for the 2007 Approved Project, no new impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to sensitive natural communities.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

As discussed in Section 5.4.1, above, the project site contains protected riparian habitat, including jurisdictional wetlands. Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project generally avoids these areas. Where wetlands would be impacted, either temporarily or permanently, the 2016 Modified Project would be required to comply with provision of the MSHCP and Biological Resources Measures 1 through 13. Because these mitigation measures were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses of the 2007 Approved Project, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Furthermore, because the 2016 Modified Project would not impact habitat areas outside of those analyzed by the 2007 Certified EIR, no new impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to adverse effects on federally protected wetlands.

- 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The project site contains several minor wildlife corridors that follow arroyos and canyons, and also borders a major wildlife corridor along the Garden Air Wash south of the project site. The 2016 Modified Project, like the 2007 Approved Project, generally avoids the placement of new land uses and roadways in these corridors. Indirect impacts of the 2016 Modified Project on the use of wildlife corridors by resident and/or migratory

## 5. Environmental Analysis

wildlife, like those of the 2007 Approved Project, would include noise and light impacts. Biological Resources Measures 1 through 13 would mitigate potential impacts to wildlife corridors, including light impacts (Measure 8) and noise related impacts (Measure 9). Because these measures were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Furthermore, the development footprint of the two projects and the geographic range of their impacts on wildlife habitat are nearly identical. Although the rearrangement of land uses under the 2016 Modified Project would result in small changes to the interface between wildlife corridors and urbanized uses, the location and size of wildlife corridors proposed for preservation would be the same under the 2016 Modified Project as under 2007 Approved Project. In fact, the revised land use plan proposes that a parks and open space corridor link existing natural open space corridors in the eastern half of the project site (see Planning Areas 8, 9, and 67 in Figure 3 of this Addendum) where a link was not proposed under the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, no new impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to wildlife movement.

### **e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The City of Calimesa's Oak Tree and Oak Woodlands Preservation and Protection Ordinance addresses protection of oak trees and oak woodlands in the City. The 2016 Modified Project, would result in a direct and permanent loss of native coast live oak woodland, including the disturbance and/or removal of 289 of the site's 924 oak trees. These impacts to oak trees would conflict with the City's Oak Tree and Oak Woodlands Preservation and Protection Ordinance. Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project includes an Oak Tree Protection Plan. The plan preserves approximately two thirds of the project site's oak trees. Removed oak trees would be replaced with 2,023 oak trees using a combination of acorns, seedlings, and oak saplings (VA Consulting, et al, 2013). Implementation of Biological Resources Measure 2, which has been updated to reflect the number of trees current proposed to be removed and replaced by proposed Specific Plan amendments, would apply to the 2016 Modified Project. The 2016 Modified Project would affect 19 fewer trees compared to the 2007 Approved Project. However, upon implementation of Biological Resources Measure 7, 2,023 additional trees would be planted. Because the amount of oak woodlands and the number of oak trees affected by the 2016 Approved Project would be generally similar to that affected by the 2007 Approved Project, no new impact related to compliance with the City's Oak Tree and Oak Woodlands Preservation and Protection Ordinance would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

#### Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.

As discussed in Section 5.4.2(a), above, the project site is located in the plan area for the Riverside County MSHCP. Biological Resources Measures 1 through 13, which apply to both the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project, would ensure compliance with the MSHCP. Furthermore, the project footprint and impacted habitat areas of the 2016 Modified Project are consistent with those previously analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR. Therefore, no new impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to special status species.

### 5.4.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to biological resources are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. These measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. The following measures have been slightly revised based on the updated biological resources technical report.

- 1 Permanent direct impacts to ~~20~~ 18.73 acres of buckwheat-dominated Riversidean sage scrub shall be partially offset by compliance with the mitigation requirements listed under the MSHCP. These requirements include onsite preservation of coastal sage scrub. The proposed project Plan preserves all of the coastal sage scrub on the project site that is within the Criteria Cells, which includes approximately 9 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat. Figure 3.3-7, *Proposed Conservation Areas*, shows the areas where the applicant intends to set aside with an Open Space designation.
- 2 Mitigation requirements to minimize permanent direct impacts to onsite oak tree woodlands, including removal of 289 individual coast live oak trees would include onsite preservation in compliance with MSHCP standards for Criteria Area Cells and implementation of an oak tree planting and restoration plan pursuant to the Project Specific Plan. Approximately ~~46~~ 11.60 acres of oak tree woodland would be preserved onsite. Additionally, oak trees would be planted from container stock as well as from acorns collected onsite to ensure that oak seedlings will have the best genetic adaptation for the Mesa Verde Estates development. The applicant shall plant ~~3,470~~ oak trees using a combination of acorns, seedlings, and oak saplings in containers ranging from one-gallon to sixty-inch boxes at a ratio required by the adopted City of Calimesa Oak Tree Ordinance as mitigation for the removal of oak trees. ~~Table 3.3-3 in the Section 3.3 of this EIR summarizes the mitigation requirements.~~ This planting program reduces the impact of loss of oak woodland and oak trees to a less than significant level.
- 5 To avoid significant adverse impacts to Narrow Endemic Plant Species and Criteria Area Species (CAS) and to ensure compliance with the MSHCP, pre-grading focused surveys shall be conducted

## 5. Environmental Analysis

by a qualified biologist according to USFWS and CDFW protocol. If the site is found to be occupied and at least 90% of the area with long-term conservation value cannot be avoided, then the applicant must submit a plan for a Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation alternative to the City. Prior to approval of an alternative, the USFWS and CDFW shall be notified of such determinations and shall be provided a 60-day review and response period. A grading permit shall not be issued until the applicant has fulfilled its obligations regarding the approved alternative pursuant to the MSHCP.

6 A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction presence/absence burrowing owl survey within 30 days prior to site disturbance. If burrowing owls are found to be nesting onsite, then the take of active nests will be avoided. Owl relocation will occur outside of the nesting season following accepted protocols, and subject to the approval of the City of Calimesa, RCA, CDFW, and USFWS. In order to minimize potential impacts to BUOW and to comply with the MSHCP, focused burrowing owl winter and breeding season surveys and a 30-day pre-grading survey must be conducted (TLC 2005, MSHCP, Vol. II, Page B-68). The surveys shall be conducted within the grading footprint plus a 300-foot buffer by a qualified biologist according to CDFG protocol. If active burrows are found during the breeding season, grading activities shall be postponed until a qualified ornithologist has determined that the nest has successfully fledged young. If active burrows are found outside the breeding season, relocation of the owls shall be conducted in accordance with requirements outlined in the MSHCP. Grading and associated activities shall commence only when a qualified biologist has determined that the burrows are no longer active. If three or more pairs of BUOW are found within the project site and at least 90% of the occupied area with long-term conservation area cannot be avoided, then the applicant must submit a plan for a Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation alternative to the City. Prior to approval of an alternative, the USFWS and CDFG shall be notified of such determinations and be provided a 60-day review and response period. A grading permit shall not be issued until the applicant has fulfilled its obligations regarding the approved alternative pursuant to the MSHCP.

14 The Project will provide compensatory mitigation at an approved mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program within the Santa Ana River watershed. One such approved in-lieu fee program is the Riverside-Corona Resource Conservation District (RCRCD) In-Lieu Fee Program (ILFP). The applicant is proposing to purchase 2.10 acres of mitigation credits from the RCRCD ILFP, or another approved mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program within the Santa Ana River watershed at a 2:1 mitigation-to-impact ratio.

### 5.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The analysis in this section is based in part on the following technical reports:

- *Class III Historic Resources Study for the Mesa Verde Estates Project for Section 106 Compliance*, prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates, September 2015, revised August 2016
- *Paleontological Resource Assessment, Mesa Verde Estates Project*, prepared by Brian F. Smith and Associates, September 2015, revised August 2017

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Complete copies of these reports are included in Appendix D.

### 5.5.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

A cultural resource search was conducted for the 2007 Certified EIR that found no prehistoric cultural resources in the proposed project area. In regards to historic cultural resources, the resource search found remnants of a residential complex destroyed by fire, ruins of a historic hog farm, and historic water retention features. None of those resources were identified as significant or eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources. However, mitigation measures were identified that apply in the event that either prehistoric or historic resources were encountered during grading and construction. The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that these would reduce potential cultural impacts to a less than significant level.

A paleontological resource assessment was also prepared as part of the 2007 Certified EIR. Although no specific archaeological and paleontological resources were found on the site, three geological formations known to be highly fossiliferous span the site. The substantial amount of grading required by the project prompted the inclusion of mitigation measures in the 2007 Certified EIR that address the monitoring and collection of potential paleontological resources. With the addition of a new access road and extended Roberts Road, the 2007 Certified EIR found that a specific paleontological resource (remains of an extinct horse) does exist on the project site, but that mitigation measures included in the EIR would still apply. The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that mitigation measures would reduce potential paleontological impacts to a less than significant level.

### 5.5.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

**a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

As discussed under Section 5.5.1, above, none of the historic resources found onsite were identified as significant or eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources. However, the 2007 Certified EIR identified a mitigation measure, Measure 4, that addresses discovery of previously unknown historic resources. Implementation of Cultural Resources Measure 4 would require that demolition and grading on the project site be monitored by a qualified historian. Because Cultural Resources Measure 4 was not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, it would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to historical resources.

**b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The project site is not known to contain important archaeological resources. However, such resources may be present and could be unearthed during development of the project site. Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR, Cultural Resources Measures 1 and 2, would address any impacts related to discovery of prehistoric resources during development on the project site. Because these mitigation measures were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to archeological resources.

**c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

There are two geological formations underlying the project site that likely contain high levels of paleontological resources: the San Timoteo Formation and the Pleistocene Older Alluvial Sediments (Greystone 2005). The substantial amount of grading required by the 2007 Approved Project prompted the inclusion of mitigation measures in the 2007 Certified EIR that address the monitoring and collection of potential paleontological resources. Additionally, the 2007 Certified EIR determined that improvements associated with extension of Roberts Road would impact a known paleontological resource. Because Cultural Resources Measures 5 and 6 were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Furthermore, because the overall

## 5. Environmental Analysis

development footprint and land use pattern of the 2016 Modified Project is nearly identical to that of the 2007 Approved Project, the geographic range of potential impacts to paleontological resources is substantially similar.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to historical resources.

### **d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Human remains may be present on the project site and development of the 2016 Modified Project may disturb those remains. However, Cultural Resources Measure 3, originally identified in the 2007 Certified EIR, would address such impacts. In the event that human remains were found during project grading or construction, the County Coroner would be notified. Because Cultural Resources Measure 3 was not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, it would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Furthermore, because the overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2016 Modified Project is nearly identical to that of the 2007 Approved Project, the geographic range of potential impacts to human remains is substantially similar.

The 2016 Modified Project, when compared to the 2007 Approved Project, would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to disturbance of human remains.

### **5.5.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project**

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR (listed in Appendix A) have been modified as shown below. Modifications to the original mitigation measures as described in this Addendum and via the separate MMRP are not new mitigation measures required to address new impacts, but – instead – merely clarify, amend, and modify the existing mitigation measures with which the project is already required to comply. The revisions to the mitigation measures are identified in ~~strikeout text~~ to indicate deletions and underlined to signify additions.

- ~~1 — In the event that unanticipated prehistoric cultural resources are encountered during construction, all earthmoving activity shall cease in the area until the services of a qualified archaeologist are retained. The archaeologist shall examine the prehistoric cultural resources, assess their significance, and make a recommendation for mitigation as needed.~~
- ~~2 — If Native American cultural resources are discovered, the developer/contractor shall immediately contact the City of Calimesa, which shall in turn notify the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. If requested by the Tribe, the City shall consult on the discovery and disposition of artifacts, including but not limited to avoidance, preservation, or return of artifacts to the Tribe.~~

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- ~~3 — If human remains are encountered during grading and other construction excavation, work in the immediate vicinity shall cease and the County Coroner shall be contacted pursuant to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5.~~
- ~~4 — A qualified archaeologist/historian shall monitor future demolition and subsequent grading activities at the historic sites. In the event that unanticipated historic cultural resources are encountered during construction, all earthmoving activity shall cease in the area until the archaeologist can examine the historic cultural resources, assess their significance, and make a recommendation for mitigation as needed.~~
- ~~5 — A qualified paleontologist shall monitor grading as described in Measure CUL-6. The paleontologist shall be present at any pre-grading meetings to explain the monitoring program to the contractors prior to initiation of any earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities. The monitoring program shall include the measures listed in Measure 6.~~
- ~~6 — In units with known high potential to impact significant paleontological resources, a supervised paleontological field monitor shall be present during earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities on a full time basis. The areas that shall be monitored full time include any grading in the San Timoteo Formation and the Older Alluvial Sediments, and grading below three meters depth in the Quaternary Younger Alluvium and the Recent Wash Sediments. Monitoring shall be conducted every grading day during each hour that brushing or grubbing and earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities are being conducted in these areas.
  - ~~a) A qualified paleontologist shall supervise the paleontological field monitor. The normal monitoring of earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities shall include hand recovery of minor concentrations of significant paleontological resources.~~
  - ~~b) The project paleontologist and/or field monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large fossil specimens encountered during construction grading excavations.~~
  - ~~c) Monitoring and/or salvage of significant paleontological resources shall be consistent with the provisions of CEQA, as well as regulations of the City of Calimesa, and the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's Measures for Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Non-Renewable Paleontological Resources: Standard Procedures (SVP 1991).~~
  - ~~d) As required by SVP (1991) the monitoring program shall involve collection of samples of fossiliferous matrix sediments suspected of containing small invertebrate or vertebrate fossils. Once collected, the samples shall be dry screened and/or water washed to recover small sized and/or microscopic fossils. A sample of 6,000 pounds of matrix for each horizon, paleosol, or stratigraphic bed at each fossil locality within a sedimentary unit is considered adequate. To avoid construction delays, matrix samples may be removed from the path of excavation equipment for processing either on or off site. If concentrations of small and/or microscopic invertebrates, rodents, mammals, or other vertebrates are encountered during sampling, it will be necessary to~~~~

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- ~~wash and screen additional samples of matrix. The project paleontologist will determine the number of additional samples. Washed matrix samples will be visually examined, as need with binocular microscopes, and hand-sorted to recover a representative sample of fossil specimens. The remaining unsorted portion of the screened and/or washed matrix shall be accessioned into a museum repository with retrievable storage.~~
- ~~e) Salvaged fossils shall be identified, curated to a point of identification, and accessioned (deposited) into a permanent and accredited institution maintaining fossil collections, such as the San Bernardino County Museum or the Geology Department at the University of California at Riverside.~~
- ~~f) Upon completion of construction excavations, the project paleontologist shall submit a grading monitoring report of findings and significance for review and approval by the City of Calimesa. The report shall include at least the following elements:~~
- ~~▪ The dates of paleontological resource monitoring;~~
  - ~~▪ A description of the on-site geology;~~
  - ~~▪ A description of the on-site stratigraphy;~~
  - ~~▪ A catalogue and analysis of the fossils observed and/or salvaged;~~
  - ~~▪ A brief statement of significance of the salvaged fossils; and,~~
  - ~~▪ The repository where the salvaged fossils were accessioned.~~
- ~~g) Upon approval by the City of Calimesa, acceptance of the final report of findings and significance indicates the completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level.~~
- 1           **Tribal Monitoring:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall contact the consulting Native American Tribe(s) that have requested monitoring through consultation with the City during the AB 52 process. These tribes are the Morongo Band of Mission Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians. The applicant shall coordinate with the Tribe(s) to develop a Tribal Monitoring Agreement(s). A copy of the agreement shall be provided to the City of Calimesa Planning Department prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
- 2           **Archaeological Monitoring:** At least 30-days prior to application for a grading permit and before any grading, excavation and/or ground disturbing activities on the site take place, the Project Applicant shall retain a Secretary of Interior Standards qualified archaeological monitor to monitor all ground-disturbing activities in an effort to identify any unknown archaeological resources. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with interested tribes, the Developer and the City, shall develop an Archaeological Monitoring Plan to address the details, timing and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the project site. Details in the Plan shall include:
- a) Project grading and development scheduling;

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- b) The development of a rotating or simultaneous schedule in coordination with the applicant and the Project Archeologist for designated Native American Tribal Monitors from the consulting tribes during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities on the site: including the scheduling, safety requirements, duties, scope of work, and Native American Tribal Monitors' authority to stop and redirect grading activities in coordination with all Project archaeologists;
  - c) The protocols and stipulations that the Developer, City, Tribes and Project archaeologist will follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation.
- 3 If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the Riverside County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b) remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission must be contacted within 24 hours. The Native American Heritage Commission must then immediately identify the "most likely descendants(s)" for purposes of receiving notification of discovery. The most likely descendant(s) shall then make recommendations within 48 hours, and engage in consultation concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and the agreement described in MM 2.
- 4 A qualified archaeologist/historian shall monitor future demolition and subsequent grading activities at the historic sites. In the event that unanticipated historic cultural resources are encountered during construction, all earthmoving activity shall cease in the area until the archaeologist can examine the historic cultural resources, assess their significance, and make a recommendation for mitigation as needed.
- 5 A qualified paleontologist shall monitor grading as described in MM 6. The paleontologist shall be present at any pre-grading meetings to explain the monitoring program to the contractors prior to initiation of any earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities. The monitoring program shall include measures listed in MM 6.
- 6 In units with known high potential to impact significant paleontological resources, a supervised paleontological field monitor shall be present during earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities on a full-time basis. The areas that shall be monitored full-time include any grading in the San Timoteo Formation and the Older Alluvial Sediments, and grading below three meters depth in the Quaternary Younger Alluvium and the Recent Wash Sediments. Monitoring shall be conducted every grading day during each hour that brushing or grubbing and earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities are being conducted in these areas.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- a) A qualified paleontologist shall supervise the paleontological field monitor. The normal monitoring of earth disturbing construction excavation (grading) activities shall include hand recovery of minor concentrations of significant paleontological resources.
- b) The project paleontologist and/or field monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large fossil specimens encountered during construction grading excavations.
- c) Monitoring and/or salvage of significant paleontological resources shall be consistent with the provisions of CEQA, as well as regulations of the City of Calimesa, and the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's Measures for Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Non-Renewable Paleontological Resources: Standard Procedures (SVP 1991).
- d) As required by SVP (1991) the monitoring program shall involve collection of samples of fossiliferous matrix sediments suspected of containing small or invertebrate or vertebrate fossils. Once collected, the sample shall be dry screened and/or water washed to recover small sized and/or microscopic fossils. A sample of 6,000 pounds of matrix for each horizon, paleosol, or stratigraphic bed at each fossil locality within a sedimentary unit considered adequate. To avoid construction delays, matrix samples may be removed from the path of excavation equipment for processing either on- or off-site. If concentrations of small and/or microscopic invertebrates, rodents, mammals, or other vertebrates are encountered during sampling, it will be necessary to wash and screen additional samples of matrix. The project paleontologist will determine the number of additional samples. Washed matrix samples will be visually examined, as needed with binocular microscopes, and hand-sorted to recover a representative sample of fossil specimens. The remaining unsorted portion of the screened and/or washed matrix shall be accessioned into a museum repository with retrievable storage.
- e) Salvage: Fossils shall be identified, curated to a point of identification, and accessioned (deposited) into a permanent and accredited institution maintaining fossil collections, such as the San Bernardino County Museum or the Geology Department at the University of California at Riverside.
- f) Upon completion of construction excavations, the project paleontologist shall submit a grading monitoring report of findings and significance for review and approval by the City of Calimesa. The report shall include at least the following elements:
  - The dates of paleontological resource monitoring;
  - A description of the on-site geology;
  - A description of the on-site stratigraphy;
  - A catalogue and analysis of the fossils observed and/or salvaged;
  - A brief statement of significance of the salvaged fossils; and,
  - The repository where the salvaged fossils were accessioned.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Upon approval by the City of Calimesa, acceptance of the final report of findings and significance indicates the completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources to a less than significant level.

- 7 **Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources:** In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for this Project. The following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

**Temporary Curation and Storage:** During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location onsite or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the project site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process; and

**Treatment and Final Disposition:** The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and non-human remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The applicant shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods and provide the City of Calimesa Planning Department with evidence of same:

- a) Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloging and basic recordation have been completed;
- b) A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository within Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility within Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation;
- c) If more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to a consensus as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center or Riverside Metropolitan Museum by default.
- d) At the completion of grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities on the site a Phase IV Monitoring Report shall be submitted to the City documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project Archaeologist and Native Tribal Monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pre-grade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports

## 5. Environmental Analysis

produced will be submitted to the City of Calimesa, Eastern Information Center and interested tribes.

### 5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

#### 5.6.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that there are no special or unique geologic or topographic features on project site. However, it did conclude that development of the project site would potentially result in significant impacts related to seismic activity, landslides, erosion, unstable soils, dust and sedimentation. Many of these potential impacts are exacerbated by the substantial amount of grading (including cut and fill operations) required to develop the project site and by the Cherry Valley Fault, which runs through a portion of the project site. The 2007 Certified EIR provided nine mitigation measures (see Appendix A) that reduce potential geology and soil impacts to a less than significant level. The detailed measures outline a variety of ways that development on the project site must be sensitive to the site's topography, including fault zone setbacks, wind and water erosion prevention measures, requirements for the compacting of fill material, and other geotechnical engineering.

#### 5.6.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:					
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X	
iv) Landslides?				X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				<b>X</b>	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				<b>X</b>	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?					<b>X</b>

### Comments:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
  - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** There are six major faults in the vicinity of the project site, including the San Andreas, San Gorgonio Pass, San Jacinto, Crafton Hill, Banning, and Beaumont Plain faults. In addition to these major faults, the region has numerous “blind” and unmapped faults. A portion of the Cherry Valley Fault, which is believed to be an extension of the San Gorgonio Pass Fault Zone east of the project site, traverses the project site diagonally from the southwest to the northwest. The geotechnical report prepared for the 2007 Certified EIR identified the portions of the Cherry Valley Fault that traverse the site as “potentially” and “possibly” active. As a result of this and other local faults, the project site could experience fault rupture. However, because the overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project are nearly identical, no new land uses would be placed near the Cherry Valley Fault. Therefore, the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially greater impacts related to fault rupture.

The 2007 Certified EIR identified two mitigation measures, Geology and Soils Measures 1 and 2, that address potential onsite fault rupture. (see Appendix A) Geology Measure 1 requires that development be set back specific distances from known fault zones. Although the land use mix proposed for the project

## 5. Environmental Analysis

site by the 2016 Modified Project is different from that of the 2007 Modified Project, these setbacks would be applicable to any land use. Furthermore, Geology and Soils Measure 2, which requires that buildings on the project site comply with the current California Building Code, is also relevant to the 2016 Modified Project. Therefore, upon implementation of Geology and Soils Measures 1 and 2, impacts related to fault rupture would remain less than significant.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to fault rupture.

### ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** As discussed under Section 5.6.2(i), above, there are active faults in close proximity to the project site which may generate strong seismic ground shaking, including the Cherry Valley Fault which traverses the project site. However, implementation of Geology and Soils Measures 1 and 2 would reduce impacts of the 2016 Modified Project related to ground shaking.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to ground shaking.

### iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Liquefaction is a loss of strength and stiffness in soil due to ground shaking; it typically occurs within 50 feet of the surface, in saturated, loose, fine- to medium-grained sandy to silty soils. Liquefaction can substantially damage structures and can cause structures to sink or tilt. Three conditions are needed for liquefaction: ground shaking with acceleration of about 0.2 g or greater; loose, unconsolidated sediments; and saturated soil within about 50 feet of the surface. Liquefaction-induced ground failure historically has been a major cause of earthquake damage in southern California. The State of California has not yet prepared hazard zone maps for the quadrangle containing the project site. Although the valleys in the area are known to have high potential for liquefaction, the 2007 Certified EIR and its associated geological investigation found that those on the project site are underlain by bedrock at shallow depths (Greystone 2005). Although implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would place 200 additional homes and approximately 409 additional residents on the project site, including areas of the site with the potential to experience seismic-related liquefaction, the overall development footprints and land use patterns of the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project are nearly identical. Therefore, the 2016 Modified Project would not result in new impacts related to seismic-related ground failure. Furthermore, mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR, Geology and Soils Measures 7 through 9, are applicable to the 2016 Modified Project and would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

The 2016 Modified Project, when compared to the 2007 Approved Project, would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to seismic-related ground failure.

### **iv) Landslides?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** The 2007 Certified EIR found that, while landslide risks on the project site are not significant, there is some potential for landslides along steep valleys, canyons, and stream flow channels. Localized landslides in these locations could result in potential impacts to structures or people. However, the overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project are nearly identical. Furthermore, the 2007 Certified EIR identifies a mitigation measure, Geology and Soils Measure 6, that would reduce potential impacts related to landslides. (see Appendix A) Measure 6 requires that structures be located away from areas known to have landslide risks. This measure is applicable to the 2016 Modified Project and would reduce potential impacts related to landslide hazards to less than significant level.

The 2016 Modified Project, when compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to landslide risks.

### **b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Surface soils on the project site are predominantly composed of medium dense sand and silty materials with some clay (Greystone 2005). Implementation of the 2016 Modified Project, like the 2007 Approved Project, would involve removal of vegetation and topsoil and other grading activities that could expose soil to wind and rain erosion. The 2007 Certified EIR identified a mitigation measure, Geology and Soils Measure 4, addressing potential soil erosion impacts. (see Appendix A) The measure requires compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District erosion control requirements, that recommend that excavation work be schedule in dry months, requires preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and identifies other physical measures aimed at preventing erosion and minimizing runoff. Because Geology and Soils Measure 4 was not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, it also applies to the 2016 Modified Project. Its implementation would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion and loss of topsoil. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

### **c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Subsidence is a decrease in ground elevation due to natural settlement, movement of faults, or withdrawal of groundwater or oil. Lateral spreading is the displacement of surficial blocks of soil as a result of liquefaction in the subsurface layer. Lateral spreading most commonly occurs on gentle slopes that range between 0.3 and 3 degrees, and can displace the ground surface by several to tens of meters. Such movement damages pipelines, utilities, bridges, roads, and other structures.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Groundwater below the project site is, on average, approximately 300 feet below ground surface. Furthermore, soil underlying the project site is generally compact and dense (Greystone 2005). Based on this information and requirement of mitigation measures, the 2007 Certified EIR determined that implementation of the 2005 Proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to unstable soil. Because the overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project are nearly identical, the modified ratio of commercial and residential uses proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not affect the overall potential for impacts related to unstable soil to occur. The low risk of soil instability on the project site is unrelated to the type of use for the site. Under both iterations of the project, soil would be compacted before construction of new buildings and all uses would be set back from steep slopes.

Because Geology and Soils Measures 7 and 8 were not tailored to the specific design, mix of land uses, or ratio of commercial and residential development contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts related to unstable soils by ensuring that structures on the project site would be constructed on compacted soils and shallow foundations. As discussed above under sections 5.6.2(a)(i) and 5.6.2(a)(iv), Geology and Soils Measures 6 through 9 would mitigate potential impacts of the 2016 Modified Project related to liquefaction and landslides to a less than significant level.

The 2016 Modified Project, when compared to the 2007 Approved Project, would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to unstable geologic units or soil.

**d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 19-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Expansive soils shrink or swell as the moisture content decreases or increases; the shrinking or swelling can shift, crack, or break structures built on such soils. The overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project are nearly identical. Therefore, any impacts related to expansive soils are similar between the two projects. The 2016 Modified Project would be required to comply with Geology and Soils Measures 7 through 9, (see Appendix A) which would reduce potential impacts related to expansive soil to a less than significant level.

The 2016 Modified Project, when compared to the 2007 Approved Project, would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect expansive soil.

**e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

**No Impact.** Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would include installation of a comprehensive sewer infrastructure adequate to serve the entirety of the project. The use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not occur as part of the 2016 Modified Project and no impact would occur.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.6.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to geology and soils are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. These measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project and no modifications are necessary.

## 5.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

### 5.7.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR did not analyze greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. GHG emissions were not specifically analyzed in the Certified EIR because it was certified prior to the adoption of Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) and the Senate Bill 97 (SB 97) amendments (adopted December 30, 2009, effective March 18, 2010) to the CEQA Guidelines.

The information provided in this section includes the most current scientific data on GHG and global climate change, but does not change the conclusions of the 2007 Certified EIR. Current information on GHG emissions and global climate change do not trigger the need for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR pursuant to Public Resources Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. The current scientific information does not demonstrate that the 2016 Modified Project will result in new or substantially greater significant impacts than those that would have resulted from implementation of the 2007 Approved Project.

### 5.7.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

#### Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change

Scientists have concluded that human activities are contributing to global climate change by adding large amounts of heat-trapping gases, known as GHG, to the atmosphere. The primary source of these GHG is fossil fuel use. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has identified four major GHG—water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and ozone (O<sub>3</sub>)—that are the likely cause of an increase in global average temperatures observed within the 20th and 21st centuries. Other GHG identified by the IPCC that contribute to global warming to a lesser extent include nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and chlorofluorocarbons (IPCC 2001).<sup>3,4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Water vapor (H<sub>2</sub>O) is the strongest GHG and the most variable in its phases (vapor, cloud droplets, ice crystals). However, water vapor is not considered a pollutant.

<sup>4</sup> Black carbon is the most strongly light-absorbing component of PM emitted from burning fuels. Black carbon contributes to climate change both directly, by absorbing sunlight, and indirectly, by depositing on snow (making it melt faster) and by interacting with clouds and affecting cloud formation. Reducing black carbon emissions globally can have immediate economic, climate, and public health benefits. California has been an international leader in reducing emissions of black carbon, with close to 95 percent control expected by 2020 due to existing programs that target reducing PM from diesel engines and burning activities (CARB 2013).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Regulatory Setting

The regulatory settings for the 2016 Modified Project have changed since the adoption of 2007 Certified EIR. The following discussion is provided to update conditions relative to development of the 2016 Modified Project.

#### *Federal Laws*

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced on December 7, 2009, that GHG emissions threaten the public health and welfare of the American people and that GHG emissions from on-road vehicles contribute to that threat. The EPA's final findings respond to the 2007 U.S. Supreme Court decision that GHG emissions fit within the Clean Air Act definition of air pollutants. The findings do not in and of themselves impose any emission reduction requirements, but allow the EPA to finalize the GHG standards proposed in 2009 for new light-duty vehicles as part of the joint rulemaking with the Department of Transportation (EPA 2009).

The EPA's endangerment finding covers emissions of six key GHGs—CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and SF<sub>6</sub>—that have been the subject of scrutiny and intense analysis for decades by scientists in the United States and around the world (the first three are applicable to the 2016 Modified Project).

In response to the endangerment finding, the EPA issued the Mandatory Reporting of GHG Rule that requires substantial emitters of GHG emissions (large stationary sources, etc.) to report GHG emissions data. Facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons (MT) or more of CO<sub>2</sub> per year are required to submit an annual report.

#### *State Laws*

Current State of California guidance and goals for reductions in GHG emissions are generally embodied in Executive Order S-03-05, Executive Order B-30-15, Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), and Senate Bill 375 (SB 375).

#### *Executive Order S-03-05*

Executive Order S-3-05, signed June 1, 2005. Executive Order S-03-05 set the following GHG reduction targets for the state:

- 2000 levels by 2010
- 1990 levels by 2020
- 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050

#### *Executive Order B-30-15*

Executive Order B-30-15, signed April 29, 2015, sets a goal of reducing GHG emissions within the state to 40 percent of 1990 levels by year 2030. Executive Order B-30-15 also directs CARB to update the Scoping Plan to quantify the 2030 GHG reduction goal for the State and requires state agencies to implement measures to meet the interim 2030 goal of Executive Order B-30-15 as well as the long-term goal for 2050 in Executive Order S-03-5. It also requires the Natural Resources Agency to conduct triennial updates the

## 5. Environmental Analysis

California adaptation strategy, Safeguarding California, in order to ensure climate change is accounted for in State planning and investment decisions.

### ***Assembly Bill 32, The Global Warming Solutions Act (2006)***

Current State of California guidance and goals for reductions in GHG emissions are generally embodied in AB 32, *the Global Warming Solutions Act*. AB 32 was passed by the California state legislature on August 31, 2006, to place the state on a course toward reducing its contribution of GHG emissions. AB 32 follows the 2020 tier of emissions reduction targets established in Executive Order S-3-05.

The final Scoping Plan was adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), on December 11, 2008. Based on the GHG emissions inventory conducted for the Scoping Plan, GHG emissions in California by 2020 are anticipated to be approximately 596 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>. In December 2007, CARB approved a 2020 emissions limit of 427 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub> (471 million tons) for the state. The 2020 target requires a total emissions reduction of 169 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>, 28.5 percent from the projected emissions of the business-as-usual (BAU) scenario for the year 2020 (i.e., 28.5 percent of 596 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>) (CARB 2008).<sup>5</sup>

### ***2014 Scoping Plan Update***

CARB recently completed a five-year update to the 2008 Scoping Plan, as required by AB 32. The final Update to the Scoping Plan was released in May, and CARB adopted it at the May 22, 2014, board hearing. The Update to the Scoping Plan defines CARB's climate change priorities for the next five years and lays the groundwork to reach post-2020 goals in Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-16-2012. The update includes the latest scientific findings related to climate change and its impacts, including short-lived climate pollutants. The GHG target identified in the 2008 Scoping Plan is based on IPCC's GWPs identified in the Second and Third Assessment Reports (see Table 5.4-1). IPCC's Fourth and Fifth Assessment Reports identified more recent GWP values based on the latest available science. CARB recalculated the 1990 GHG emission levels with the updated GWPs in the Fourth Assessment Report, and the 427 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub> 1990 emissions level and 2020 GHG emissions limit, established in response to AB 32, is slightly higher, at 431 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub> (CARB 2014d).

The update highlights California's progress toward meeting the near-term 2020 GHG emission reduction goals defined in the original 2008 Scoping Plan. As identified in the Update to the Scoping Plan, California is on track to meeting the goals of AB 32. However, the Update to the Scoping Plan also addresses the state's longer-term GHG goals within a post-2020 element. The post-2020 element provides a high level view of a long-term strategy for meeting the 2050 GHG goals, including a recommendation for the state to adopt a mid-term target. According to the Update to the Scoping Plan, local government reduction targets should chart a reduction trajectory that is consistent with, or exceeds, the trajectory created by statewide goals (CARB 2014b).

According to the Update to the Scoping Plan, reducing emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels will require a fundamental shift to efficient, clean energy in every sector of the economy. Progressing toward California's

---

<sup>5</sup> CARB defines BAU in its Scoping Plan as emissions levels that would occur if California continued to grow and add new GHG emissions but did not adopt any measures to reduce emissions. Projections for each emission-generating sector were compiled and used to estimate emissions for 2020 based on 2002–2004 emissions intensities. Under CARB's definition of BAU, new growth is assumed to have the same carbon intensities as was typical from 2002 through 2004.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

2050 climate targets will require significant acceleration of GHG reduction rates. Emissions from 2020 to 2050 will have to decline several times faster than the rate needed to reach the 2020 emissions limit (CARB 2014b).

The new Executive Order B-30-15 requires CARB to prepare another update to the Scoping Plan to address the 2030 target for the State. It is anticipated the Scoping Plan will be updated within the next five years to address the new 2030 interim target to achieve a 40 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2030.

### ***Senate Bill 375, The Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (2008)***

In 2008, Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, was adopted to connect the GHG emissions reductions targets established in the Scoping Plan for the transportation sector to local land use decisions that affect travel behavior. Its intent is to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty trucks and automobiles (excludes emissions associated with goods movement) by aligning regional long-range transportation plans, investments, and housing allocations to local land use planning to reduce VMT and vehicle trips. Specifically, SB 375 required CARB to establish GHG emissions reduction targets for each of the 17 regions in California managed by a metropolitan planning organization (MPO). Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the MPO for the southern California region, which includes the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial.

SB 375 requires the MPOs to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plan. For the SCAG region, the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) was adopted in April 2012 (SCAG 2012). The SCS outlines a development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, would reduce GHG emissions from transportation (excluding goods movement). The SCS is meant to provide growth strategies that will achieve the regional GHG emissions reduction targets. However, the SCS does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS, but provides incentives for consistency for governments and developers.

## **Methodology**

### ***SCAQMD Thresholds***

SCAQMD has adopted a significance threshold of 10,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year for permitted (stationary) sources of GHG emissions for which SCAQMD is the designated lead agency. To provide guidance to local lead agencies on determining significance for GHG emissions in their CEQA documents, SCAQMD has convened a GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Working Group (Working Group). Based on the last Working Group meeting, held in September 2010 (Meeting No. 15), SCAQMD has proposed a tiered approach for evaluating GHG emissions for development projects where SCAQMD is not the lead agency:

- Tier 1. If a project is exempt from CEQA, project-level and cumulative GHG emissions are less than significant.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- Tier 2. If the project complies with a GHG emissions reduction plan or mitigation program that avoids or substantially reduces GHG emissions in the project's geographic area (i.e., city or county), project-level and cumulative GHG emissions are less than significant.

For projects that are not exempt or where no qualifying GHG reduction plans are directly applicable, SCAQMD requires an assessment of GHG emissions. SCAQMD has proposed a “bright-line” screening-level threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> annually for all land use types or the following land-use-specific thresholds: 1,400 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> for commercial projects, 3,500 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> for residential projects, or 3,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> for mixed-use projects. This bright-line threshold is based on a review of the Governor's Office of Planning and Research database of CEQA projects. Based on their review of 711 CEQA projects, 90 percent of CEQA projects would exceed the bright-line thresholds identified above. Therefore, projects that do not exceed the bright-line threshold would have a nominal, and therefore, less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions:

- Tier 3. If GHG emissions are less than the screening-level threshold, project-level and cumulative GHG emissions are less than significant.
- Tier 4. If emissions exceed the screening threshold, a more detailed review of the project's GHG emissions is warranted.

SCAQMD has proposed an efficiency target for projects that exceed the screening threshold. The current recommended approach is per capita efficiency targets. SCAQMD is not recommending use of a percent emissions reduction target. Instead, SCAQMD proposes a 2020 efficiency target of 4.8 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year per service population (MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year/SP) for project-level analyses and 6.6 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year/SP for plan level projects (e.g., program-level projects such as general plans). The per capita efficiency targets are based on the AB 32 GHG reduction target and 2020 GHG emissions inventory prepared for CARB's 2008 Scoping Plan.<sup>6</sup>

SCAQMD's efficiency targets have been adjusted based on the long-term GHG reduction targets of Executive Order B-30-15, which set a goal of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2035, and Executive Order S-03-05, which set a goal of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Based on these long-term targets, project emissions are compared to the SCAQMD's project-level efficiency threshold of 2.4 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year/SP, for year 2035. If projects exceed this per capita efficiency target, GHG emissions would be considered potentially significant in the absence of mitigation measures.

### *Modeling Methodology*

SCAQMD's most recent air quality analysis model, CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2., was utilized to compare the impacts of the existing entitlements (Approved Project) to the 2016 Modified Project. Resulting operational phase emissions are compared to the significance thresholds adopted by the SCAQMD. Air quality modeling sheets are included in Appendix B.

---

<sup>6</sup> SCAQMD took the 2020 statewide GHG reduction target for land-use-only GHG emissions sectors and divided it by the 2020 statewide employment for the land use sectors to derive a per capita GHG efficiency metric that coincides with the GHG reduction targets of AB 32 for year 2020.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				<b>X</b>	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				<b>X</b>	

### Comments:

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

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

A project does not generate enough GHG emissions on its own to influence global climate change; therefore, GHG emissions impacts are a measure of a project's contribution to the cumulative environmental impact.

The 2016 Modified Project would contribute to global climate change through direct emissions of GHG from onsite area sources and vehicle trips generated by the Project, and indirectly through offsite energy production required for onsite activities, water use/wastewater generation, and waste disposal. Annual GHG emissions were calculated for operation of both the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project (see Appendix B). The total and net increase in GHG emissions associated with the Specific Plan is shown in Table 4.

GHG emissions of the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project are compared to SCAQMD's GHG efficiency metric. As shown in this table, GHG emissions associated with both the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project would exceed the efficiency metric of 2.4 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/SP/yr. GHG associated with both the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project would be significant. The primary source of GHG emissions associated with both the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project would be from mobile sources. However, the 2016 Modified Project would slightly improve GHG emissions on a per capita basis compared to the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, the 2016 Modified Project would not result in new or substantially greater impacts related to GHG emissions and preparation of a supplemental or subsequent EIR is not required by CEQA.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 4 Mesa Verde Specific Plan GHG Emissions**

Category	GHG Emissions MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/Year		
	2007 Approved Project	2016 Modified Project	Net Increase from Existing
Area	893	945	52
Energy	15,461	14,974	488
Mobile	53,600	52,740	860
Waste	2,131	1,934	197
Water/Wastewater	3,599	3,920	321
<b>Total</b>	<b>75,684</b>	<b>74,513</b>	<b>1,171</b>
Service Population (SP) <sup>2</sup>	9,370	9,297	-73
MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP	8.1 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP	8.0 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP	-0.1 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP
SCAQMD Efficiency Metric	2.4 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP	2.4 MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP	—
Exceeds Efficiency Metric	Yes	Yes	—

Source: CalEEMod 2013.2.2.

<sup>1</sup> Based on a service population of 2007 Approved Project: 8,315 residents and 1,056 employees; 2016 Modified Project: 8,724 residents and 573 employees.

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

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Applicable plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions include CARB's Scoping Plan and SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS. A consistency analysis with these plans is presented below.

#### **CARB Scoping Plan**

CARB's 2008 Scoping Plan is California's GHG reduction strategy to achieve the state's GHG emissions reduction target established by AB 32, which is 1990 levels by year 2020. Statewide strategies to reduce GHG emissions include the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), California Appliance Energy Efficiency regulations, California Renewable Energy Portfolio standard, changes in the corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards, and other early action measures would ensure the state is on target to achieve the GHG emissions reduction goals of AB 32. In addition, new buildings constructed are required to comply with the most recent Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and California Green Building Code (CALGreen). The 2016 Modified Project's GHG emissions would be reduced through compliance with statewide measures that have been adopted since AB 32 was adopted. Because the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict with the above statewide strategies identified to implement the CARB Scoping Plan, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

#### **SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS**

In addition to AB 32, the California legislature passed SB 375 to connect regional transportation planning to land use decisions made at a local level. SCAG's 2012 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) does not require that local general plans, specific plans, or zoning be consistent with the SCS, but provides incentives for consistency for governments and developers. Table 5 demonstrates the proposed project's consistency with the 2012 RTP/SCS.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 5 Consistency with SCAG's 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals**

RTP/SCS Goal #	SCAG Goal	Project Compliance with Goal
G1	Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.	<b>Consistent:</b> This is not a project-specific policy and is therefore not applicable.
G2	Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The transportation networks in Calimesa would be developed and maintained to meet the needs of local and regional transportation and to ensure efficient mobility. A number of regional and local plans and programs would be used to guide development and maintenance of transportation networks, including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Riverside County Congestion Management Program</li> <li>• Caltrans Traffic Impact Studies Guidelines</li> <li>• Caltrans Highway Capacity Manual</li> <li>• SCAG RTP/SCS</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, the City of Calimesa is required by the California Government Code to coordinate its Circulation Element with regional transportation plans. The Circulation Element is a comprehensive transportation management strategy that addresses infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Furthermore, the City of Calimesa is currently updating its General Plan to be consistent with AB 1358 (the Complete Streets Act) because Complete Streets is one of the key components in the Circulation Element of the General Plan.</p> <p>Section 5.16.3 of this EIR Addendum lists an extensive number of circulation improvements that would be implemented as part of the 2016 Modified Project. These improvements will maintain satisfactory levels of service on roadways in the vicinity of the project site.</p>
G3	Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.	<p><b>Consistent:</b> All modes of transit would be required to follow safety standards set by corresponding regulatory documents. Pedestrian walkways and bicycle routes must follow safety precautions and standards established by local (e.g., City of Calimesa, County of Riverside) and regional (e.g., SCAG, Caltrans) agencies. Roadways for motorists must follow safety standards established for the local and regional plans mentioned in the analysis for RTP/SCS Goal 2.</p> <p>The Specific Plan provides guidance and policies that promote the safe movement of people and goods with importance placed on pedestrian safety as well as vehicular safety.</p>
G4	Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.	<b>Consistent:</b> A traffic study has been prepared for the 2016 Modified Project and mitigation measures have been identified to maintain satisfactory levels of service on the regional transportation system, including I-10. Additionally, the regional plans mentioned in the analysis for RTP/SCS Goal 2 would be applicable to the design and development of the regional roadway network.
G5	Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.	<b>Consistent:</b> The local and regional transportation system would be improved and maintained to encourage efficiency and productivity. The City's Public Works and Engineering Department oversees the improvement and maintenance of all

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 5 Consistency with SCAG's 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals**

RTP/SCS Goal #	SCAG Goal	Project Compliance with Goal
		<p>aspects of the public right-of-way on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>The City also strives to maximize productivity of the region's public transportation system (i.e., bus, bicycle) for residents, visitors, and workers coming into and out of Calimesa. The Specific Plan includes a Circulation Master Plan and a Trails Master Plan which proposes significant improvements to the City's existing circulation system, as well as new bicycle and pedestrian trails, sidewalks and connections.</p>
G6	Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (non-motorized transportation, such as bicycling and walking).	<p><b>Consistent:</b> The reduction of energy use, improvement of air quality, and promotion of more environmentally sustainable development would be encouraged through the development of alternative transportation methods, green design techniques for buildings, and other energy-reducing techniques. For example, development projects are required to comply with the provisions of the current Building and Energy Efficiency Standards and the Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen).</p> <p>The City also strives to maximize the protection of the environment and improvement of air quality by encouraging and improving the use of the region's public transportation system (i.e., bus, bicycle) for residents, visitors, and workers coming into and out of Calimesa. The Specific Plan includes a Circulation Master Plan and a Trails Master Plan which proposes significant improvements to the City's existing circulation system, as well as new bicycle and pedestrian trails, sidewalks and connections.</p> <p>The 2016 Modified Project includes 250,000 square feet of commercial uses within Planning Areas 1 through 4, which is designated as Mixed Use. Allowing a mix of uses in these areas and commercial development to serve the future residents would help reduce vehicle trips and thereby reduce air quality and traffic impacts and greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
G7	Actively encourage and create incentives for energy efficiency, where possible.	<b>Consistent:</b> This is not a project-specific policy and is therefore not applicable.
G8	Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit and non-motorized transportation.	<b>Consistent:</b> See response to RTP/SCS Goal 6.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 5 Consistency with SCAG's 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals**

RTP/SCS Goal #	SCAG Goal	Project Compliance with Goal
G9	Maximize the security of our transportation system through improved system monitoring, rapid recovery planning, and coordination with other security agencies.	<p><b>Consistent:</b> Calimesa would conduct monitoring of existing and newly constructed roadways and transit routes to determine the adequacy and safety of these systems. Other local and regional agencies (i.e., Riverside County Transportation Department, Caltrans, SCAG) would work with the City to manage these systems. Security situations involving roadways and evacuations would be addressed in the County of Riverside's emergency management plans (e.g., Riverside County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan) developed in accordance with the state and federal mandated emergency management regulations.</p> <p>The Circulation Master Plan of the Mesa Verde Specific Plan contains guidance and policies for a safe and efficient transportation system.</p>

Source: 2012–2305 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

As shown in Table 4, the 2016 Modified Project would not interfere with SCAG's ability to implement the regional strategies outlined in the 2012 RTP/SCS. No changes or new significant information would change the significance conclusions of the 2007 Certified EIR; no new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

### 5.7.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

No mitigation measures related to greenhouse gas emissions were identified in the 2007 Certified EIR. Mitigation Measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to air quality (see Section 5.3.3 of this Addendum) would reduce GHG emissions impacts of the 2016 Modified Project.

## 5.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

### 5.8.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR includes mitigation measures that address fire hazards and hazardous materials. The 2007 Certified EIR found that, upon implementation of those measures, impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, including those related to wildland fire and existing hazardous material sites, would be less than significant.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.8.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				<b>X</b>	
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?				<b>X</b>	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				<b>X</b>	
d) 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?				<b>X</b>	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					<b>X</b>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					<b>X</b>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				<b>X</b>	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				<b>X</b>	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

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

#### **Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Hazardous materials such as fuels, greases, paints, and cleaning materials would be used during project construction. Onsite construction equipment might require routine or emergency maintenance that could result in the release of oil, diesel fuel, transmission fluid, or other materials. However, the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. Also, these activities would be short term or one time in nature. Developers and construction contractors of individual projects on the project site would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations, including those enforced by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA), Caltrans, and the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD). Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner, and would minimize the potential for safety impacts to occur. Such compliance is required by Hazards and Hazardous Materials Measure 4. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use, transport, or storage of hazardous materials during project construction would be less than significant. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

Operation of the proposed residential units, commercial space, parks, and elementary schools would likely involve only small amounts of hazardous materials for cleaning and maintenance purposes. Furthermore, commercial-grade chemicals would be required to be transported, used, and disposed of consistent with current local, state and federal laws and regulations. Compliance with applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, as required by Hazards and Hazardous Materials Measure 4, would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner, and would minimize the potential for safety impacts. Therefore, hazards to the public or the environment arising from the routine use, transport, or storage of hazardous materials during operation of the 2016 Modified Project would be less than significant. Furthermore, because implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would not introduce new land uses on the project site that were not previously proposed by the 2007 Approved Project, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to 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?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The project site does not feature any existing buildings or structures that could contain asbestos or lead, materials that have been shown to cause cancer. Therefore, demolition activities that would release hazardous

## 5. Environmental Analysis

materials into the environment would not occur. Hazardous materials such as fuels, greases, paints, and cleaning materials would be used during project construction. However, as stated in Hazards and Hazardous Materials Measure 4, development on the project site would be required to comply with existing local, state, and federal regulations, which would reduce potential impacts arising from accidental releases of hazardous materials. For example, all spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities are required to be immediately contained, the hazardous material identified, and the material remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations for the contaminant released. All contaminated waste encountered would be required to be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility. Additionally, the 2016 Modified Project, like the 2007 Approved Project, would be constructed and operated with strict adherence to all emergency response plan requirements of the City of Calimesa and the RCFD. Therefore, impacts resulting from implementation of the 2016 Modified Project related to accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to release of hazardous materials into the environment.

**c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

One existing school is within one-quarter mile of the project site: Mesa View Middle School, which opened in 2009 and is adjacent to the project site's northeast boundary. The 2016 Modified Project also proposes two elementary schools be constructed on the project site. One school site is in the western portion of the project site and would be surrounded by residential (low, low-medium, and medium density), park, and open space uses. The second school site would be located in the eastern portion of the project site, west of Mesa View Middle School. This school would be surrounded by open space and medium density residential uses. Hazardous materials are routinely used in industrial, manufacturing, and commercial businesses, as well as in hospitals and households. As under the 2007 Approved Project, the land uses proposed near, or adjacent to, the three schools under the 2016 Modified Project, as described above, are not likely to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project when compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to existing hazardous materials sites.

**d) 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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

As the project site is vacant there are no existing sensitive receptors that would be at high risk due to

## 5. Environmental Analysis

exposure of hazardous materials releases. In 2004, Petra Geotechnical conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to address hazardous material issues associated with the project site.

The Phase I ESA identified three locations that represent recognized environmental conditions. These consisted of oil-stained soil, soil staining around fallen transformers, and possible concerns regarding historical pesticide use near an olive grove. These locations were determined to represent a potential significant impact requiring mitigation. The Phase I ESA also identified six locations that do not necessarily pose recognized environmental conditions but could pose a potential for human or environmental risk during development of the project site. These consist of three water wells, residential septic systems, seven pole-mounted transformers, miscellaneous solid waste debris piles, an abandoned oil well drilling site, and a possible ranch-related solid waste debris site. These locations were also determined to pose potentially significant impacts. Additionally, the Phase I ESA noted that only two of three suspected underground storage tanks (USTs) were found on the project site. The possibility of a third UST was considered a potentially significant impact. Because these existing conditions have not changed since approval of the 2007 Approved Project, not new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

The 2007 Certified EIR identified four mitigation measures that, upon their implementation, would reduce potential impacts related to hazardous materials sites to a less than significant level. Hazards and Hazardous Materials Measures 10 through 13 would require closing of onsite water wells, and testing and remediation of other existing hazardous material sites. Because Measures 10 through 13 were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Upon implementation of Measures 10 through 13, impacts of the 2016 Modified Project related to hazardous materials sites would be less than significant.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project when compared to the 2007 Approved Project, would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to existing hazardous materials sites.

**e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not within an airport land use plan (ALUP) area and is not within two miles of a public or public use airport. The nearest airport is Redlands Municipal Airport, approximately six miles to the northwest. Therefore, like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would not result in impacts due to airport-related safety hazards.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to airport-related hazards.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would not result in impacts due to airstrip-related safety hazards.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to airport-related hazards.

**g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The County of Riverside and City of Calimesa both maintain emergency response plans that apply to the project area and surrounding vicinity. The City's General Plan includes goals and policies related to disaster preparedness in its Safety Element. Because the 2016 Modified Project features a development footprint and land use pattern that is almost identical to that of the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would not generate any new impacts related to implementation of policies in adopted emergency plans.

Although the 2016 Modified Project proposes changes in designation and right-of-way width to some project-related roadways, these roadways would still provide emergency access to the project site. As under the 2007 Approved Project, emergency access between the project site and County Line Road would be provided via Street D (see Figure III.4, *Circulation Master Plan*, of the revised Specific Plan). At the project site's eastern boundary, County Line Road would be gated with a Knox activated electric gate per Riverside County Fire Department standards to permit fire department access to the project site but restrict public access to the site from County Line Road. Trails would also be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency response vehicles. Upon implementation of these project design features, impacts emergency ingress/egress from the property will be assured and the project's impacts to implementation of adopted emergency plans would be less than significant.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to implementation of with adopted emergency plans.

**h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

**Less Than Significant Impact/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The project site and its surrounding vicinity feature the types of grasslands, chaparral, and woodlands that are susceptible to wildfires. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) identifies the western portion of the site as being in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2009). Although buildout of the 2016 Modified Project, like the 2007 Approved Project, would involve the replacement of natural vegetation with irrigated landscaping over much of the project site, many canyons and

## 5. Environmental Analysis

other undeveloped areas would remain in their natural state. The placement of new residential, commercial, and public uses next to undisturbed natural areas susceptible to wildland fires could result in increased risk to personal property and life. However, because the 2016 Modified Project features a development footprint and land use pattern that is nearly identical to that of the 2007 Approved Project, potential wildland fire impacts would be substantially similar between the two projects. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur. The 2007 Certified EIR identified five mitigation measures, Hazards and Hazardous Materials Measures 5 through 9, that would reduce potential impacts related to wildland fire hazards. Because these measures were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Upon implementation of Mitigation Measures 5 through 9, impacts of the 2016 Modified Project related to wildland fire hazards would be less than significant.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to wildland fire hazards.

### 5.8.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to hazards and hazardous materials are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. With the exception of Measures 1 through 3, these measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project and no modifications are necessary. Measures 1 through 3 from the 2007 Certified EIR mitigate potential impacts to a proposed middle school that is not included in the 2016 Modified Project. Therefore, these mitigation measures are not applicable to the 2016 Modified Project.

- ~~1 — Development of the mixed-use site (PA 1) to the east of PA 7 shall be compatible with activities planned for this school site location.~~
- ~~2 — Development of the mixed-use site (PA 5) to the north of PA 8 shall be compatible with activities planned for this school site location.~~
- ~~3 — Traffic controls for the proposed school site located in PAs 7 and 8 shall be implemented and enforced for the protection of activities planned for the sites.~~
- 4 All federal, State of California, County of Riverside, and the City of Calimesa LORS and plans dealing with the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials or wastes shall be implemented.
- 5 On-site development activities shall be coordinated with the Riverside County Fire Department and all LORS associated with wildfire prevention and construction activities within the wildfire/urbanization interface areas shall be implemented.
- 6 All water mains and fire hydrants shall be reviewed by the Riverside County Fire Department and constructed in accordance with the Riverside County Ordinance No. 460 and/or 787.1.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- 7 All buildings shall be constructed in accordance with the provisions ~~contained in Riverside County Ordinance 787.1, and roofing materials shall be in accordance with Section 1503 of the latest~~ Uniform Building Code.
- 8 Prior to approval of any development plan for land adjacent to open space areas, a Fire Protection/Vegetation Management (Fuel Modification) Plan shall be developed and submitted to the Riverside County Fire Department for review and approval. Additionally, the Homeowner's Association or the appropriate management entity for the proposed project shall be responsible for maintaining the elements of this Plan.
- 9 The Proposed circulation system shall be acceptable to the City's transportation and fire departments.
- 10 Soil stained area in the debris area near the old mobile home park shall be further investigated, removed by a licensed cleanup contractor, and disposed in accordance with federal and state LORS.
- 11 Soil staining near the fallen transformers shall be sampled for PCBs, mineral soil, or petroleum hydrocarbons. If the soil is contaminated at regulatory action levels, a licensed cleanup contractor shall remove it in accordance with federal and state LORS.
- 12 The soils near the olive trees shall be sampled and tested for pesticides (including organochlorine pesticides such as dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane [DDT], dichlorodiphenyldichloroethane [DDD], and dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene [DDE] used up until 1970s) to determine if soils contain regulatory action levels. Soil testing shall be required to identify any potential public health risk associated with development of the area for residential uses.
- 13 Three Water Wells – These wells shall be closed in accordance with the appropriate Riverside County regulatory agency procedures if they are not intended for future use.

## 5.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

### 5.9.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that the Approved Project could potentially result in short-term construction and long-term operational impacts to the hydrology and drainage of the region. Site construction and grading could result in erosion, which could result in increased siltation and/or turbidity in on- and off-site water systems. Development of new land uses would increase impervious surfaces, increasing surface water runoff. The 2007 Certified EIR identified mitigation measures that would, upon implementation, reduce hydrology and drainage impacts to a less than significant level. The mitigation measures included requirements that individual development projects comply with applicable provisions of the federal and state water quality regulations, such as the preparation and submission of Stormwater

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Pollution Prevention Programs for individual projects, and a requirement that detention basins be constructed to reduce on-site runoff.

### 5.9.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?				X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?					X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?					X

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?					<b>X</b>
j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					<b>X</b>

### Comments:

#### a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Similar to the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project has the potential to affect the water quality of stormwater runoff during construction and operation of the project. However, the 2016 Modified Project features the same overall development footprint, though slightly reduced, and land use pattern as the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, the overall geographic extent of the area receiving runoff from the site would be the same. Furthermore, although the 2016 Modified Project features a modified ratio of residential and commercial land uses, it does not feature any types of land uses not analyzed by the 2007 Certified EIR. Therefore, no new land uses that would generate additional types of water pollutants not analyzed by the 2007 Certified EIR (such as industrial uses) would be developed on the project site. Similar to the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would generally develop the easternmost portion of the project site with a mix of residential and commercial land uses, and would generally develop the remaining portions of the site with residential uses interspersed with recreational amenities and open space. Because the land use pattern is nearly identical to the 2007 Approved Project, the type and amount of water discharge generated on the project site would be largely unchanged. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur related to discharge that could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

The 2007 Certified EIR identified two mitigation measures related to water quality: Hydrology and Water Quality Measures 1 and 2. These measures require preparation of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) for developments on the project site, which would ensure compliance with standards of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB). Because Measures 1 and 2 were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to placement of housing with flood hazard areas.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Differences between the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project include various changes to land uses and roadways proposed for the project site. These may result in small reductions to the proportion of the site that is covered with impermeable surfaces, thereby increasing the rate and volume of groundwater recharge. However, because the overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2016 Modified Project are similar to that of the 2007 Approved Project, the geographic range of potential impacts to groundwater recharge would be similar, though slightly reduced. Therefore, no new impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project when compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to groundwater recharge.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Similar to the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would alter the existing drainage pattern on the project site. The project site is currently undeveloped and the 2016 Modified Project would substantially increase impervious surfaces on the project site. Differences between the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project include various changes to land uses and the onsite circulation network. As such, changes in proposed internal drainage areas have taken place which would correspondingly increase or decrease flow at various locations on the project site. In response to these changes, the proposed back-bone storm drain system has been revised to account for changes in the alignments of major roadways as well as the changes in drainage area flow rates. The overall approach to drainage configuration, however, is consistent between 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project. In both these cases, the backbone storm drain systems would be routed through detention basins prior to discharging into existing natural conveyances. The continued use of on-site peak flow migration would ensure that post-development peak flow rates would continue to be at or below pre-development levels in the natural drainage courses that convey stormwater to downstream locations offsite. Implementation of Hydrology and Water Quality Measure 3, which is relevant to both the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project, would ensure that onsite detention basins are sized to prevent substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to alteration of existing drainage patterns.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

As discussed in Section 5.9.2(c), above, the 2016 Modified Project involves changes to the mix of land uses and roadway network proposed for the project site. These changes would have minor effects on the site's drainage pattern. However, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would not alter the course of a stream or river, and the overall approach to drainage configuration is consistent between 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project. Furthermore, the construction of detention basins consistent with Hydrology and Water Quality Measure 3 would ensure that such basins are sized to accommodate storm flows and prevent flooding. Therefore, no new impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project when compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to alteration of existing drainage patterns.

- e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

See Section 5.9.2(c), above. As under the 2007 Approved Project, the use of on-site peak flow stormwater migration for the 2016 Modified Project would ensure that post-development peak flow rates would continue to be at or below pre-development levels in the natural drainage courses that convey stormwater to downstream locations offsite. Because of minor modifications to the distribution of residential, commercial, and recreational uses on the project site, the 2016 Modified Project relocates proposed onsite detention basins and backbone storm drains (see Figure III.11 in the proposed Specific Plan). However, as under the 2007 Approved Project, this infrastructure would be evenly distributed throughout the project site and sized to accommodate stormwater flows generated onsite. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to runoff water and the capacity of planned stormwater drainage systems.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Potential water quality impacts of the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project area are analyzed in Section 3.9.2(a), above. Regulatory compliance consistent with Hydrology and Water Quality Measures 1 and 2 would mitigate water quality impacts related to differences between the two projects.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to substantial degradation of water quality.

**g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

**No Impact.** According to maps prepared by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the project site is not located in a 100-year flood zone. Implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would result in the construction of 200 additional housing units compared to the 2007 Approved Project. However, because those units would be located on a low plateau and not in the 100-year flood zone, they would not be at a substantial risk of flooding. Therefore, no impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to placement of housing with flood hazard areas.

**h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**No Impact.** As discussed under Section 5.9.2(g), above, the project site is not located in a 100-year flood zone. No impacts related to the impediment of flood flows by new structures would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to placement of structures in flood hazard zones.

**i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

There are no major dams, reservoirs, or water tanks on or near the project site. Therefore, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would not result in exposure of people or structures to significant flooding-related risks. Detention basins constructed consistent with Hydrology and Water Quality Measure 3, as originally identified in the 2007 Certified EIR, would reduce potential impacts related to localized flooding during storm events. Although detention basin recommendations alluded to in Mitigation Measure 3 were based partially on design features of the 2005 Proposed Project, the overall configuration of backbone storm drain systems and detention basins for the 2016 Modified Project would be substantially similar to that of the 2005 Proposed Project and 2007 Approved Project. The continued use of on-site peak flow migration would ensure that post-development peak flow rates generated by the 2016 Modified Project would continue to be at or below pre-development levels in the natural drainage courses that convey stormwater to downstream locations. Therefore, potential impacts related to localized flooding would be minimal.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to flooding hazards.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### j) Expose people or structures to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**No Impact.** A seiche is a surface wave created when a body of water is shaken, usually by earthquake activity. There are no major dams, reservoirs, or water tanks on or near the project site that would result in seiche impacts on the project site. The site is approximately 50 miles from the Pacific Ocean and, therefore, not anticipated to experience tsunami-related impacts. Furthermore, new land uses proposed for the project site under the 2016 Modified Project would be located outside of arroyos and canyon areas that may experience mudflows. Therefore, despite the changes in land use and street network proposed by the 2016 Modified Project in comparison to the 2007 Approved Project, no impacts to people or structures would result related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

### 5.9.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to hydrology and water quality are listed below and in Appendix A to this Addendum. These measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Hydrology and Water Quality Measure 3 has been modified to refer to updated technical reports. Modifications are identified in ~~strikeout text~~ to indicate deletions and underlined to signify additions.

- 1 The Applicant shall prepare and submit a SWPPP to the City of Calimesa within 60 days of project approval. The SWPPP shall include a requirement to include hydrocarbon filters along the perimeter of the retention basin. The SWPPP must be prepared by a licensed engineer, hydrologist, or erosion control specialist and shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. The SWPPP shall be available on-site at all times for review by the City and RWQCB inspectors.
- 2 The Applicant shall be responsible for coordinating all SWPPPs for various projects and facilities to make sure the overall proposed project meets the requirements specified in the Federal CWA and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Division 7 of the California Water Code).
- 3 Detention basins shall be constructed in accordance with the recommendations provided in the VA Consulting report entitled ~~Oak Valley Development Project Existing and Developed Condition Hydrology Study, Volumes 1 and 2, dated May 2005~~ Mesa Verde Estates Development Project Existing and Developed Condition Hydrology Study Volume 1, dated May 2016.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

#### 5.10.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that the 2007 Approved Project would result in a significant and unavoidable land use impact to the existing neighborhood along County Line Road due to traffic and noise generated by the project. According to the 2007 Certified EIR, that impact would occur both on a short-term basis during construction and grading, and on a long-term operational basis. This issue was addressed in the 2007 Certified EIR by identifying County Line Road as an emergency-only access route to the project site by proposing an extension of Roberts Road that would bypass the western County Line Road neighborhood. However, the 2007 Certified EIR concluded that a significant and unavoidable impact would result in the neighborhood surrounding the Roberts Road extension related to noise, traffic, and dust. The Roberts Road extension would also physically divide that neighborhood.

#### 5.10.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?					X

#### Comments:

##### a) Physically divide an established community?

#### Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.

Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project includes a new network of roadways on the project site and additional roadway improvements offsite. As under the 2007 Approved Project, the largest offsite improvement is the planned extension of Roberts Road, which would be necessary to provide

## 5. Environmental Analysis

adequate access to the land uses proposed by the 2016 Modified Project. The extension would begin at the project site's southern boundary, traverse the easternmost portion of the project site parallel to I-10, and then terminate at the existing County Line Road north of the project site (see Figure III.4, *Circulation Master Plan*, of the revised Specific Plan. Although the road is consistent with the Calimesa General Plan's circulation plan and would offer new ingress/egress options not currently offered, it would introduce a high-volume traffic artery into a low-traffic area and would permanently divide an existing neighborhood. However, because the Roberts Road extension was analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR and is featured in both the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project, no new or substantially greater impact related to division of an established community would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to the division of established communities.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

An analysis of the 2016 Modified Project's consistency with the Calimesa General Plan is included as Appendix A to the amended Mesa Verde Specific Plan. The analysis demonstrates that the project is consistent with the General Plan's goals and policies. The 2016 Modified Project would require amendments to the General Plan Circulation Element to change the classification of County Line Road. The roadway is proposed to be downgraded to a Local Road with 60-foot right-of-way from the project site to the Roberts Road extension. Between the I-10 freeway and the Roberts Road extension, the roadway is proposed to be expanded from an 80-foot right-of-way to a 98-foot right-of-way. However, these changes to the Circulation Element are considered part of the 2016 Modified Project and the General Plan would be amended upon approval of the project. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts between the 2016 Modified Project and applicable land use plans would remain less than significant. No new impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to consistency with applicable land use plans.

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** As described in the 2007 Certified EIR and above under Section 5.4.2(f) of this Addendum, portions of the project site are within the Western Riverside County MSHCP area. Mitigation measures in the 2007 Certified EIR related to biological resources, Biological Resources Measures 1 through 13, would require consistency with the MSHCP. These include measures that require conservation of oak tree woodland habitat, completion of focused burrowing owl surveys, and prohibition of the introduction of invasive species. Furthermore, project compliance with the MSHCP would include payment of the applicable fees. Because the 2016 Modified Project would feature the same overall development footprint as the 2007

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Approved Project, the project would not encroach into additional habitat protected by the MSHCP. Biological Resources Mitigation Measures 1 through 13 would ensure that the implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict with the Western Riverside County MSHCP. No impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to consistency with the adopted habitat conservation plan.

### 5.10.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

No mitigation measures related to land use and planning were identified in the 2007 Certified EIR, except for Biological Resources Measures 1 through 13, which relate to Section 5.10(c), above (see Appendix A for a complete list of mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR).

## 5.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

### 5.11.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The Initial Study for the 2007 Certified EIR concluded that impacts of the 2005 Proposed Project on mineral resources would be less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, impacts related to mineral resources were not analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR or the 2007 Revised and Recirculated DEIR.

### 5.11.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?					<b>X</b>
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?					<b>X</b>

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

- a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**No Impact.** The project site is mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3) by the California Division of Mines and Geology. Such areas are those where “the available geologic information indicates that mineral deposits are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposit is undetermined.” The project site is not known to feature important mineral resources and has not been used in the past for mineral extraction. Therefore, like the 2007 Approved Project, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project is not anticipated to result in the loss of mineral resources that are of high value to the region or state. No impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to loss of known mineral resources.

- 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?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not designated as a mineral resource recovery site on local land use plans. Therefore, no impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to loss of locally important mineral resource recovery sites.

### 5.11.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

The Initial Study for the 2007 Certified EIR determined that potential impacts to mineral resources were less than significant. No mitigation measures related to mineral resources were identified in the 2007 Certified EIR since both those documents determined that potential impacts to such resources would be less than significant.

## 5.12 NOISE

### 5.12.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR explains that the 2007 Approved Project would have generated short-term construction noise and long-term operational noise impacts related to vehicular traffic and non-transportation noise from the operation of schools and parks. The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that the implementation of mitigation measures would reduce short-term construction noise impacts and long-term operational noise impacts to a less than significant level. Those mitigation measures included restrictions on the timing of construction and grading activities, requirements for the muffling of equipment noise, and

## 5. Environmental Analysis

other common techniques for reducing construction noise. Mitigation measures aimed at reducing long-term operation noise included a requirement that sound walls separate residential areas from major roadways (including I-10), and siting requirements for orienting homes away from roadway noise, and limiting the hours of operation of parks and schools during the daytime and evening hours.

### 5.12.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project result in:

<b>Environmental Issues</b>	<b>Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions</b>	<b>Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions</b>	<b>New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				<b>X</b>	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				<b>X</b>	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				<b>X</b>	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				<b>X</b>	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					<b>X</b>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					<b>X</b>

The discussion in this Addendum focuses on impacts resulting from changes or modifications to the 2007 Approved Project as proposed by the 2016 Modified Project.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

- a) **Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Potential long-term noise impacts would be caused by project-related traffic noise on sensitive receptors along roadways and from non-transportation noise from the operation of the proposed parks and schools. In addition, traffic noise could have the potential to affect proposed noise-sensitive uses within the project.

#### **Off-Site Project-Related Traffic Noise**

This analysis evaluates operational noise impacts from project-related traffic. To determine if a project would cause a significant adverse noise impact, consideration must be given to the magnitude of the increase and the affected receptors. The 2007 Certified EIR established that roadway noise impacts would be considered significant if the project increases noise levels for a noise sensitive land use by 3 dBA CNEL and if: (1) the existing noise levels already exceed the 65 dBA CNEL residential standard or (2) the project increases noise levels from below the 65 dBA CNEL standard to above 65 dBA CNEL. To cause an increase of 3 dBA, a doubling in traffic must occur, assuming all other factors such as speed and road geometries constant.

The 2016 Modified Project's traffic assignments to the study area roadways would be similar to the 2007 Approved project, as the proposed circulation master plan (see Exhibit 2-1 of the Traffic Study) have only slightly changed, where access to the project would be provided by County Line Road, Sandlewood Drive, Street "F", 7th Street, and Roberts Road. Table 2-2 of the Traffic Study prepared for the 2016 Modified Project (Urban Crossroads 2016) compares the 2016 Modified Project's trip generation to the previously 2007 Approved Project's trip generation. The 2016 Modified Project is anticipated to generate a total of approximately 47,782 trips per day with 3,510 AM peak hour trips and 4,860 PM peak hour trips (excluding retail pass-by trips, but including both external and internal trip ends). The 2016 Modified Project will generate 3,164 fewer daily trips, 457 fewer AM peak hour trips, and 167 fewer PM peak hour trips. The project's trips would be assigned to the same roads, and the 2016 Modified Project would result in a decrease in daily trips of approximately 6%. The focused traffic study for the project evaluated traffic along roadway segments for buildout conditions. Daily traffic volume forecasts for General Plan Buildout for the 2016 Modified Project were compared with the 2007 Approved Project. As the project's trip generation for the 2016 Modified Project is less, traffic volumes on all segments compared are forecast to be less than under the 2007 Approved Project. As traffic noise is a function of traffic volumes, the reduction in daily volumes would result in a 2016 Modified Project decrease in project-related traffic noise to uses adjacent to study-area roadways when compared to the anticipated in the 2007 Approved Project (see Table 6). It is noted that the 2007 Certified EIR identified a significant traffic noise impact on Sandalwood Drive west of Roberts Road, which is located in an existing noise sensitive residential neighborhood (mobile home park). As shown on Table 6, the traffic volumes for the 2016 Modified Project are slightly lower than the 2007 Approved Project, but the changes in noise would be negligible. Noise Measure 18 would ensure that noise impacts to the affected areas would be reduced to less than significant levels.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 6 Roadway Segment Vehicle Volume Comparison**

Roadway	Segment	Daily Vehicle Volumes		
		2007 Approved Project <sup>1</sup>	2016 Modified Project <sup>2</sup>	Change
Sandalwood Dr.	West of Roberts Rd.	18,000	15,533	-2,467
Sandalwood Dr.	Between Roberts Rd. & 7th St.	43,000	25,375	-17,625
Sandalwood Dr.	Between 7th St. and I-10 SB Ramps	43,000	28,226	-14,774
Roberts Road	South of County Line Rd.	17,000	16,167	-833
Roberts Road	North of Street "C" (formerly Street "F")	17,000	13,707	-3,293
Roberts Road	South of Street "C" (formerly Street "F")	23,000	8,531	-14,469
Roberts Road	North of Sandalwood Dr.	23,000	8,762	-14,238
Roberts Road	Between Sandalwood Dr. and Street "B"	35,000	14,995	-20,005
Roberts Road	South of Street "B"	34,000	12,093	-21,907

<sup>1</sup> 2007 volumes obtained from the Mesa Verde Estates Traffic Impact Analysis, prepared by Urban Crossroads in 2005.

<sup>2</sup> 2016 volumes obtained from the Mesa Verde Estates Focused Traffic Study, prepared by Urban Crossroads in 2016.

In summary, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would not result in new significant long-term, traffic-related noise impacts to off-site uses and no new noise mitigation is required. No new significant impact would occur.

### Non-Transportation Noise Impacts

The 2016 Modified Project would include similar uses as the 2007 Approved project that would generate non-transportation noise, such as elementary schools and parks. However, no specific site plans are available to show where potential stationary noise sources such as ball courts, skateparks, PA systems, and would be located. Noise Measure 22 would limit non-transportation noise impacts from future parks and schools. The 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts or change to the significance conclusions of the 2007 Certified EIR.

### Transportation Noise Impacts to the Project

As discussed above, the traffic volumes on study area roadways for the 2016 Modified Project would be less than the traffic anticipated for the 2007 Approved Project. As traffic noise is a function of the traffic volumes on roadways, no new significant noise impacts would occur and no new mitigation measures would be required. The proposed changes related to the 2016 Modified Project will not alter the noise contours from the nearby I-10 or existing railways and the project design will not be impacted by existing noise sources. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and implementation of Noise Measures 15, 16, 19, 20, and 21 would reduce noise impacts to less than significant levels.

In summary, the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

As under the 2007 Approved Project, operation of construction equipment associated with the 2016 Modified Project will generate vibration from construction activities. Vibration from construction activities rarely reach levels that can damage structures, but can achieve the perceptible ranges in buildings close to a construction site. Construction activities can generate varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the construction procedures, construction equipment used, and proximity to vibration-sensitive uses. While most of the area in the vicinity of the project site hasn't changed, the Mesa View Middle School has already been constructed (see Figure 2, *Aerial Photograph*) in the northeastern border of the project site. Vibration impacts to this school were not evaluated in the 2007 Certified EIR. The nearest buildings are located approximately 200 feet to the north of the Specific Plan boundary. As vibration dissipates rapidly with distance, vibration levels at the nearest sensitive receptors due to construction activities would not be perceptible, therefore groundborne vibration impacts would be less than significant. No new impact would occur. The changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to groundborne vibration.

**c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

As discussed in response a), the 2016 Modified Project would generate less traffic, which would not cause an increase in traffic noise. The changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts as it relates to a substantial increase in ambient noise levels.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to an increase in ambient noise in the vicinity of the project.

**d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Construction would generate noise from equipment operating in the 2016 Modified Project site, and construction haul trucks along roadways.

The 2016 Modified Project would be constructed in phases. Construction of some of phases could result in a potentially significant impact to completed phases because they would contain newly constructed sensitive receptors. Most affected noise sensitive receptors would be those located immediately adjacent to the next

## 5. Environmental Analysis

development. Noise-sensitive uses along County Line Road, extension of County Line Road (Street “E” and Street “D”), and extension of Sandalwood Drive would be impacted by construction worker and delivery traffic using these routes. County Line Road may be used for construction traffic if an alternate route cannot be found. Worker related traffic will result in the most significant traffic noise during the 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. period and the 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. period when various trades enter and leave the site during the work day. Delivery truck noise would occur on these roadways periodically from about 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. The 2016 Modified Project and the 2007 Approved Project include the same sensitive land uses, such as residential, schools, and parks. As the 2016 Modified Project has a very similar footprint as the 2007 Approved Project, noise sensitive uses in the vicinity of the project would be similarly affected. Potential noise impacts to nearby uses during construction would be similar to the impacts evaluated in the 2007 Certified EIR. Mitigation measures were developed to minimize construction traffic noise impacts to noise sensitive areas along these roadways.

While most of the area in the vicinity of the project site hasn't changed since the approval of the project, the Mesa View Middle School was constructed in August 2009 (see Figure 2, *Aerial Photograph*) in the northeastern border of the project site. Noise impacts to the school during construction were not evaluated in the 2007 Certified EIR. The nearest buildings are located approximately 200 feet to the north of the Specific Plan boundary. As shown on Table 7, typical construction noise reached the highest levels of 89 dBA at 50 feet during the grading activities, which would represent the highest composite noise levels during construction of the project. As noise from construction equipment dissipates at a rate of 6 dBA per doubling distance, when grading occurs at the worst-case location approximately 200 feet from the school buildings, noise from construction activities could reach 77 dBA. Construction activities would result in increases in the ambient noise when construction occurs in the northwestern portions of the site nearest to the school. The noise impacts during construction to the school would be similar to the potential noise impacts at nearby residential areas analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR. Noise Measures 1 through 14 and 17 would reduce potential noise impacts to less than significant levels.

The changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to exposure of persons to or generation of a substantial temporary increase in noise levels. With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to temporary noise.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**Table 7 Typical Construction Noise Levels**

Construction Phase	Loudest Construction Equipment	Equipment Noise Level (dBA) at 50 ft	Composite Site Noise Level (dBA) at 50 ft
Site Clearing and Excavation	Dump Truck	91	89
	Backhoe	85	
Concrete Pouring	Truck	91	78
	Concrete Mixer	85	
Steel Erection	Derrick Crane	88	87
	Jack Hammer	88	
Mechanical	Derrick Crane	88	87
	Pneumatic Tools	86	
Cleanup	Rock Drill	98	89
	Trucks	91	

Source: Mesa Verde Estates Specific Plan Draft EIR, 2005.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed 2016 Modified Project is within the same boundaries of the 2007 Approved Project. The nearest airport is Redlands Municipal Airport, approximately six miles to the northwest. The 2016 Modified Project is not located within the direct path of the airport flight patterns and is not located within the 60 dBA CNEL airport noise contours. There would be no impacts related to aircraft noise.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to airport-related noise.

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

**No Impact.** The proposed 2016 Modified Project is within the same boundaries of the 2007 Approved Project. The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to airport-related noise.

### 5.12.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to noise are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. These measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. With the exception of Noise Measure

## 5. Environmental Analysis

17, the measures have been preserved as originally written. Noise Measure 17 has been modified to reflect the recent construction of the Mesa View Middle School.

- 17 Heavy equipment activities adjacent to residences or schools shall be limited to the minimal periods required to complete the task. Grading activities adjacent to the Mesa View Middle School shall be avoided when school is in session.

### 5.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

#### 5.13.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR estimated that the 2007 Approved Project would generate approximately 3,450 units and 8,384 residents over four phases. In the short-term, such a population increase would exceed Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) growth projections for the City of Calimesa, and would thus constitute a significant impact that cannot be mitigated. However, in the long-term, the population generated by the 2007 Approved Project at buildout (Phase 4) would fall within SCAG's Calimesa growth projections for the year 2030 and within the City's General Plan estimated housing capacity for the Specific Plan area.

#### 5.13.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Induce substantial 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)?				X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

- a) **Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The DOF estimates that, in 2015, the average household size in Calimesa was 2.39 persons per household (DOF 2015a). Using this average, the 2016 Modified Project's 3,650 housing units would generate approximately 8,724 residents, or 409 additional residents compared to the 2007 Approved Project. As with the 2007 Approved Project, this represents a substantial direct inducement of population growth. The project would also directly induce population growth via the construction of up to 250,000 square feet of employment-generating commercial space. Indirect inducement of population growth would result from the extension of County Line Road, Sandalwood Drive, and Roberts Road, and from the construction of new infrastructure such as water and sewer lines. As stated in the 2007 Certified EIR, project impacts related to population growth would remain significant and unavoidable.

Since the 2007 Certified EIR, SCAG has updated its growth projections to anticipate the 3,450 units associated with the 2007 Approved Project. SCAG forecasts Calimesa's population to be 25,800 in 11,000 households by 2035 (SCAG 2012). The 25,800 residents projected for the City in 2035 more than accommodates the City's current population of 8,353 and (DOF 2015b), the growth generated by the 2016 Modified Project (approximately 8,724 residents), and additional growth elsewhere in the City. Similarly, the 11,000 households projected for the City in 2035 more than accommodates the City's current 3,797 housing units (DOF 2015b), the growth generated by the 2016 Modified Project (3,650 households), and additional growth elsewhere in the City. Since population and housing impacts of the 2007 Approved Project were already found to be significant, the 200 additional units added by the 2016 Modified Project would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant effect. Therefore, with regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to inducement of population growth.

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** The project site is undeveloped and contains no housing units. Therefore, existing housing units would not be displaced by implementation of the 2016 Modified Project. No impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to displacement of housing.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### c) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** The project site is undeveloped and contains no housing units or existing residents. Therefore, no people would be displaced by implementation of the 2016 Modified Project. No impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to displacement of people.

### **5.13.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project**

No mitigation measures related to population or housing were identified in the 2007 Certified EIR.

## **5.14 PUBLIC SERVICES**

### **5.14.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project**

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that impacts on public services, including fire, police, schools, and other public facilities, as a result of 2007 Approved Project would be less than significant.

Development of the 2007 Approved Project was estimated to generate approximately 10,000 additional residents in the Specific Plan area at buildout (2007 Certified Final EIR). Those additional residents would require more police services, fire services, parks and open space, teachers, and school facilities. The 2007 Certified EIR identified mitigation measures that would reduce public services impacts of the project to a less than significant level, including the payment of impact fees and requirements that the developer coordinate with the pertinent government agencies to ensure that public services are adequately provided.

### **5.14.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project**

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

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Fire protection?				X	
b) Police protection?				X	
c) Schools?				X	
d) Parks?				X	
e) Other public facilities?				X	

### Comments:

#### a) Fire protection?

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The City of Calimesa contracts with the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) to provide fire protection services. RCFD serves over 1.5 million residents of the County and operates 97 fire stations. Additionally, RCFD contracts with the State of California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) to provide firefighting response to forest fires in the region. RCFD's Calimesa Station (No. 21) is located at 906 Park Avenue, approximately 1 mile east of the project site. Other RCFD stations within a 10-mile radius of the City include those in Beaumont (Nos. 20 and 66) and Cherry Valley (Station No. 22).

Compared to the 2007 Approved Project, buildout of the 2016 Modified Project would involve an increase of approximately 409 residents in the RCFD service area. These new residents would likely generate additional services calls to RCFD. However, development fees collected during entitlement of individual projects on the project site would pay for capital improvements and increased property and sales taxes generated by the 2016 Modified Project would be used to finance increased local firefighting capabilities. If any additional funding deficiencies are identified, creation of a service community facilities district could be pursued. The RCFD Master Plan requires one new fire station and/or engine company for every 2,000 residential dwellings or 3.5 million square feet of commercial or industrial space. However, using these ratios, the 2016 Modified Project, like the 2007 Approved Project, would only require two fire stations or engine companies. Therefore, the 200 additional housing units proposed under the 2016 Modified Project would not trigger the need for a third new station or engine company. Therefore, the 2016 Modified Project would not result in a substantially greater impact to fire services.

The 2007 Certified EIR identified four mitigation measures, Public Services Measures 3 through 6, that address fire protection and public safety for the 2007 Approved Project. These include measures that require coordination between the City and RCFD, and payment of fees that will fund new fire stations. Because Measures 3 through 6 were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, they would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. Upon implementation of the Public

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Services Measures 3 through 6, impacts of the 2016 Modified Project on the provision of fire protection and emergency services would remain less than significant.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to provision of fire protection and emergency services.

### b) Police protection?

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Police protection services in Calimesa are provided by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD). The RCSD station assigned to Calimesa is the Cabazon Station located at 50290 Main Street in the community of Cabazon. RCSD services and facilities contracted by the City of Calimesa are currently funded by revenues in the City's General Fund. The RCSD's staffing standard is one officer for every 1,000 residents.

Compared to the 2007 Approved Project, buildout of the 2016 Modified Project would involve an increase of 200 housing units and approximately 409 residents. However, based on the RCSD staffing standard, the approximately 8,724 total residents generated by the 2016 Modified Project would require nine officers, the same amount required to serve the 2007 Approved Project. Furthermore, Mitigation Measures 1 and 2 for Public Services, were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses contained in the 2007 Approved Project, nor to the amount of units proposed by the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, these measures would also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. In particular, Public Services Measure 1 and the City's adopted impact fee program would ensure that police protection impact fees would be paid to the City of Calimesa to cover costs associated with the need for greater police services generated by the 2016 Modified Project. If any additional funding deficiencies are identified, creation of a service community facilities district could be pursued.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to provision of police services.

### c) Schools?

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

School services in Calimesa are provided by the Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School District (YCJUSD) and the Beaumont Unified School District. The project site is located within the service boundaries of YCJUSD. Only one YCJUSD school, Mesa View Middle School, is located in the Calimesa. The school is directly adjacent to the project site to the east.

The YCJUSD uses a student generation rate of 0.7 students per household (Greystone 2005). The additional 200 housing units proposed by the 2016 Modified Project, would therefore generate approximately 140 more students than the 2,415 that would have been generated by the 2007 Approved Project, for a total of 2,555 new students. The 2016 Modified Project designates two planning areas for future elementary school sites. Because Mesa View Middle School was constructed and opened for instruction since approval of the 2007

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project does not propose a middle school site. Although the 140 additional students generated by the 2016 Modified Project would need to be accommodated in new school facilities, they would not require new schools beyond those identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and included in the 2016 Modified Project. The two new schools within the 2016 Modified Project can be sized appropriately to accommodate the additional students. Additionally, the Mesa View Middle School was designed and constructed to serve students from the 2007 Approved Project. Mesa View Middle School has a current enrollment of 885 students.<sup>7</sup> It has a design capacity for up to 1,200 middle school students, but is eventually planned to serve up to 1,700 high school students.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new or substantially greater impacts related to school services since adequate capacity exists to serve future students generated by the 2016 Modified Project.

In addition to the designation of two elementary school sites, the 2016 Modified Project would be required to comply with mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR that address funding of school services. Public Services Measures 7 and 8 would ensure that developers of new housing on the project site pay school impacts fees consistent with California Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) and coordinate with the YCJUSD to ensure that adequate school services are supplied in the area. SB 50 is a funding program established by the state legislature to constitute “full and complete mitigation of the impacts” on the provision of adequate school facilities (Government Code § 65995[h]). SB 50 relieves jurisdictions from having the authority of denying approval of legislative or adjudicative actions under CEQA based upon the inadequacy of school facilities. Although the increased demand for school facilities would result in substantial impact, payment of impact fees in compliance with SB 50 would reduce the impacts to an acceptable level.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to school services.

### d) Parks?

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.** Section 17.15.110 of the Calimesa Municipal Code states the City’s parkland standard is 5 acres of public parkland per 1,000 residents. The 2007 Approved Project includes 57.5 acres of parkland which exceeds the City’s parkland standard by 16 acres. The 2016 Modified Project would generate approximately 8,724 residents (3,650 units x 2.39 persons per unit) and generate a need for approximately 43.6 acres of park land. The 2016 Modified Project includes 47.9 total acres of public park land (see Figure 3 of this Addendum for locations of proposed parks). Therefore, despite an increased need for additional park space and a reduction in park space provided, the 2016 Modified Project meets the City’s requirement for parkland and does not result in a new or substantially greater impact related to park land 2016 Modified Project.

The 47.9 acres of parks proposed by the 2016 Modified Project includes seven public parks that feature a variety of recreational amenities and ten “pocket parks” evenly distributed throughout the project site. The

---

<sup>7</sup> California Department of Education Data Reporting Office, 2014-2015 School Year.

<sup>8</sup> Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School District, *Mesa View School Project – Access Road and Conversion To High School Final Environmental Impact Report*, August 2006.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

distribution and size of the proposed public parks is generally the same between the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project. Notable exceptions include the conversion of two parks to residential use (Planning Areas 22 and 46 [previously Planning Area 45]), the introduction of a park adjacent to Street B in the central portion of the project site (Planning Area 68), and the introduction of a park at the intersection of Roberts Road and Street A in the mixed use/commercial portion of the project site (Planning Area 67). The 2016 Modified Project also includes 8.2 acres of private recreational facilities, a 23.1-mile trail system, and additional recreational opportunities within the project's extensive network of open space. Improvement of these parks would be achieved through compliance with the City's Parks and Recreation Fee and Dedication ordinance (Section 17.15.110 and Chapter 18.110 of the Calimesa Municipal Code). Parks will be phased with residential development and may include parkland dedication, park facility improvements and/or payment of in-lieu park fees in accordance with the adopted conditions of approval for the project. Developers of individual projects on the project site would be required to dedicate land for parks and/or pay in-lieu fees that would facilitate construction of the required parkland. Because new parkland proposed for the project site is part of the 2016 Modified Project, environmental impacts of its construction and operation are evaluated throughout this Addendum. For example, greenhouse gas emissions and traffic estimates account for all proposed uses, including parks. No new or substantially greater impact related to parks would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to increased need for parkland.

### e) Other public facilities?

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Library services in Calimesa are provided by the Calimesa Library, which is operated by the Riverside County Library System. The total housing units proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would increase the Calimesa population by approximately 8,724 residents and would increase the local need for library services. The 2007 Certified EIR determined that, at that time, the Calimesa Library offered 0.9 books per capita and 0.3 square feet of library space per capita. Based on these levels of service, the 409 additional residents generated by the 2016 Modified Project would generate the need for approximately 369 additional books and 123 additional square feet of library space compared to the 2007 Approved Project. While this represents an increased need, it is only a 5 percent increase, which does not represent a substantial increase in the severity of impacts to library services. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impact would occur.

Furthermore, Public Services Measure 9 would mitigate potential impacts to library services. Mitigation Measure 9 would ensure that developers of projects on the project site would pay library impacts fees to the City of Calimesa to covers costs associated with increased demand for library services resulting from the 2016 Modified Project. Because Mitigation Measure 9 was not tailored to the specific number of units proposed by the 2007 Approved Project or to an estimated number of new residents generated in the Calimesa Library's service area under the 2007 Approved Project, it also applies to the 2016 Modified Project.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to provision of library services.

### 5.14.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to public services are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. These measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project and no modifications are necessary. In the 2007 Certified EIR, mitigation measures related to public services were originally grouped with those related to utilities and service systems. However, the two sets of measures have been separated in Appendix A to correspond to the order of topics analyzed in this Addendum. Measures related to public services are numbered 1 through 9; measures related to utilities and services systems are numbered 10 through 17.

## 5.15 RECREATION

### 5.15.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

Recreation impacts were not analyzed in the 2007 Certified EIR.

### 5.15.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				<b>X</b>	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				<b>X</b>	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Comments:

- a) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

As discussed in Section 5.14.2(d) of this Addendum, the 2016 Modified Project would provide 47.9 acres of public parks. This is greater than the 43.8 acres of parks and recreational facilities required for the project's projected buildout population of 8,760. Improvement of the 2016 Modified Project's proposed parks would be achieved through compliance with the City's Parks and Recreation Fee and Dedication ordinance (Section 17.15.110 and Chapter 18.110 of the Calimesa Municipal Code). Parks will be phased with residential development and may include parkland dedication, park facility improvements and/or payment of in-lieu park fees in accordance with the adopted conditions of approval for the project. Developers of individual projects on the project site would be required to dedicate land for parks and/or pay in-lieu fees that would facilitate construction of the required parkland. Therefore, the approximately 200 additional residents generated by the 2016 Modified Project would be adequately served by parks provided onsite and would not create or accelerate substantial physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities. Impacts related to use of existing parks and recreational facilities in Calimesa would remain less than significant.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to use of existing parks and recreational facilities.

- b) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

#### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The 2016 Modified Project includes the same acreage of public parks and three fewer acres of private recreational facilities compared to the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts related to construction or expansion of recreational facilities would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project, when compared to the 2007 Approved Project, would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to use of development of recreational facilities.

### **5.15.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project**

No mitigation measures related to recreational facilities were identified in the 2007 Certified EIR.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

#### 5.16.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that residential and commercial land uses associated with buildout of the 2007 Approved Project would generate approximately 50,946 vehicle trips per day and an estimated 3,967 vehicles per hour during the a.m. peak period and 5,027 vehicles per hour during the p.m. peak hour. The 2007 Certified EIR explains that the region is projected to undergo significant growth through 2030 and therefore major highway and roadway improvements would be necessary in advance of construction of facilities on the project site. Mitigation measures were provided in the 2007 Certified EIR that were designed to alleviate traffic and circulation impacts. However, the 2007 Certified EIR concluded that despite mitigation, select intersections would operate below Level of Service (LOS) C during Phase 3 of the project and would continue to operate below that level at project buildout. Therefore, traffic impacts of the project were identified as significant and unavoidable.

#### 5.16.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				<b>X</b>	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				<b>X</b>	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?					<b>X</b>

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?					X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?					X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?					X

### Comments:

- a) **Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

A focused traffic study was prepared to provide an update to the phasing analysis components of the traffic impact analysis previously completed for the 2007 Approved Project (Urban Crossroads 2016). The project plan has been the subject of ongoing refinement, and the focused analysis in this report addresses three key issues from a transportation perspective:

- Assess the phasing requirements for off-site improvements for the modified project, based upon current information and more realistic project construction timelines.
- Provide a detailed assessment of on-site circulation requirements for the proposed project.
- With refinements to the proposed project, evaluate traffic conditions based upon updated ambient peak hour travel demand data forecasts.

Table 8, below, lists the intersection analysis locations for this focused traffic study. A more detailed on-site circulation evaluation has been performed as part of the analysis.

Exhibit 1-2 of the focused traffic study and Figure 4 of this Addendum show the project development area and network associated with each of the eight development phases analyzed in this study. Appropriate public street improvements and supplemental emergency access improvements are identified for each phase, and the improvement recommendations are listed in chapters 4 through 11 of the focused traffic study.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Key issues that are considered in the off-site improvement phasing analysis include timing of construction of the off-site segments of Roberts Road, as well as the timing of improvements at the interchanges of County Line Road and Sandalwood Drive (Calimesa Boulevard) with the I-10 Freeway. These are the locations where the Mesa Verde Estates Specific Plan project was previously conditioned to construct physical improvements in conjunction with development and were selected for this reason.

No roadway through connections are contemplated as part of the project description, nor have any through connections been identified on other circulation master plans such as the City of Calimesa Circulation Element or the County of Riverside Circulation Element.

**Table 8 Intersection Analysis Locations**

ID	Off-Site Intersection Locations	Jurisdiction
<b>Offsite Intersection Locations</b>		
1	7th Place / County Line Road	Calimesa
2	I-10 Freeway Southbound Ramps / County Line Road	Caltrans
3	I-10 Freeway Northbound Ramps / County Line Road	Caltrans
4	Calimesa Boulevard / County Line Road	Calimesa
5	Calimesa Boulevard / Sandalwood Drive	Calimesa
6	Calimesa Boulevard / I-10 Freeway Northbound Off-Ramp	Calimesa
7	I-10 Freeway Northbound On-Ramp / Sandalwood Drive	Caltrans
8	I-10 Freeway Southbound Ramps / Sandalwood Drive	Caltrans
9	7th Street / Sandalwood Drive	Calimesa
10	Roberts Road / County Line Road (future)	Calimesa
11	Street "C" / Roberts Road (future)	Calimesa
<b>Onsite Intersection Locations (future)</b>		
12	Roberts Road / 7th Street	Calimesa
13	Roberts Road / Sandalwood Drive	Calimesa
14	Roberts Road / Street "B"	Calimesa
15	Roberts Road / TAZ 14 & 15 Access	Calimesa
16	Street "C" / Street "B"	Calimesa
17	Street "C" / Sandalwood Drive	Calimesa
18	Street "D" / Street "A"	Calimesa
19	Street "D" / Street "B"	Calimesa
20	Street "E" / Street "A"	Calimesa
21	Street "E" / Street "B"	Calimesa
22	Street "B"/Sandalwood Drive – Street "A"	Calimesa
23	Street "G"/Sandalwood Drive – Street "A"	Calimesa

Source: Urban Crossroads 2016.

### Project Trip Generation

Table 9 presents overall project trip generation. Breakdowns of this data into traffic analysis zones for each project phase are provided in Sections 4 to 11 of the traffic study. The 2016 Modified Project is anticipated to

## 5. Environmental Analysis

generate a total of approximately 47,683 trips per day with 3,507 AM peak hour trips and 4,850 PM peak hour trips (excluding retail pass-by trips, but including both external and internal trip ends).

Table 10 compares the 2016 Modified Project trip generation to the Approved Project trip generation. The 2007 Approved Project generates 50,946 trips per day with 3,967 AM peak hour trips and 5,027 PM peak hour trips (excluding retail pass-by trips, but including both external and internal trip ends). The 2016 Modified Project will therefore generate 3,164 fewer daily trips, 457 fewer AM peak hour trips, and 10 additional PM peak hour trips.

**Table 9 Overall Trip Generation Summary**

Land Use	Quantity	Units	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Daily
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Single Family Detached	3,292	DU	624	1,843	2,467	2,074	1,218	3,292	31,340
Multi-Family	358	DU	36	147	183	143	78	221	2,381
Active Park	48.0	AC	41	35	76	107	107	214	1,894
Recreational Community Center	8.0	TSF	10	6	16	10	11	21	271
Elementary School	1,200	STU	300	240	540	84	96	180	1,548
Shopping Center	250	TSF	170	102	272	532	576	1,108	12,320
Commercial Pass-By/Diverted			(22)	(22)	(44)	(88)	(88)	(176)	(1,972)
<b>Total Project Trips (Less Retail Pass-by/Diverted)</b>			<b>1,159</b>	<b>2,351</b>	<b>3,510</b>	<b>2,862</b>	<b>1,998</b>	<b>4,860</b>	<b>47,782</b>
Residential and School Internal Capture			(352)	(353)	(705)	(194)	(194)	(388)	(3,387)
Residential and Commercial Internal Capture			(64)	(64)	(128)	(266)	(266)	(532)	(5,912)
Residential and Recreation Center Internal Capture			(22)	(19)	(41)	(41)	(40)	(80)	(828)
Residential and Active Park Internal Capture			(33)	(33)	(66)	(98)	(98)	(196)	(1,724)
<b>Total Internal Trip Activity</b>			<b>(471)</b>	<b>(469)</b>	<b>(940)</b>	<b>(599)</b>	<b>(597)</b>	<b>(1,196)</b>	<b>(11,854)</b>
<b>TOTAL EXTERNAL (OFF-SITE) TRIPS</b>			<b>688</b>	<b>1,882</b>	<b>2,570</b>	<b>2,263</b>	<b>1,401</b>	<b>3,664</b>	<b>35,928</b>

Source: Urban Crossroads 2016.

**Table 10 Project Trip Generation Comparison**

Project		AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Daily
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
2016 Modified Project (Less Retail Pass-by / Diverted)		1,159	2,351	3,510	2,862	1,998	4,860	47,782
Previous FEIR (7/5/07) - Table 3.12-4 (Less Retail Pass-by/Diverted)		1,456	2,511	3,967	2,888	2,139	5,027	50,946
<b>Delta (2016 Modified Project – 2007 Approved Project)</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>-297</b>	<b>-160</b>	<b>-457</b>	<b>-26</b>	<b>-141</b>	<b>-167</b>	<b>-3,164</b>
	<b>Percent</b>	<b>-26%</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>-13%</b>	<b>-1%</b>	<b>-7%</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>-7%</b>

Source: Urban Crossroads 2016.

Overall the 2016 Modified Project results in a seven percent reduction in overall trips. Therefore, the differences between the 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project are considered less than significant.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Project Trip Assignment by Phase

Traffic volume forecasts were developed for the following phases of development:

- Interim Year 2017 with the Proposed Project Phase 1A
- Interim Year 2018 with the Proposed Project Phase 1B
- Interim Year 2019 with the Proposed Project Phase 1C
- Interim Year 2020 with the Proposed Project Phase 1D
- Interim Year 2021 with the Proposed Project Phase 2A
- Interim Year 2023 with the Proposed Project Phase 2B
- Interim Year 2024 with the Proposed Project Phase 3A
- Horizon Year 2035 with the Proposed Project Phase 3B

Traffic operations of roadway facilities are described using the term "Level of Service" (LOS). LOS is a qualitative description of traffic flow based on several factors such as speed, travel time, delay, and freedom to maneuver. Six levels are typically defined ranging from LOS A, representing completely free-flow conditions, to LOS F, representing breakdown in flow resulting in stop-and-go conditions. LOS E represents operations at or near capacity, an unstable level where vehicles are operating with the minimum spacing for maintaining uniform flow.

Riverside County General Plan Policy C 2.1 states that LOS "D" is allowed in Community Development areas at intersections of any combination of Secondary Highways, Major Highways, Arterial Highways, Urban Arterial Highways, Expressways or conventional State Highways. LOS "E" may be allowed in designated Community Centers to the extent that it would support transit-oriented development and pedestrian communities. LOS "C" is otherwise the target level of service on County-maintained roads.

The City of Calimesa General Plan Update states that City seeks to maintain level of service "D" on City-maintained roads. However, a peak hour level of service "D" may be allowed on City-maintained road segments in commercial and employment areas or any combination of major highways, urban arterials, secondary highways, or freeway ramp intersections. As such, LOS "D" has been considered acceptable at the off-site study intersections at or near the vicinity of the I-10 freeway ramps and LOS "C" has been considered acceptable at all other study locations, including on-site intersections.

### Existing Conditions

The focused traffic study area consists of nine (9) existing off-site intersection locations, as follows:

1. 7th Place / County Line Road
2. I-10 Freeway Southbound Ramps / County Line Road
3. I-10 Freeway Northbound Ramps / County Line Road
4. Calimesa Boulevard / County Line Road
5. Calimesa Boulevard / Sandalwood Drive

## 5. Environmental Analysis

6. Calimesa Boulevard / I-10 Freeway Northbound Off-Ramp
7. I-10 Freeway Northbound On-Ramp / Sandalwood Drive
8. I-10 Freeway Southbound Ramps / Sandalwood Drive
9. 7th Street / Sandalwood Drive

With occupancy of Mesa View Middle School, AM peak hour volumes at the following intersections have increased substantially in 2013 as compared to volumes identified in 2003:

- 7th Place/County Line Road
- I -10 Freeway Southbound Ramps/County Line Road
- Calimesa Boulevard/Sandalwood Drive
- Calimesa Boulevard/I-10 Freeway Northbound Off-Ramp
- I-10 Freeway Northbound On-Ramp/Sandalwood Drive - 5th Street
- I-10 Freeway Southbound Ramps/Sandalwood Drive
- 7th Street / Sandalwood Drive

Minimal increases have occurred during both morning and evening peak hours at the I-10 Freeway Northbound Ramps / County Line Road and Calimesa Boulevard / County Line Road intersections.

### Phase 1A Conditions

Phase 1A development within the project consists of 226 single family homes, 7.7 acres of active park, and 7,000 square feet of recreation community center land uses. Exhibit 4-1 in the traffic study illustrates the Phase 1A project development area, and the initial roadway connections which are proposed to serve this initial phase. Street "A" is provided as an interim two-lane extension of Sandalwood Drive west of Street "C", and an emergency access route is provided near the northwest corner of the existing Mesa View Middle School. Street "A" from Street "C" to Street "D" will ultimately be improved to a full Secondary (4 through lanes with space for an exclusive left turn lane, 104-foot right-of-way) in Phase 2A.

For Phase 1A conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 2,592 trip-ends per day with 189 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 271 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Table 4-4 in the traffic study provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 1A development of 226 single family homes and related park and recreation uses within the project. Without improvements, LOS deficiencies occur at the following intersections:

- I -10 Freeway Southbound Ramps/County Line Road
- I-10 Freeway Southbound Ramps/Sandalwood Drive
- 7th Street/Sandalwood Drive

## 5. Environmental Analysis

The existing intersection deficiency at I -10 Freeway Southbound Ramps / County Line Road is unrelated to Phase 1 project traffic.

The remaining two intersections impacted by the Phase 1A project are located at or near the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area.

### Phase 1B Conditions

Phase 1B development within the project consists of 567 additional single family homes within the project (project cumulative total = 793 dwelling units), as well as 1.2 additional acres of active park (project cumulative total = 8.9 acres of park and 7,000 square feet of recreation community center land uses).

Exhibit 5-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 2 project development area, and the roadway connections which are proposed to serve this phase. Street “A” is extended from the TAZ 7 westerly boundary to Street “D” with an interim two-lane cross-section. Street “A” from Street “F” to Street “D” will ultimately be improved to a full Secondary (4 through lanes with space for an exclusive left turn lane, 104-foot right-of-way) in Phase 1C. During Phase 1B, Street “D” is improved as a Collector (72-foot right-of-way) from Street “B” to the northeasterly project boundary, and an emergency access connection is provided from the terminus of Street “D” to the existing westerly terminus of County Line Road. Phase 1B improvements include the construction of Street “F” from Sandalwood Drive/Street “A” to Street “B” as a Divided Collector (80-foot right-of-way), and the improvement of Street “B” as a Divided Collector (80-foot right-of-way) from Street “D” to the easterly boundary of TAZ 11.

For Phase 1B conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 8,159 trip-ends per day with 623 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 854 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Table 5-4 of the traffic study provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 1B development. The existing intersection deficiency at I -10 Freeway Southbound Ramps / County Line Road is unrelated to Phase 1B project traffic.

### Phase 1C Conditions

Phase 1C development within the project consists of 364 additional single family homes within the project (project cumulative total = 1,157 dwelling units, 8.9 acres of active park, and 7,000 square feet of recreation community center land uses).

Exhibit 6-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 1C project development area, and the roadway connections which are proposed to serve this phase. Phase 1C is primarily served by the cumulative on-site roadway infrastructure constructed during Phases 1A and 1B. This phase maintains Sandalwood Drive – Street “A” as an interim two-lane roadway with the exception of the vicinity of the intersection of Street “B” and Sandalwood Drive. Sandalwood Drive is widened to 3 lanes (2 eastbound through lanes and 1 westbound through lane) within the vicinity of Street “B” and Sandalwood Drive.

For Phase 1C conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 11,624 trip-ends per day with 896 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 1,218 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Table 6-4 provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 1C development of 364 additional single family homes within the project (project cumulative total = 1,157 dwelling units). For Phases 1A to 1C, project traffic is not directed to the County Line Road/I-10 interchange area. However, existing LOS deficiencies at the I-10 Southbound Ramps/County Line Road intersection worsen with gradual peak hour traffic volume increases due to area wide growth (not related to the proposed project) during these project phases.

### Phase 1D Conditions

Phase 1D development activity within the project includes 216 additional single family homes (project cumulative total = 1,373 dwelling units), as well as 14.8 additional acres of active park (project cumulative total = 23.7 acres of park and 7,000 square feet of recreation community center land uses).

~~Exhibit 7-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 1D project development area, and the roadway network which now includes a roadway connection from the project site to County Line Road via Street "C" and a segment of Roberts Road. Street "C" is extended as a Modified Divided Collector (64-foot right-of-way) from the northeasterly project boundary to the future alignment of Roberts Road. Roberts Road is constructed from Street "C" to County Line Road as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section (interim Secondary cross-section). Phase 1D on-site improvements include the construction of Street "G" from Sandalwood Drive to Roberts Road as a Collector (72-foot right-of-way), and the improvement of Roberts Road from Sandalwood Drive to Street "G" as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section (interim Secondary cross-section).~~

For Phase 1D conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 14,299 trip-ends per day with 1,082 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 1,504 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

~~Phase 1D spreads the project traffic volumes to both County Line Road and Sandalwood Drive with the new connection of Roberts Road to County Line Road from Street "C". Project development during this phase therefore does not increase the total daily project volume on Sandalwood Drive at the project east boundary. However, the project adds 2,800 vehicles per day to County Line Road between Roberts Road and the I-10 Southbound Ramps/County Line Road intersection.~~

Table 7-4 provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 1D development of 286 additional single family homes (project cumulative total = 1,373 dwelling units).

### Phase 2A Conditions

Phase 2A development activity includes 550 additional single family homes within the project site (project cumulative total = 1,923 dwelling units), as well as 5.01 additional acres of active park and 1,000 square feet of recreational community center (project cumulative total = 28.8 acres of park, 8,000 square feet of recreation community center land uses).

Exhibit 8-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 2A project development area, and the roadway network which now includes the connectivity of Roberts Road from County Line Road to Sandalwood Drive.

For Phase 2A conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 19,782 trip-ends per day with 1,505 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 2,080 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Phase 2A on-site improvements include the following:

- Construction of Street “A” from Street “D” to Street “E” as a Divided Collector (80-foot right-of-way) and from Street “E” to the westerly boundary of TAZ 6a as a Collector (72-foot right-of-way).
- Construct Street “B” from Street “D” to Street “E” as a Divided Collector (80-foot right-of-way) and from Street “E” to the westerly boundary of TAZ 4a as a Collector (72-foot right-of-way).
- Construct Street “E” between Street “B” and Street “A” as a Collector (72-foot right-of-way).
- Improvement of Sandalwood Drive from Street “D” to Street “C” as a full Secondary cross-section (80-104-foot right-of-way), between Street “C” to Roberts Road as a full Major cross-section (108-foot-right-of-way), and between Roberts Road and easterly Project boundary as an interim four lane roadway.

Table 8-4 provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 2A development of 550 additional single family homes (project cumulative total = 1,923 dwelling units, 28.8 acres of park, 8,000 square feet of recreation community center land uses).

### Phase 2B Conditions

Phase 2B development activity includes 150 additional single family homes and 220 multi-family units within the Project (project cumulative total = 2,093 dwelling units), as well as a new elementary school, and 125,000 square feet of commercial retail (project cumulative total = 28.8 acres of park, 8,000 square feet of recreation community center, 125,000 square feet of retail, and a 600-student school).

Exhibit 9-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 2B project development area, and the roadway network which now includes the connectivity of Roberts Road from County Line Road to Sandalwood Drive. Roberts Road is constructed from Street “C” to the project boundary as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section (interim Secondary cross-section).

For Phase 2B conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 28,621 trip-ends per day with 2,113 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 2,922 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Phase 2B on-site improvements include the construction of Roberts Road from Sandalwood Drive to the northeasterly project boundary as a full Secondary cross-section (104-foot right-of-way) and realignment of 7th Street from Sandalwood Drive to Roberts Road as a Collector (72-foot-right-of-way).

Table 9-4 of the traffic study provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 2B development of 150 additional single family homes and 220 multi-family units within the Project (project cumulative total = 2,293 dwelling units), as well as a new elementary school and 125,000 square feet of commercial retail (project cumulative total = 28.8 acres of park, 8,000 square feet of recreation community center, 125,000 square feet of retail, and a 600-student school). Substantial additional improvements are needed at or near the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area (as shown previously on Exhibit 1-10). However, no additional improvements (beyond those presented for Phase 2A) are recommended in the County Line Road/I-10 interchange area.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Phase 3A Conditions

Phase 3A development activity includes 839 additional single family homes on the project site (project cumulative total = 3,132 dwelling units, 39.8 acres of park, 8,000 square feet of recreation community center, 125,000 square feet of retail, and a 600-student school).

Exhibit 10-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 3A project development area, and the roadway network which now includes the connectivity of Roberts Road from County Line Road to Sandalwood Drive.

For Phase 3A conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 37,068 trip-ends per day with 2,760 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 3,813 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Table 10-4 provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 3A development. Without improvements, LOS deficiencies occur at the or near the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area, and at the or near the County Line Road/I-10 interchange area.

### Phase 3B Conditions

Phase 3B development activity accounts for, and includes 380 additional single family homes and 138 multi-family units for the multi-year period between 2024 and buildout of the project (project cumulative total = 3,650 dwelling units), as well as a second elementary school, 125,000 additional square feet of commercial retail, and 8.2 additional acres of active park (project cumulative total = 48.0 acres of park, 8,000 square feet of recreation community center, 250,000 square feet of retail, and two 600-student schools).

Exhibit 7-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 1D project development area, and the roadway network which now includes a roadway connection from the project site to County Line Road via Street "C" and a segment of Roberts Road. Street "C" is extended as a Modified Divided Collector (64-foot right-of-way) from the northeasterly project boundary to the future alignment of Roberts Road. Roberts Road is constructed from Street "C" to County Line Road as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section (interim Secondary cross-section).

Exhibit 11-1 of the traffic study illustrates the Phase 3B project development area, and the roadway network which now includes the extension of Roberts Road south of the project site. Travel demand forecasts for this scenario are derived from the Riverside County Transportation Analysis Model (RivTAM) horizon year 2035 forecasts.

For Phase 3B conditions, the project site is projected to generate a total of approximately 47,782 trip-ends per day with 3,510 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 4,860 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour.

Phase 3B on-site improvements include the improvement of Roberts Road from Sandalwood Drive to the southeasterly project boundary as a full Secondary cross-section (104-foot right-of-way).

Table 11-4 provides an overall summary of intersection operations in the study area with Phase 3B development.

### Conclusion

In summary, upon implementation of the mitigation measures listed below, all study area roadways and intersections would operate at acceptable LOS.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program adopted minimum Level of Service (LOS) threshold is LOS “E”. Therefore, when a CMP street or highway segment falls to “F”, a deficiency plan must be required. No study-area arterials or highways are part of the CMP roadway system. In addition, the City of Calimesa adopts LOS D as the threshold. As mitigation measures would be implemented with the 2016 Modified Project to achieve LOS D (which is stricter than the CMP LOS E), there would no impacts to the CMP program.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to CMP facilities.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

**No Impact.** The 2016 Modified Project would not change air traffic patterns, or change the location of development areas where persons would dwell and work, which would result in a substantial safety risk. The nearest airport is Redlands Municipal Airport, approximately six miles to the northwest. No new or increased impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the Modification would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**No Impact.** The 2016 Modified Project would extend Street C (formerly Street F) to Street B and would modify on-site road classifications when compared to the 2007 Approved Project. As with the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would design and construct streets, roundabouts and intersections according to applicable State and City of Calimesa guidelines. No new or substantially increased impact would occur.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the Modification would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to roadway hazards.

### e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

**No Impact.** Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would be constructed with a circulation system that would provide multiple access points to the surrounding regional circulation system and access to two freeway ramps on the I-10 Freeway. Furthermore, the 2016 Modified Project would be consistent with policies in adopted emergency plans, which require emergency access to the project site. As under the 2007 Approved Project, emergency access between the project site and County Line Road would be provided via Street D (see Figure III.4, *Circulation Master Plan*, of the revised Specific Plan). At the project site's eastern boundary, County Line Road would be gated with a Knox activated electric gate per Riverside County Fire Department standards to permit fire department access to the project site but restrict public access to the site from County Line Road. Trails would also be designed and constructed to accommodate emergency response vehicles. Adequate emergency access would be provided and no impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or increase the severity of impacts, with respect to adequacy of emergency access.

### f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

**No Impact.** The Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) is the transit agency that would serve the Mesa Verde Estates community. Currently there is no regular bus service that serves the project area and the City of Calimesa. The City plans to continue to monitor transit service planning and programming activities within the County of Riverside, and the region, to ensure that the City receives its fair share of transit services, when they become available. The proposed on-site roads would dedicate land for the provision of on-site bicycle trails and sidewalks to provide and promote multi-modal transportation. As shown on Exhibit 2-2 of the Traffic Study (Urban Crossroads 2014), all onsite street classifications would include sidewalks and bike lanes on both direction of travel. Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities; no new or substantially increased impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

### 5.16.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR (listed in Appendix A) have been modified as follows to reflect changes in the amount and distribution of traffic that would be generated by the 2016

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Modified Project when compared to the 2007 Approved Project. Modifications to the original mitigation measures to reflect changes to the necessary traffic improvements are based on the updated traffic study (Appendix F) prepared for the 2016 Modified Project. The revisions to the mitigation measures are identified in ~~strikeout text~~ to indicate deletions and underlined to signify additions.

### Phase 1

- 1 ~~Install traffic signals and provide ramp widening and back-to-back left turn lane striping at the I-10/Sandalwood Interchange ramp intersections.~~
- 2 ~~Install traffic signals and provide turn lane improvements which include ramp widening and under crossing lane improvements at the I-10/County Line Interchange.~~
- 3 ~~Install a traffic signal and provide turn lane improvements at the intersection of Roberts Roads and Sandalwood Drive.~~
- 4 ~~Provide turn lane improvements at the following intersections:~~
  - a. ~~Roberts Road at County Line Road~~
  - b. ~~Calimesa Boulevard at County Line Road~~
  - c. ~~7th Street at Sandalwood Drive~~
- 5 ~~Construct Sandalwood Drive from the I-10 Eastbound Ramps to Roberts Road as a two lane, 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 6 ~~Construct North Loop from Street "C" to Street "E" at its ultimate full section width as a Major (98-foot right-of-way).~~
- 7 ~~Construct North Loop from Street "E" to the access for PA 56 as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 8 ~~Construct North Loop from the TAZ 14 west boundary to Street "C" as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 9 ~~Construct the realignment of 7th Street north of Sandalwood Drive as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 10 ~~Construct North Loop from Roberts Road to the TAZ 14 west boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Major (98-foot right-of-way).~~
- 11 ~~Construct Roberts Road from North Loop to South Loop at its ultimate half-section width as a Major (98-foot right-of-way) [ends like this in 2007 FEIR]~~
- 12 ~~Construct South Loop from Roberts Road to the TAZ 14 west boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- 13 ~~Construct South Loop from the TAZ 14 west boundary to Street "C" as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 14 ~~Construct South Loop from Street "C" to Street "D" at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 15 ~~Construct Street "D" from North Loop to South Loop at its ultimate half-section width as a Divided Collector (78-foot right-of-way).~~
- 16 ~~Construct Street "C" from North Loop to South Loop at its ultimate full-section width as a Divided Collector (78-foot right-of-way).~~
- 17 ~~Construct South Loop from Street "D" to the TAZ 2 east boundary as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 18 ~~Construct South Loop from the TAZ "2" east boundary to the TAZ 2 west boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 19 ~~Construct Street "E" from North Loop to the easterly project boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Collector (66-foot right-of-way).~~
- 20 ~~Construct Street "F" from Roberts Road to North Loop as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 21 ~~Construct Roberts Road from County Line Road to Sandalwood Drive as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~

### Phase 1A

- 1 Prior to issuance of the first building permit within Phase 1A, the following improvements in the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:
  - Provide a separate eastbound right turn lane on Sandalwood Drive approaching the I-10 Southbound Ramps/Sandalwood Drive intersection.
  - Modify Sandalwood Drive bridge to provide a separate westbound left turn lane on Sandalwood Drive approaching the I-10 Southbound Ramps/Sandalwood Drive intersection.
  - Widen the southbound off-ramp approach to the I-10 Southbound Ramps/Sandalwood Drive intersection in order to provide a separate right turn lane.
  - Install a traffic signal at the I-10 Southbound Ramps/Sandalwood Drive intersection.
  - Reconfigure the 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Sandalwood Drive intersection to replace the existing westbound-to-northbound curve with a conventional "T" configuration, as illustrated on Exhibit 1-3 of the traffic study (Urban Crossroads 2016).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- Provide a westbound right turn lane and interim eastbound left turn at the redesigned 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Sandalwood Drive intersection.
- Install a traffic signal at the redesigned 7<sup>th</sup> Street/Sandalwood Drive intersection.

### Phase 1B

2 Prior to issuance of the first building permit within Phase 1B, the following improvements at or near the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange shall be constructed:

- Modify Sandalwood Drive bridge striping to provide a separate eastbound left turn lane on Sandalwood Drive approaching the I-10 Northbound ramps/Sandalwood Drive intersection. This would create back-to-back left turn striping on the existing Sandalwood Drive bridge over I-10, between the northbound ramp (westbound freeway) and southbound ramp (eastbound freeway) intersections.

### Phase 1C

~~1 Provide additional ramp widening and under crossing widening at the I-10/County Line Interchange.~~

~~2 Provide additional turn lane improvements at the I-10/Sandalwood Interchange.~~

~~3 Install traffic signals at the following on-site intersections:~~

- ~~a. North Loop at Street "D"/Street "E"~~
- ~~b. North Loop at Street "F"~~

~~4 Widen North Loop from the TAZ 4 east boundary to the TAZ 4 west boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~

~~5 Widen South Loop from the TAZ 4 west boundary to the TAZ 2 east boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~

~~6 Complete South Loop from the TAZ 4 east boundary to the TAZ 4 west boundary at its ultimate full-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~

3 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 1C, the following improvements in the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

- Convert the existing southbound off-ramp share left/through lane to allow right turn movements (shared left/through/right lane).

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### Phase 1D

- 1 ~~Provide ramp reconfiguration and bridge improvements at the I-10/Sandalwood Interchange ramp intersections.~~
- 2 ~~Install traffic signals and provide turn lane improvements at the following intersections:
  - a. ~~Roberts Road at County Line Road;~~
  - b. ~~Roberts Road at Street "F"; and~~
  - c. ~~South Loop at Street "D".~~~~
- 3 ~~Provide additional turn lane improvements at the following intersections:
  - a. ~~Roberts Road at Sandalwood Drive; and~~
  - b. ~~7th Street at Sandalwood Drive.~~~~
- 4 ~~Complete Street "E" from North Loop to the easterly project boundary at its ultimate full section width as a Collector (66-foot right-of-way).~~
- 5 ~~Complete North Loop from the TAZ 3 north boundary to Street "E" at its ultimate full section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 6 ~~Construct North Loop from the TAZ 3 north boundary to the TAZ 3 west boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 7 ~~Construct North Loop from the TAZ 1.1 north boundary to the TAZ 1.1 south boundary at its ultimate full-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 8 ~~Construct South Loop from the TAZ 6 west boundary to the TAZ 6 south boundary at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 9 ~~Complete South Loop from the TAZ 6 south boundary to Street "C" at its ultimate full-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 10 ~~Widen North Loop from the TAZ "14" west boundary to Street "C" at its ultimate half-section width as a Major (98-foot right-of-way).~~
- 11 ~~Widen Roberts Road from Sandalwood Drive to the realigned 7th Street at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~
- 12 ~~Complete North Loop from the TAZ 14 west boundary to Roberts Road at its ultimate full-section width as a Major (98-foot right-of-way).~~
- 13 ~~Widen South Loop from the TAZ 14 west boundary to Street "C" at its ultimate half-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way).~~

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- 14 ~~Complete South Loop from the TAZ 14 west boundary to Roberts Road at its ultimate full-section width as a Secondary (96-foot right-of-way)~~
- 15 ~~Construct North Loop from the TAZ 3 west boundary to the TAZ 1.1 north boundary as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 16 ~~Construct South Loop from the TAZ 1.1 south boundary to the TAZ 6 west boundary as a two-lane 32-foot pavement section.~~
- 17 ~~Widen Sandalwood Drive from Roberts Road to the I-10 Eastbound ramps as an interim 4-lane pavement section with raised median.~~
- 18 ~~Complete Street "D" from North Loop to South Loop at its ultimate full section width as a Divided Collector (78-foot right-of-way).~~
- 4 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 1D, the following improvements in the County Line Road/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:
- ~~Construct Roberts Road to an interim 2-lane secondary roadway from Street "C" to County Line Road.~~
  - Widen County Line Road to a 2-lane divided cross-section from the I-10 Southbound Ramps/County Line Road intersection to Roberts Road.
  - Install a traffic signal at the new Roberts Road/County Line Road intersection.
  - Restrict the 7th Place turning movements to right turns in and right turns out only at the 7th Place/County Line Road intersection.
  - Install a traffic signal at the I-10 SB Ramps and County Line Road intersection.
  - Install a traffic signal at the I-10 NB Ramps and County Line Road intersection.
- 5 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 1D, the project applicant shall construct or bond for the construction of the following on-site improvements in the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area:
- Construct Roberts Road to an interim 2-lane secondary roadway from Street Sandalwood Drive to Street "B".
  - Install a traffic signal at the new Roberts Road/Sandalwood Drive intersection.
  - Install a traffic signal at the I-10 Northbound Off-Ramp/Calimesa Boulevard intersection.

### **Year 2030**

- 1 ~~Install a traffic signal and provide additional turn lane improvements at the following intersections:~~

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- a. ~~Roberts Road at South Loop;~~
  - b. ~~Street "C" at North Loop; and~~
  - c. ~~Street "C" at South Loop.~~
2. ~~Provide additional turn lane improvements at the following intersections:~~
- a. ~~Roberts Road at County Line Road;~~
  - b. ~~Roberts Road at Sandalwood Drive;~~
  - c. ~~I-10 Westbound Ramps at County Line Road;~~
  - d. ~~I-10 Eastbound Ramps at County Line Road;~~
  - e. ~~Calimesa Boulevard at County Line Road;~~
  - f. ~~7th Street at Sandalwood Drive;~~
  - g. ~~I-10 Westbound Ramps at Sandalwood Drive;~~
  - h. ~~Calimesa Boulevard at Sandalwood Drive/5th Street; and~~
  - i. ~~Calimesa Boulevard at I-10 Eastbound Ramps.~~
3. ~~Complete Sandalwood Drive from I-10 Eastbound Ramps to Roberts Road at its ultimate full section width as an Urban Arterial (134 foot right of way).~~
4. ~~Complete Roberts Road from Sandalwood Drive to the TAZ 9 south boundary at its ultimate full section width as an Arterial (108 foot right of way).~~
5. ~~Complete Roberts Road from Sandalwood Drive to the TAZ 12 north boundary at its ultimate full section width as a Secondary (96 foot right of way).~~
6. ~~Complete South Loop from the TAZ 16 east boundary to Street "C" at its ultimate full section width as a Secondary (96 foot right of way).~~
7. ~~Complete 7th Street from Sandalwood Drive to Roberts Road at its ultimate full section width as a Divided Collector (78 foot right of way).~~
8. ~~Complete North Loop from the TAZ 6 south boundary to the TAZ 3 north boundary at its ultimate full section width as a Secondary (96 foot right of way).~~
9. ~~Participate in the construction of the extension of Roberts Road from the southerly Mesa Verde Estates project boundary to northerly Summerwind Ranch development boundary on a fair share basis.~~
10. ~~Complete North Loop from the TAZ 7 east boundary to Street "C" at its ultimate full section width as a Major (98 foot right of way).~~

### **Phase 2A**

6. Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 2A, the following improvements in the County Line Road/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- At the intersection of County Line Road and I-10 SB Ramps:
  - Modify the east leg striping (underpass, between I-10 Southbound and Northbound Ramps) to provide a 2nd eastbound through receiving lane.
  - Construct one new eastbound through lane in addition to the existing shared through-right turn lane.

7 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 2A, the following improvements in Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

- Widen Sandalwood Drive to a 4-lane divided cross-section from the I-10 Southbound Ramps/Sandalwood Drive intersection to Street “C” (Mustang Way) within the project.
- Provide a separate westbound right turn lane on Sandalwood Drive approaching the I-10 Northbound On-Ramp/Sandalwood Drive intersection.
- At the intersection of 7th Street at Sandalwood Drive, convert westbound right turn lane to shared through-right turn lane and provide a 2nd eastbound through lane.
- At the intersection of Roberts Road at Sandalwood Drive, provide a 2nd eastbound and westbound through lanes.

### **Phase 2B**

8 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 2B, the following improvements in the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

- Construct Roberts Road to 4-lane secondary roadway from Sandalwood Drive to the northeasterly project boundary, and transition to an interim 2-lane secondary roadway from the northeasterly project boundary to Street “C”. In addition, configure the intersection of Roberts Road/Sandalwood Drive to provide new northbound left turn lane, northbound through lane, southbound left turn lane, southbound through lane, southbound right turn lane, and eastbound left turn lane.
- Restrict the 7th Street/Sandalwood Drive intersection to right turns in, right turns out, and left turns out only (no eastbound left turns), in conjunction with improved connectivity to Roberts Road from 7th Street north of Sandalwood Drive.
- Restrict the existing I-10 Northbound On-Ramp/Sandalwood Drive intersection to westbound right turns only (no median break). Modify the eastbound left turn striping to an eastbound through lane.
- At the intersection of Calimesa Boulevard and Sandalwood Drive, modify the northbound approach striping to provide a dual left turn lanes, one through turn lane, and one new right turn lane.
- Reconfigure the I-10 Northbound off-ramp at Calimesa Boulevard to provide a new I-10 Northbound loop on-ramp, south of the Calimesa Boulevard/Sandalwood Drive

## 5. Environmental Analysis

intersection. In addition, configure the new I-10 Northbound ramps/Calimesa Boulevard intersection to provide one northbound and one southbound through lane, a separate northbound left turn lane, separate southbound right turn lane, and a shared I-10 Northbound off-ramp left/right turn lane with traffic signal control.

### **Phase 3A**

9 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 3A, the following improvements in the County Line Road/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

- Widen County Line Road to 4-lane divided cross-section from the I-10 Southbound Ramps to Roberts Road to provide a 2nd eastbound and 2nd westbound through lanes at the intersection of 7th place and County Line Road.
- Widen County Line Road between I-10 northbound and Calimesa Boulevard to accommodate four travel lanes.
- Widen the I-10 Southbound off-ramp approach to provide a 2nd left turn lane, a shared left-through lane, and a separate right turn lane.
- At the intersection of Roberts Road and County Line Road, provide a separate northbound left turn lane, provide a 2nd westbound left turn lane, and provide a 2nd SB receiving lane, which then transitions to one lane as shown on Exhibit 1-10.
- At the intersection of I-10 Northbound Ramps and County Line Road, provide a separate northbound right turn lane.

10 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 3A, the following improvements in the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

- Widen the Sandalwood Drive bridge over I-10 to accommodate five travel lanes between the northbound ramp (westbound freeway) and southbound ramp (eastbound freeway) intersections.
- At the intersection of I-10 Northbound on ramp, provide a 3rd eastbound through lane and modify the westbound right turn lane to provide a 2nd westbound through lane.
- At the intersection of I-10 Southbound ramps, provide a 2nd eastbound through lane and 2nd westbound through lane. In addition, widen the southbound on-ramp to provide a 2nd receiving lane, which then transitions to one lane before entering the I-10 freeway mainline.
- At the intersection of Roberts Road and Sandalwood Drive, modify the southbound lane configuration to provide dual left turn lanes and a shared through/right turn lane.
- At the intersection of Calimesa Boulevard, modify the existing westbound right turn lane to provide a 2nd westbound through lane.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### **Phase 3B**

11 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 3B, the following improvements in the County Line Road/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

- Reconfigure the County Line Road undercrossing of I-10 to accommodate four travel lanes between the northbound ramp (westbound freeway) and southbound ramp (eastbound freeway) intersections.
- At the intersection of 7th Place and County Line Road, provide a 3rd eastbound through lane and provide a 3rd eastbound receiving lane.
- At the intersection of I-10 SB ramps and County Line Road, provide a separate eastbound right turn lane and 2nd westbound through lane.
- Widen the southbound on-ramp from the I-10 Southbound Ramps/County Line Road intersection in order to provide a second receiving lane, which then transitions to one lane before entering the I-10 eastbound mainline.
- At the intersection of I-10 Northbound ramp and County Line Road, provide a 2nd eastbound through lane and receiving lane, modify the existing westbound right turn lane to provide a 2nd westbound through lane, provide a channelized westbound right turn lane, and widen the northbound on-ramp to provide 2 receiving lanes.
- At the intersection of Calimesa Boulevard and County Line Road, provide a 2nd northbound left turn lane, one northbound right turn lane, 2nd southbound through lane, 2nd eastbound through lane, one eastbound right turn lane, and one westbound right turn lane.
- Construct Roberts Road to an interim 2-lane secondary roadway from Street “C” to County Line Road. Roberts Road may be connected to County Line Road prior to this Phase 3B only if the connection occurs after ultimate improvements have been made to the County Line Road/I-10 interchange.

12 Prior to issuance of the first building permit in Phase 3B, the following improvements in the Sandalwood Drive/I-10 interchange area shall be constructed:

- Widen the Sandalwood Drive bridge over I-10 to accommodate six travel lanes between the northbound ramp (westbound freeway) and southbound ramp (eastbound freeway) intersections.
- Widen Sandalwood Drive between I-10 Southbound ramps and Roberts Road to accommodate six travel lanes.
- At the intersection of I-10 Southbound ramps and Sandalwood Drive, provide a 2nd southbound left turn lane, a new channelized southbound right turn lane, and a 2nd westbound left turn lane.
- At the intersection of I-10 Northbound on-ramp and Sandalwood Drive, provide a channelized westbound right turn lane, 4th eastbound through lane, and widen the

## 5. Environmental Analysis

northbound on ramp to provide 2 receiving lanes, which then transitions to one lane before entering the I-10 freeway mainline.

- At the intersection of Calimesa Boulevard and Sandalwood Drive, provide a separate eastbound right turn lane.
- At the intersection of Calimesa Boulevard and I-10 Northbound ramps, south of Sandalwood Drive, widen the I-10 off ramp to provide a 2nd westbound left turn lane.
- At the intersection of Roberts Road and Sandalwood Drive, provide a 2nd NB through lane, a new northbound channelized right turn lane, a new eastbound right turn lane, and a 2nd westbound left turn lane. In addition, modify the southbound approach to provide one left turn lane and two through lanes.

### 5.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

#### 5.17.1 Summary of Impacts Associated with the 2007 Approved Project

The 2007 Certified EIR concluded that the increase in local population associated with buildout of the project site would increase demand for water, natural gas, electricity, wastewater services, solid waste disposal, cable service, and television service. It also concluded that development of the project site would alter existing stormwater drainage patterns and likely increase off-site runoff. The 2007 Certified EIR identified mitigation measures that would reduce the above impacts to a less than significant level, including the payment of fees or building of infrastructure to accommodate delivery of additional utility service. To mitigate additional stormwater runoff, a mitigation measure requiring the obtainment of National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits was stipulated.

#### 5.17.2 Impacts Associated with the 2016 Modified Project

Would the proposed project:

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				<b>X</b>	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				<b>X</b>	

## 5. Environmental Analysis

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				<b>X</b>	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				<b>X</b>	
e) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				<b>X</b>	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				<b>X</b>	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?					<b>X</b>

### Comments:

- a) Exceed waste water treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

#### Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.

Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would be required to comply with all water treatment requirements of the SARWQCB. Because the 2016 Modified Project would not introduce new sources of wastewater discharge to the project site (such as additional land use types) or change the general amount, direction, or geographic range of stormwater flows, modifications to the project's design and mix of land uses would not jeopardize compliance with these regulations as documented in the 2007 Certified EIR. No new impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or substantially increase the severity of impacts, with respect to wastewater treatment requirements.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would require construction of new water and wastewater facilities. However, the scale and location of these infrastructure improvements would be similar to those required for the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, there would be no additional impacts related to construction of water and wastewater improvements required to serve the 2016 Modified Project.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project when compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or substantially increase the severity of impacts, with respect to construction of water and wastewater facilities.

- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Like the 2007 Approved Project, the 2016 Modified Project would require construction of new storm drainage facilities. However, the scale and location of these infrastructure improvements would be similar to those required for the 2007 Approved Project. Proposed drainage improvements include onsite detention basins and a stormwater conveyance system that includes streets and local storm drains. All storm drain outlets and detention basins are designed to minimize or avoid impacts to natural stream courses that are considered jurisdictional by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Proposed storm drain outlets are designed to protect against erosion at the point of discharge. Existing drainage systems that transverse the project site are crossed in a manner that minimizes or avoids impacts to natural creek bottoms.

The construction of new stormwater drainage facilities required to serve the 2016 Modified Project could result in environmental effects, including impacts related to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology, and water quality. However, the overall development footprint and land use pattern of the 2007 Approved Project and 2016 Modified Project are nearly identical. Correspondingly, the geographic range, scale, and impacts of required drainage improvements would be nearly identical between the two projects. Therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or substantially increase the severity of impacts, with respect to construction of stormwater drainage facilities.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

YVWD would provide water service to new land uses on the project site. As outlined in the revised Specific Plan, a water supply system to provide the site with potable water would consist of pipes ranging in size from

## 5. Environmental Analysis

12 to 16 inches. In addition, recycled water would be provided by pipes of the same size for irrigation of landscaped areas. Water for the project site would be sourced from a combination of existing and planned YVWD reservoirs.

Water supply needs generated by the 2016 Modified Project as compared to the 2007 Approved Project were addressed in a Water Supply Assessment prepared by the YVWD. (see Appendix G). As shown in Appendix G, Page 49, implementation of the 2016 Modified Project would generate a need for approximately 3,291 acre feet of water per year. Due to changes in the proposed mix of land uses, this is approximately 121 acre feet less than the 3,412 acre feet estimated for the 2007 Approved Project (as calculated in the 2017 Water Supply Assessment [WSA] prepared for the 2016 Modified Project). As a result, the Water Supply Assessment concludes that, based on an analysis of available water supplies, projected demand and the water supply reliability efforts made by YVWD, there will be adequate water supplies to serve the project over the next 20 years under all water year conditions. Furthermore, developers of the project site would be required to enter into agreements with YVWD to pay their fair share of the costs for development of these facilities and their related infrastructure. In addition, fee credits would be available to offset direct costs. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 10 through 17, originally identified in the 2007 Certified EIR, would ensure that developers of the 2016 Modified Project would work with YVWD to ensure that adequate water supplies are available to serve new land uses on the project site. Therefore, no new impact would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or substantially increase the severity of impacts, with respect to water supply.

- e) **Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

### **Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Wastewater treatment in Calimesa is provided by the YVWD. The 3,650 housing units and 250,000 square feet of commercial space proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would require additional wastewater treatment capacity beyond that currently provided by YVWD. The 2007 Certified EIR indicated that the 2007 Approved Project would generate approximately 3.45 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater. By comparison, based on a current YVWD generation rate of 250 gallons per day per residential unit, the 2016 Modified Project would generate a total of approximately 912,500 gallons of wastewater per day (or 0.9 MGD). The planned expansion of the Henry N. Wochholz Regional Water Reclamation Facility (WRWRF) north of the project site would accommodate wastewater generated by the 2016 Modified Project. Lift stations that will transport wastewater from the project site to the WRWRF are proposed as part of the 2016 Modified Project. Furthermore, YVWD plans to construct a new water reclamation facility south of the project site that, at buildout, will have a capacity of 12 million gallons per day. Developers of individual projects on the project site would be required to enter into agreements with YVWD to pay their fair share of the costs for developing the above improvements to wastewater treatment infrastructure. Payment of fees would be required by Utilities and Service Systems Measure 14. Measures 14 through 16, which were originally identified in the 2007 Certified EIR, were not tailored to the specific design or mix of land uses

## 5. Environmental Analysis

contained in the 2007 Approved Project. Therefore, they also apply to the 2016 Modified Project. No new impact related to wastewater treatment capacity would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or substantially increase the severity of impacts, with respect to adequacy of wastewater treatment capacity.

**f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The City of Calimesa contracts with CR&R Waste Services for collection and disposal of solid waste generated in the City. CR&R transports non-recyclable solid waste to the Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill approximately 11 miles south of Calimesa near the City of Beaumont. The Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill is permitted to receive 3,000 tons of waste per day. According to recent inspections of the landfill, it generally receives approximately 1,500 to 2,500 tons of waste per day (CalRecycle 2013).

The 2007 Certified EIR assumed a household generation rate of 5.78 pounds per day for municipal solid waste. Using this rate, the 200 additional units proposed by the 2016 Modified Project would collectively generate approximately 1,156 pounds (0.58 tons) of municipal solid waste per day. This does not represent a substantial increase from the 19,940 pounds (9.97 tons) of waste estimated to be generated by the 2007 Approved Project. Furthermore, this amount would be reduced by the removal of recyclable waste and offset by the reduction nonresidential solid waste generated by the 100,000 square foot reduction in commercial uses. Therefore, no new impact related to solid waste generation would occur.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or substantially increase the severity of impacts, with respect to the capacity of local landfills to accommodate the project's waste disposal needs.

**g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**No Impact.** Similar to the 2007 Approved Project, construction and operation of the 2016 Modified Project would be required to comply with statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including provisions of the Riverside County's Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. The changes in land use and roadway system proposed by the 2016 Modified Project, including 200 additional housing units and 100,000 fewer square feet of commercial space, would not change the project's ability to comply with applicable solid waste regulations.

With regard to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), the changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new impacts, or substantially increase the severity of impacts, with respect to compliance with statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

### 5.17.3 Mitigation Measures Identified in the 2007 Certified EIR and Applicable to the 2016 Modified Project

Mitigation measures identified in the 2007 Certified EIR related to utilities and services systems are listed in Appendix A to this Addendum. These measures also apply to the 2016 Modified Project and no modifications are necessary. In the 2007 Certified EIR, mitigation measures related to public services were originally grouped with those related to public services. However, the two sets of measures have been separated in Appendix A to correspond to the order of topics analyzed in this Addendum. Measures related to public services are numbered 1 through 9; measures related to utilities and services systems are numbered 10 through 17.

### 5.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Environmental Issues	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing New or Increased Significant Effects	Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				<b>X</b>	
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				<b>X</b>	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				<b>X</b>	

#### Comments:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or

## 5. Environmental Analysis

**restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

The 2007 Approved Project and the 2016 Modified Project have development footprints that are nearly identical. Therefore, the geographic range and severity of impacts to biological resources resulting from the 2016 Modified Project would be substantially similar to those that would result from implementation of the 2007 Approved Project. The 2016 Modified Project would not result in any new impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed impacts related to biological or cultural resources.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new cumulatively considerable impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed cumulatively considerable impacts.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

**Less Than Significant Impacts/No Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of an EIR.**

Changes proposed by the 2016 Modified Project compared to the 2007 Approved Project would not result in any new substantial adverse impacts or substantially increase the severity of previously disclosed adverse impacts.

## 5. Environmental Analysis

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 6. List of Preparers

---

### **CITY OF CALIMESA**

Keith Gardner	Community Development Director
Kelly Lucia	Assistant Planner
Michael P. Thornton	City Engineer
Bob French	Public Works Director

### **PLACEWORKS**

William Halligan, Esq.	Principal, Environmental Services
Nicole Vermilion	Manager, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases
Fernando Sotelo, PTP, INCE	Senior Associate, Noise, Vibration, and Acoustics
Ryan Potter	Associate
Gina Froelich	Senior Editor
Cary Nakama	Graphic Artist

## 6. List of Preparers

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 7. References

---

- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). 2011, Revised. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2015, October 1. Ambient Air Quality Standards. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf>.
- . 2014a, August 22. Area Designations Maps/State and National. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>.
- . 2014b. Air Pollution Data Monitoring Cards (2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013). Accessed August 3, 2014, <http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/topfour/topfour1.php>.
- . 2014c, March 24. California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000–2009: By Category as Defined by the Scoping Plan.
- . 2014d, May 15. Proposed First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework, <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scopingplan.htm>
- . 2013b, October 23. Proposed 2013 Amendments to Area Designations for State Ambient Air Quality Standards. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2013/area13/area13isor.pdf>.
- . 2012a, April. California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000–2009: By Category as Defined by the Scoping Plan.
- . 2012b, Status of Scoping Plan Recommended Measures, [http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/status\\_of\\_scoping\\_plan\\_measures.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/status_of_scoping_plan_measures.pdf).
- . 2010, August. Staff Report Proposed Regional Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Targets for Automobiles and Light Trucks Pursuant to Senate Bill 375.
- . 2008, October. Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan, a Framework for Change.
- . 1999. California Air Resources Board (CARB). Final Staff Report: Update to the Toxic Air Contaminant List.
- California Climate Action Team. 2006, March. Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature.
- California Energy Commission. 2008. The Future Is Now: An Update on Climate Change Science, Impacts, and Response Options for California. CEC-500-2008-0077.

## 7. References

- . 2006a. Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks 1990 to 2004. Report CEC-600-2006-013-SF. December.
- . 2006b. Our Changing Climate: Assessing the Risks to California. 2006 Biennial Report, California Climate Change Center. CEC-500-2006-077.
- . 2005. Climate Change Emissions Estimates from Bemis, Gerry and Jennifer Allen, Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2002 Update. California Energy Commission Staff Paper CEC-600-2005-025. Sacramento, California. June.
- California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). California Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS), Accessed December 2014, <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/energy/Renewables/>.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2011. Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, Riverside County Important Farmland 2010. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/riv10\\_west.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/riv10_west.pdf)
- . 2011b. Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, San Bernardino County Important Farmland 2010. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/sbd10\\_so.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/sbd10_so.pdf)
- . 2012. Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, Riverside County Williamson Act, Fiscal Year 2008/2009. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/riverside\\_w\\_08\\_09\\_WA.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/riverside_w_08_09_WA.pdf).
- California Department of Finance (DOF). 2015a. Report E-5: Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 2011-2015, with 2010 Benchmark. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-5/2011-20/view.php>
- . 2015b. Report E-1: Population Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, January 1, 2014 and 2015. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/estimates/e-1/view.php>.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2009, December. Very High Fire Hazard Severity in the Local Responsibility Area, Western Riverside County. [http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/riverside\\_west/fhszl\\_map.60.jpg](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/riverside_west/fhszl_map.60.jpg)
- California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2013. Facility/Site Inspection Details, Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill, December 20, 2013, Daily Landfilled Tonnage & Total Traffic By Site. <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/33-AA-0007/Inspection/374062/>
- Calimesa, City of, 2007, Final Environmental Impact Report for the Mesa Verde Estates Specific Plan.
- . 2007. Public Facilities Development Impact Fee Study.
- Dudek. 2016, August 5. Oak Tree Report Addendum—Oak Management Plan Update TTM 33931-01.
- Glen Lukos Associates. 2016. August 16. Addendum to Biological Technical Report and MSHCP Consistency Analysis for the Mesa Verde Estates Project, City of Calimesa, Riverside County, California.

## 7. References

- Greystone Environmental Consultants, Inc. (Greystone). 2005, September 7. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Mesa Verde Estates Specific Plan.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Fourth Assessment Report: Climate Change 2007. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krieger & Stewart. 2016, August. Yucaipa Valley Water District Mesa Verde Estate Water Delivery Study.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2013, February. 2012 Final Air Quality Management Plan. <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/library/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan/final-2012-air-quality-management-plan>
- . 2012a, May 4. Final 2012 Lead State Implementation Plan: Los Angeles County. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/lead-state-implementation-plan/revise-draft-2012-lead-sip.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- . 2012b. Air Quality Analysis Handbook. Updates to CEQA Air Quality Handbook. <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/regulations/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook>
- . 2011, March (Revised). SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/scaqmd-air-quality-significance-thresholds.pdf?sfvrsn=2>
- . 2008a, September. *Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study in the South Coast Air Basin* (MATES III).
- . 2008b, June. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology.
- . 2005, May. Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning.
- . 1993. California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Handbook.
- Smith, Brian F. and Associates. 2016, August 15. Class III Historic Resources Study for the Mesa Verde Estates Project for Section 106 Compliance.
- . 2015, September 29. Paleontological Resource Assessment, Mesa Verde Estates Project.
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2012, April. 2012–2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, Growth Forecast Appendix. <http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Pages/2012-2035-RTP-SCS.aspx>.
- United States Energy Information Administration (USEIA). 2011. Rankings: Total Carbon Dioxide Emissions 2011. <http://www.eia.gov/state/rankings/#/series/226>
- Urban Crossroads. 2016, October 10. Mesa Verde Estates Focused Traffic Study (Revised).

## 7. References

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2012. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.  
<http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases.html>.

———. 2009, December. USEPA: Greenhouse Gases Threaten Public Health and the Environment, Science overwhelmingly shows greenhouse gas concentrations at unprecedented levels due to human activity.  
<http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/0/08D11A451131BCA585257685005BF252>.

VA Consulting, et al. 2013. Mesa Verde Specific Plan, Amendment No. 2.

———. 2016, May. Mesa Verde Estates Development Project Existing and Developed Condition Hydrology Study.

Yucaipa Valley Water District. 2017, August. Water Supply Assessment and Written Verification of Supply for the Mesa Verde Development.

# Appendix A

## Mitigation Measures from the 2007 Certified EIR

## Appendices

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Appendix B

## Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emission Modeling

## Appendices

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Appendix C

## Biological Resources Studies

## Appendices

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Appendix D

## Cultural Resource Studies

## Appendices

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Appendix E

## Hydrology Study

## Appendices

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Appendix F

## Focused Traffic Impact Analysis

## Appendices

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# Appendix G

## Water Supply Assessment

## Appendices

*This page intentionally left blank.*