

CITY OF MENIFEE

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 41320

Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Change of Zone No. 7501, Tentative Parcel Map No. 34998
Plot Plan No. 2009-051, Conditional Use Permit No. 3549,
Conditional Use Permit No. 2009-102 and Conditional Use
Permit No. 2009-103

Lead Agency Name: City of Menifee Planning Department

Address: 29714 Haun Road, Menifee, CA 92586

Contact Person: Lisa Sheldon

Telephone Number: (951) 672-6777

Applicant's Name: Heritage Square

Applicant's Address: 40651 Calle Bandido, Murrieta, CA 92562

Engineer's Name: Albert A. Webb & Associates

Engineer's Address: 3788 McCray Street, Riverside, CA 92506

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Description:

Change of Zone No. 7501 proposes to alter the zoning classification of a portion of the project site from One-Family Dwellings (R-1) to Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). The southeastern portion of the site is currently Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S); however, the remainder of the site is classified as One-Family Dwellings (R-1).

Tentative Parcel Map No. 34998 proposes a Schedule E subdivision of 19.6 acres into four (4) parcels ranging in size from 1.48 to 8.61 acres.

Plot Plan No. 2009-051 proposes a 132,580 sq. ft. retail center. The project will include a 43,830 sq. ft. grocery store, one (1) 15,661 sq. ft. major retail building with drive through, two (2) buildings for multi-tenant shops totaling 15,600 sq. ft., one (1) 9,973 sq. ft. retail pad building, a 3,860 sq. ft. fast food restaurant building pad with a drive through, and a 3,878 sq. ft. gas station and convenience store including a drive through car wash and six (6) fueling pumps, three (3) major retail buildings totaling 33,629 sq. ft., one (1) 6,240 sq. ft. retail pad building, and 711 parking spaces. The project also includes a recyclable collections area and seasonal sales located in the parking areas.

The project will also include the installation and/or modification of traffic signals on Junipero Road, Menifee Road, and McCall Boulevard. Street improvements shall also be constructed on Junipero Road, Menifee Road and McCall Boulevard.

The project will also contribute to the construction of the Homeland Line A and Line A-2 (of the Romoland/Homeland Master Drainage Plan). Onsite flows will be treated using infiltration trenches/bio swales which will outlet to the extension of the Homeland/Romoland MDP Line A-2.

The project will also include public art which will consist of historical plaques embedded onto the sidewalk through out the major and shops buildings and a mural on the south elevation of Pad A. The historical plaques will include text providing a narrative of the history and importance of early settlers in Riverside County.

Conditional Use Permit No. 3549 proposes to allow for the gasoline service station with the concurrent sale of beer and wine for off-premises consumption.

Conditional Use Permit No. 2009-102 proposes to allow the sale of distilled spirits and beer and wine for off-premises consumption for the drug store at Major A

Conditional Use Permit No. 2009-103 proposes to allow for the seasonal sales area and recyclable areas associated with the grocery store.

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

B. Total Project Area: 19.60 gross acres

Residential Acres:	Lots:	Units:	Projected No. of Residents:
Commercial Acres: 15.58	Lots: 4	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area: 132,580	Est. No. of Employees: 50
Industrial Acres:	Lots:	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area:	Est. No. of Employees:
Other:			

C. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 333-070-009, -044, -052

D. Street References: Northerly of McCall Boulevard, southerly of Heritage Lake Drive, easterly of Junipero Road and westerly of Menifee Road.

E. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: Township 5 South, Range 3 West, and Section 23

F. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is currently characterized by vacant, previously disturbed land. The project site is relatively flat but slopes gently towards the southwest from an elevation of 1,460 to 1,483 feet above sea level. The project site is surrounded by vacant undeveloped land to the north, vacant land, scattered single family residential, and a proposed commercial shopping center to the south, single family residential to the east and Boulder Ridge Middle School to the west. The project is located adjacent to McCall Boulevard and Menifee Road which are both designated as urban arterial highways with a 152 foot right of way. The project site contains sparse vegetation.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

A. General Plan Area Plan(s): Sun City/Menifee Valley

B. Foundation Component(s): Community Development (CD)

C. Land Use Designation(s): Commercial Retail (CR) (0.20 to 0.35 floor area ratio)

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

E. Policy Area(s), if any: Highway 79 Policy Area

F. Adjacent and Surrounding Area Plan(s), Foundation Component(s), Land Use Designation(s), and Overlay(s) and Policy Area(s), if any:

	AREA PLAN	FOUNDATION COMPONENT	LAND USE DESIGNATION	OVERLAY	POLICY AREA
NORTH	Sun City/ Menifee Valley	Community Development (CD)	High Density Residential (HDR) (8-14 dwelling units per acre)	Not Applicable	Highway 79
EAST	Sun City/ Menifee Valley	Community Development (CD)	Medium Density Residential (MDR) (2-5 dwelling units per acre)	Not Applicable	Highway 79
SOUTH	Sun City/ Menifee Valley	Community Development (CD)	Commercial Retail (CR) and Medium Density Residential (MDR)	Not Applicable	Highway 79
WEST	Sun City/ Menifee Valley	Community Development (CD)	Medium Density Residential (MDR) (2-5 dwelling units per acre)	Not Applicable	Highway 79

G. Adopted Specific Plan Information

1. Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any: N/A

2. Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any: N/A

H. Existing Zoning: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) within the southeastern portion of the site and One-Family Dwellings (R-1) in the northwestern portion of the site.

I. Proposed Zoning, if any: The project proposes to alter the portion of the site designated as One-Family Dwellings (R-1) to Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) so that the entire site is designated as Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S) and is consistent with the General Plan land use designation.

J. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning:

North: One-Family Dwellings (R-1)

East: Menifee Valley Ranch Specific Plan No. 301 Planning Areas 16, 17, and 23 (Residential)

South: Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S), Rural Residential (R-R), Controlled Development Areas (W-2), and One-Family Dwellings (R-1)

West: One-Family Dwellings (R-1)

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils

- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing

- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Other
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

IV. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED	
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED	
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, NO NEW ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IS REQUIRED because (a) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, (b) all potentially significant effects of the proposed project have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (c) the proposed project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (d) the proposed project will not substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, (e) no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and (f) no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible.	
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An ADDENDUM to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.	
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.	
<input type="checkbox"/> I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any 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 shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration; (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or, (D) Mitigation	

measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Signature

August 24, 2009

Date

Lisa Sheldon
Printed Name

For Carmen Cave, Planning Director

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

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

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

Source: Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan, On-site Investigation, Riverside County Land Information System (GIS)

Findings of Fact:

1a. The project site is located along McCall Boulevard and Menifee Road, both of which are designated as County Eligible Scenic Highways. Currently, the project site can be characterized as vacant land. The project site is currently surrounded by vacant land to the north, vacant land and scattered residential to the south, single family residential to the east, and a middle school and mountainous terrain to the west. The proposed site would consist of commercial/retail buildings, which follows the established surrounding urban pattern. The site's layout, architecture and landscaping have been designed to avoid the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. The proposed project demonstrated visual buffers, such as landscaping, along the project boundaries.

The proposed buildings incorporate 360-degree architecture, meaning that the backs and sides of the buildings are architecturally enhanced. The detention basin at the northeastern corner of the site will be fully landscaped to avoid the creation of an aesthetically unpleasing flood control facility. The main entryway will incorporate an enhanced entry statement. Landscaping will completely encompass the project area along the site's four borders. A landscaping plan has been deemed visually appropriate by the County's Landscaping Division. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have a substantial affect upon the scenic corridor in which it is located. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

1b. The project would not substantially damage scenic resources. No trees or unique landmark features exist onsite; however, there is one prominent rock outcropping located in close proximity to

McCall Boulevard in the southern portion of the site. The development of the proposed project would result in the removal of this outcropping; however, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant because the loss of the rock outcropping would not be considered substantial. The project would include site design, architecture, and landscaping that retain the natural character of the area. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: The project provides landscape screening, enhanced architecture, and the use of natural colors and materials. The project has been conditioned to submit elevations and landscaping plans to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to building permit issuance. These plans shall be in conformance with the conceptual plans which have been submitted and reviewed for compliance with standards and guidelines. The landscaping shall be installed in compliance with the approved landscaping plans. The developer is also required to submit fees to cover the cost of a six-month and one-year landscape inspection to verify that the landscaping is properly installed and maintained.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the building and safety plan check process.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

a) Interfere with the nighttime use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through City Ordinance No. 2009-024, Menifee Municipal Code Chapter 6.01 "Dark Sky Ordinance?

Source: Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS); Ordinance No. 2009-024, Menifee Municipal Code Chapter 6.01 "Dark Sky Ordinance" (Regulating Light Pollution)

Findings of Fact:

2a. The project site is located 30.21 miles from Mt. Palomar Observatory. Therefore, it has the potential to interfere with the Observatory. The project is required to comply with the Menifee Municipal Code Chapter 6.01, the "Dark Sky Ordinance", since the project is located within Zone B. The purpose of the Dark Sky Ordinance is to restrict the use of certain light fixtures emitting into the night sky that can create undesirable light rays and detrimentally affect astronomical observations and research. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: The project is required to comply with the Dark Sky Ordinance.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

3. Other Lighting Issues

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

b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels?

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

3a. The proposed project would result in new sources of light as a result of additional streetlights, parking lot lighting, security lighting, signage, and other lighting typical of a commercial center. The project site would also introduce new sources of light due to vehicular lighting from cars traveling to and from the site. These light sources, however, are not anticipated to create nuisances to surrounding properties. With adherence to the Ordinance No. 2009-024 lighting control measures and landscape buffering it is not anticipated that spill-over light would adversely affect surrounding properties. The project has also been conditioned by the Planning Department to have any outside lighting hooded and directed so as not to shine directly upon adjoining property or public rights-of-way. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

3b. There are residential uses to the south and east of the site; however, these residential uses are separated from the site by major roadways with a 152 foot right of way. There are residential uses planned to the north of the site. The project has been conditioned to comply with Ordinance No. 2009-024 lighting control measures and will include walls and landscape buffering. In addition, the lighting is required to be hooded, directed, and shielded in a manner that it does not interfere with residential uses. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact with regard to exposing residential uses to unacceptable levels of light.

Mitigation: The project lighting is required to comply with the Dark Sky Ordinance and shall be hooded and directed so as to not shine on adjoining properties.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the building and safety plan check process.

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture

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

b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)?

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

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

Source: Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS), General Plan, and Project Application Materials.

Findings of Fact:

4a. The project site is designated as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site does not currently facilitate any agriculture activity. The General Plan Land Use

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

designation has already been analyzed and addressed through the General Plan EIR and by the Board of Supervisors, which found that there were no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could have satisfied the loss of Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, the Board of Supervisors adopted findings of overriding considerations on October 7, 2003. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (a) the project will not result in any new significant environmental effects not identified in the General Plan EIR, nor will it substantially increase the severity of the environmental effects identified in the General Plan EIR. In addition, no considerably different mitigation measures have been identified and no mitigation measures found infeasible have become feasible. As a result, no further environmental documentation for the loss of Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance is required for this project. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

4b. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of an Agricultural Preserve which would indicate that land was subject to a Williamson Act Contract. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of land which is solely being used for agricultural purposes. The proposed project will have no impact with regards to conflicting with an existing agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

4c. The project site is not located within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. Therefore, the project will not cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property. Therefore, there is no impact.

4d. It is not anticipated that the proposed project will involve significant changes in the existing environment that will result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS) identifies a portion of the subject property as Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed development will result in the conversion of this land to non-agricultural use. The RCIP designates the project area, however, as Commercial Retail (CR). The planned use of the property, therefore, is not agricultural. The loss of farmland was adequately addressed in EIR No. 327. Furthermore, the adjacent streets to the south and east are designated in the RCIP Circulation Element as Urban Arterial roadways (152-foot ROWs), meaning the current transportation system has been constructed to accommodate higher-intensity urban uses along McCall Boulevard and Menifee Road.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

5. Air Quality Impacts

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

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

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)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?				
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan Land Use Element, General Plan Air Quality Element, Figure AQ-1, Riverside County Air Quality Basins, General Plan Circulation Element, SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook 1993 and Air Quality Management Plan, California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2005 "Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective," and URBEMIS 2007 Model 9.2.4.

Findings of Fact: The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for developing a regional air quality management plan to insure compliance with state and federal air quality standards. The SCAQMD has adopted the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The primary implementation responsibility assigned to the County (i.e. local governments) by the AQMP is the implementation of air quality control measures associated with transportation facilities. This project does not propose any transportation facilities that would require transportation control measures, and therefore will not obstruct implementation of the AQMP.

5a. The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is within the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). According to the SCAQMD Guidelines, to be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), a project must conform to the local General Plan and must not result in or contribute to an exceedance of the City's projected population growth forecast. Development of the proposed 19.6-acre commercial site would not generate population growth, as the project does not involve any residential development. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio). Therefore, the commercial project would not contribute to an exceedance of the City's projected population growth forecast. The project is consistent with the Riverside County General Plan as adopted by the City of Menifee. Therefore, the project's potential impact associated with air quality management plans would be less than significant.

5b. The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is in nonattainment for the federal 8-hour ozone standard, the State 1-hour ozone standard, the federal 24-hour PM₁₀ standard, and the State 24-hour and annual PM₁₀ standards. The South Coast Air Basin is designated as attainment or unclassified for all other federal and state ambient air quality standards. The ozone precursors VOC and NO_x, in addition to fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀), are the pollutants of primary concern for projects located in the SCAQMD. Based on SCAQMD thresholds, a project would have a significant adverse impact on regional air quality if it generates emissions exceeding any of the thresholds found in Table 1.

Table 1
SCAQMD Regional Air Quality Thresholds

Pollutant	Construction	Operation
NO _x	100 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
VOC	75 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
PM ₁₀	150 lbs/day	150 lbs/day
PM _{2.5}	55 lbs/day	55 lbs/day
CO	550 lbs/day	550 lbs/day

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993.

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

The SCAQMD has also developed Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) in response to the Governing Board's Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative (1-4), which was prepared to update the SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. LSTs were devised in response to concern regarding exposure of individuals to criteria pollutants in local communities. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an air quality exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, taking into consideration ambient concentrations in each source receptor area (SRA), project size, distance to the sensitive receptor, etc. However, LSTs only apply to emissions within a fixed stationary location, including idling emissions during both project construction and operation, and LSTs have been developed only for NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. LSTs are not applicable to mobile sources such as cars on a roadway (Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, SCAQMD, June 2003). As such, LSTs for operational emissions would not apply to the proposed project as the majority of emissions would be generated by cars on the roadways.

LSTs have been developed for emissions within areas up to 5 acres in size, with air pollutant modeling recommended for activity within larger areas. The SCAQMD provides lookup table for project sites that measure 1, 2 or 5 acres. The project site is 19.6 acres and is located in Source Receptor Area 24 (SRA-24) which is designated by the SCAQMD as the Perris Valley and includes the City of Menifee. The look-up tables were not utilized as the project exceeds 5 acres in size.

The project is consistent with the General Plan and Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan land use designations. The General Plan (2003) is a policy document that reflects the County's vision for the future of Riverside County. The General Plan is organized into eight separate elements, including an Air Quality Element. The purpose of the Air Quality Element is to protect County residents from the harmful effects of poor air quality. The Air Quality Element identifies goals, policies, and programs that are meant to balance actions regarding land use, circulation, and other issues with their potential effects on air quality. The Air Quality Element, in conjunction with local and regional air quality planning efforts, addresses ambient air quality standards set forth by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Potential air quality impacts resulting from the proposed Project would not exceed emissions projected by the Air Quality Element. The City is charged with implementing the policies in the General Plan Air Quality Element, which are focused on reducing concentrations of criteria pollutants, reducing negative impacts to sensitive receptors, reducing mobile and stationary pollutant sources, increasing energy conservation and efficiency, improving the jobs to housing balance, and facilitating multi-jurisdictional coordination for the improvement of air quality.

Air quality impacts would occur during construction of the proposed commercial development from soil disturbance and equipment exhaust. Major sources of emissions during grading and site preparation include: exhaust emissions from construction vehicles; equipment and fugitive dust generated by construction vehicles and equipment traveling over exposed road surfaces; and soil disturbances from grading and backfilling.

Construction Equipment Emissions

Grading and construction activities would cause combustion emissions from utility engines, heavy-duty construction vehicles, and vehicles transporting the construction crew. Exhaust emissions during grading and other construction activities envisioned on site vary daily as construction activity levels change. Peak grading days typically generate a larger amount of air pollutants than during other project construction days.

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

The long-term air quality emissions associated with the proposed project were estimated using the URBEMIS 2007 v.9.2.4 air quality model. Operational emissions were determined based on the projected uses by square footage on the approximately 19.6 gross acre site. Project emissions estimates, as determined in the modeling analysis, are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Mobile emissions are those associated with vehicle trips, while the use of natural gas and landscaping maintenance equipment are included in the area emissions. As shown in Table 2, the operational emissions generated by the proposed project for ROG and CO without mitigation would exceed the SCAQMD's daily operational thresholds. The mitigation to reduce impact to ROG and CO includes having local-serving retail, available bus routes, bike lanes and sidewalks in close proximity and an adequate on-site parking demand. With mitigation applied these pollutants would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds; therefore, regional air quality impacts would be less than significant.

Table 2
Operational Emissions (pounds per day)

Emission Source	Emissions (lbs/day)				
	ROG	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	55
Unmitigated Operational Emissions	74.08	92.04	774.28	115.14	23.15
Unmitigated Area Emissions	1.37	1.18	8.64	0.03	0.03
Gross Emissions	75.45	93.22	782.92	115.17	23.15
Exceed SCAQMD Thresholds?	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO
Mitigated Operational Emissions	41.02	49.88	419.74	62.12	12.50
Mitigated Area Emissions	1.17	0.95	6.91	0.02	0.02
Gross Emissions	42.19	50.83	426.65	62.14	12.52
Exceed SCAQMD Thresholds?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Source: URBEMIS 2007 v.9.2.4 (See Appendix A for model results)

As shown in Table 3, the construction emissions generated by the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD's daily operational thresholds. Therefore, regional air quality impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Table 3
Daily Construction Summer Emissions (pounds per day)

Emission Source	Summer Emissions (lbs/day)				
	ROG	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2010 Construction Emissions unmitigated	9.64	49.10	38.64	41.57	9.79
2011 Construction Emissions unmitigated	32.93	18.61	20.17	1.37	1.23
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	55
Exceed SCAQMD Thresholds?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Source: URBEMIS 2007 v.9.2.4 (See Appendix A for model results)

Fugitive Dust

Fugitive dust (PM10) emissions are generally associated with demolition, grading, land clearing, exposure, vehicle and equipment travel on unpaved roads, and dirt/debris pushing through the

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

exposure of soil to wind erosion and dust entrainment. Dust generated during construction activities would vary substantially depending on the level of activity, the specific operations, and weather conditions. Sensitive receptors, such as residents and students in the project vicinity and on-site construction workers, may be exposed to blowing dust, depending on prevailing wind conditions. In addition, exhaust emissions associated with heavy construction equipment would potentially degrade air quality. PM₁₀ and exhaust emissions associated with construction activities are considered to be temporary air quality impacts.

Temporary construction emissions were estimated using URBEMIS 2007 v.9.2.4 computer model (see Appendix A for air quality data). The number and type of equipment to be used during construction were estimated based on construction projects similar in size to the proposed project. During project site preparation, the soils that underlie portions of the site could be turned over and pushed around, exposing the soil to wind erosion and dust entrainment by onsite operating equipment. The majority of emissions associated with construction activities on site come from off-road vehicles such as backhoes, but some emissions are also associated with construction worker trips and the application of architectural coatings, which release volatile or reactive organic gases (ROG) during the drying phase. Rule 403 of the SCAQMD Handbook requires implementation of measures to minimize emissions for all dust generating activity, regardless of whether it exceeds the thresholds. The non-attainment status of the South Coast Air Basin for PM₁₀ dust emissions requires that Best Available Control Measures (BACMs) be used to minimize regional cumulative PM₁₀ impacts from all construction activities, even if any single project does not cause the thresholds to be exceeded. Additionally, the non-attainment basin status and the cumulative impact of all construction suggests that all reasonably available control measures for diesel exhaust shall be implemented even if individual thresholds are not exceeded.

Based upon the construction assumptions contained in the URBEMIS calculations, without mitigation measures, fugitive dust emissions during the grading periods would not exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 150 lbs/day during construction. The project will be conditioned to comply with existing SCAQMD Rule 402 which prohibits a person from discharging from any source quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public. In addition the project will be conditioned to comply with existing SCAQMD Rule 403 for the reduction in fugitive dust emissions.

The following measures included in Rule 403 shall be added as Conditions of Approval to the project:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
- Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earth moving).
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, or maintain at least two feet for freeboard (vertical space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114.
- Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from the main road.
- Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 mph or less.
- Additional dust suppression measures in the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* are shall be included as Conditions of Approval to further reduce the likelihood of air quality impacts including: Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible; Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph; Sweep all streets once per day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water

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

sweepers with reclaimed water); Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exist unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any other equipment leaving the site; Pave, water, or chemically stabilized all on-site roads as soon as feasible; Minimize at all times the area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations.

- The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site base on low-emission factors and high energy efficiency. The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- The construction contractor shall utilized electric or diesel-powered equipment in lieu of gasoline-powered engines where feasible.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment not in use.
- The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment not in use. During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time.
- The construction contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak-hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary; a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and transit incentives for the construction crew.
- Compliance with SCAQMD 113 on the use of architectural coatings shall be implemented. Emissions associated with architectural coatings would be reduced by complying with these rules and regulations, which include using pre-coated/natural-colored building materials, water-based or low volatile organic compounds (VOC) coating, and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

“Stratospheric ozone depletion” refers to the slow destruction of naturally occurring ozone which lies in the upper atmosphere (called the stratosphere) and which protects Earth from the damaging effects of solar ultraviolet radiation. Certain compounds, including chlorofluorocarbons (CFC), accumulate in the lower atmosphere and then gradually migrate into the stratosphere. In the stratosphere, these compounds participate in complex chemical reactions to destroy the upper ozone layer. Destruction of the ozone layer increases the penetration of ultraviolet radiation to the Earth’s surface, a known risk factor that can increase the incidence of skin cancers, and cataracts, contribute to crop and fish damage, and further degrade air quality. The SCAQMD supports State, federal and international policies to reduce levels of ozone depleting gases through its Global Warming Policy and rules. Further, SCAQMD has developed Ozone Depleting Compounds (ODC) Replacement Guidelines to facilitate transition from ODCs to substances that are the most environmentally benign. In order to reduce GHGs in California, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger signed Executive Order S-3-05 in June of 2005. This Order requires the State of California to achieve the following GHG emissions reductions: By 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emission levels to 1990 levels; by 2050 reduce GHG emission levels to 80 percent below 1990 levels. In September 2006, the Governor signed Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 establishes targets for regulatory, reporting, and market mechanisms to achieve quantifiable reductions in GHG emissions and a cap on Statewide GHG emissions whose emissions are at a level of significance as determined by the Air Resources Board (ARB).

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

The project will result in greenhouse gas emissions through the construction process and operation of the shopping center. Although, the evaluation of any potential global warming effects resulting from the project, including modeling and gauging the impacts associated with an increase of trips or generation of new trips and the effect on the greenhouse effect or global warming, would be entirely speculative since no modeling protocol or significance criteria have been established, an estimate of the anticipated CO impacts has shown that the proposed land use will generate up to 75,233 lbs/day of CO₂ without mitigation and 40,967 lbs/day with mitigation measures applied, a reduction of 45.55 percent. There are no federal, State, or local emissions thresholds established for GHGs such as CO₂. As a comparison, the entire State generated approximately 2.2 billion (2,197,992,329) lbs/day of CO₂ in 2004. The emissions from vehicle exhaust are controlled by the State and federal governments are outside the control of this project. The project is required to incorporate enhanced energy efficiency standards to minimize energy consumption, and compliance with measure XVI. The project must exceed 2005 Title 24 building energy efficiency minimum requirements by a minimum of 14% or meet/exceed 2008 Title 24 minimum requirements. Only low-and non-VOC-containing paints, sealants, adhesives, and solvents shall be utilized in the construction of the project. With the incorporation of the above mentioned mitigation, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

Attached to this Initial Study is the project specific URBEMIS analysis documenting the development of the fugitive dust emissions rate. Combined with the 3.64 lbs/day generated by equipment exhaust during grading, the total mitigated dust emissions of 41.57 lbs/day would not exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 150 lbs/day. Upon implementation of SCAQMD Rule 402 and 403 as standard conditions, fugitive dust emissions from construction activities are expected to be reduced below SCAQMD regional thresholds. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Building Activities

Building construction uses different types of equipment on the project site than during the grading period. Similarities do exist in terms of equipment exhaust emissions and fugitive dust emissions; however, it is anticipated that emissions during building construction would be below peak grading day emissions. Although it is anticipated that emissions would be similar or lower than the peak grading day total emissions, PM₁₀ would potentially exceed the SCAQMD threshold. Therefore, air pollution control measures implemented for the peak grading day emissions would be adequate to reduce emissions during other construction periods.

Architectural Coatings

Architectural coatings contain volatile organic compounds (VOC) that are similar to ROC and are part of the O₃ precursors. At this stage of the project planning, no detailed architectural coatings information is available. Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1113 on the use of architectural coatings should be considered sufficient.

5c. In addition to response 5b above, the commercial project would contribute criteria pollutants to the area during temporary project construction. A number of individual projects in the area may be under construction simultaneously with the proposed project. Depending on construction schedules and actual implementation of the projects into the area, generation of fugitive dust and pollutants. This would be a contribution to short-term cumulative air quality impacts. The proposed project will be developed in accordance with the City of Menifee's existing zoning ordinances. Emissions projections used to establish SCAQMD attainment objectives reflect adopted regional and local land use plans.

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

Therefore, the emissions associated with the proposed project are expected to be within the amounts already accounted for in the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan.

Long-term operational emissions generated by the proposed project will primarily come from motor vehicles. These growth-related impacts have been adequately addressed within the General Plan's EIR. The project conforms to its Commercial Retail (CR) land use designation, and thus this air quality impacts related to the proposed level of growth were anticipated. However, the project incorporates mitigation and site design to reduce long-term operational emissions. To reduce diesel truck emissions, the project has been conditioned to install signs in loading areas stating "The driver of a diesel-fueled motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 10,000 pounds is prohibited from idling the vehicle's primary engine for more than five (5) minutes at any location and may not operate a diesel fueled auxiliary power system (APS) for more than 5 minutes at any location within 100 feet of a restricted area (residences). Electrical connections have been provided for your use. The minimum penalty for an idling violation is \$300.00. To report a violation please contact 1800-END-SMOG". The project site also provides landscaping around the perimeter of the site which traps particulate matter and helps mitigate the impact to surrounding sensitive resources. All loading areas located in the rear of the project site and adjacent to residential have included eight foot screen walls around the loading areas and there is another eight foot block wall along the property line adjacent to the future residential uses. The project site also provides bicycle parking and sidewalk throughout the site to promote pedestrian circulation. The gas station located within the site is situated over three hundred feet away from the school to the west and residential uses to the north and east, and approximately 200 from residential uses to the south. This exceeds the California Air Resources Board recommendation of a 50 foot separation between gas stations and sensitive land uses. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Therefore, the proposed project with mitigation measures applied would not exacerbate non-attainment of air quality standards within the Basin or contribute to adverse cumulative air quality impacts.

5d. A sensitive receptor is a person in the population who is particularly susceptible to health effects due to exposure to an air contaminant than is the population at large. Sensitive receptors (and the facilities that house them) in proximity to localized CO sources, toxic air contaminants or odors are of particular concern. High levels of CO are associated with major traffic sources, such as freeways and major intersections, and toxic air contaminants are normally associated with manufacturing and commercial operations. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities. The nearest sensitive receptors include Boulder Ridge Middle School to the west of the site and residential uses to the south and east of the site. Air emissions will be emitted by construction equipment and fugitive dust will be generated during demolition, site preparation and construction activities.

However, due to the temporary nature of the project construction, activities are anticipated to produce less than significant impacts. Additionally, adherence to city ordinances would minimize these emissions through construction method and equipment standards.

As discussed above, long-term operational emissions generated by the proposed project will primarily come from motor vehicles. These growth-related impacts have been adequately addressed within the General Plan's EIR. The project conforms to its Commercial Retail (CR) land use designation, and thus this air quality impacts related to the proposed level of growth were anticipated. However, the project incorporates mitigation and site design to reduce long-term operational emissions. To reduce

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

diesel truck emissions, the project has been conditioned to install signs in loading areas stating "The driver of a diesel-fueled motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 10,000 pounds is prohibited from idling the vehicle's primary engine for more than five (5) minutes at any location and may not operate a diesel fueled auxiliary power system (APS) for more than 5 minutes at any location within 100 feet of a restricted area (residences). Electrical connections have been provided for your use. The minimum penalty for an idling violation is \$300.00. To report a violation please contact 1800-END-SMOG". The project site also provides landscaping around the perimeter of the site which traps particulate matter and helps mitigate the impact to surrounding sensitive resources. All loading areas located in the rear of the project site and adjacent to residential have included eight foot screen walls around the loading areas and there is another eight foot block wall along the property line adjacent to the future residential uses. The project site also provides bicycle parking and sidewalk throughout the site to promote pedestrian circulation. The gas station located within the site is situated over three hundred feet away from the school to the west and residential uses to the north and east, and approximately 200 from residential uses to the south. This exceeds the California Air Resources Board recommendation of a 50 foot separation between gas stations and sensitive land uses. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

5e. The proposed project is for a commercial development and no sensitive receptors are proposed to be constructed. Therefore will not involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter.

5f. While exact quantification of objectionable odors cannot be determined due to the subjective nature of what is considered "objectionable", the nature of the proposed development, commercial structures with associated infrastructure present a potential for the generation of objectionable odors association with construction activities. The proposed use of the site is not shown in Figure 5-5 "Land Uses Associated with Odor Complaints" of the 1993 SCAQMD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook. A retail commercial project is not typically associated with the generation of objectionable odors; however, the construction activities associated with the expected build out of the project site will generate airborne odors from diesel exhaust emissions and the application of architectural coatings during the construction of anticipated structure and on-site improvements. However, said emissions would occur only during daylight hours, be short-term in duration, and would be isolated to the immediate vicinity of the construction site. Therefore, they would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors on a permanent or temporary basis. Any objectionable odor may be reported to SCAQMD, which resolves complaints through investigation. A Notice to Comply/Notice of Violation will be issued when necessary. Therefore as the proposed project is consistent with the land use specified by the County of Riverside's General Plan and compliance put in place by SCAQMD, the project will not cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and the impacts thereof will be less than significant.

Conditions of Approval:

Short-term construction emission conditions:

- Apply nontoxic chemical soil stabilizers according to manufacturers' specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days or more).
- Water active sites at least twice daily (locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earth moving).

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, or maintain at least two feet for freeboard (vertical space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer) in accordance with the requirements of the California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114. • Pave construction access roads at least 100 feet onto the site from the main road. • Reduce traffic speeds on all unpaved roads to 15 mph or less. • Additional dust suppression measures in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook shall be included as Conditions of Approval to further reduce the likelihood of air quality impacts including: Revegetate disturbed areas as quickly as possible; Suspend all excavating and grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph; Sweep all streets once per day if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets (recommend water sweepers with reclaimed water); Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash trucks and any other equipment leaving the site; Pave, water, or chemically stabilized all on-site roads as soon as feasible; Minimize at all times the area disturbed by clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations. • The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used on site base on low-emission factors and high energy efficiency. The Construction Contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications. • The construction contractor shall utilize electric or diesel-powered equipment in lieu of gasoline-powered engines where feasible. • The construction contractor shall ensure that construction grading plans include a statement that work crews will shut off equipment not in use. • During smog season (May through October), the overall length of the construction period will be extended, thereby decreasing the size of the area prepared each day, to minimize vehicles and equipment operating at the same time. • The construction contractor shall time the construction activities so as to not interfere with peak-hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site; if necessary; a flag person shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways. • The construction contractor shall support and encourage ridesharing and provide transit incentives for the construction crew. • Compliance with SCAQMD 113 on the use of architectural coatings shall be implemented. Emissions associated with architectural coatings would be reduced by complying with these rules and regulations, which include using pre-coated/natural-colored building materials, water-based or low volatile organic compounds (VOC) coating, and coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency. 				

All necessary measures to control dust shall be implemented by the developer during grading.

Erosion control- landscape plans, required for manufactured slopes greater than 3 feet in vertical height, are to be signed by a registered landscape architect and bonded per the requirements of Ordinance 457, see form 284-47.

Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent deposition of debris onto downstream properties or drainage facilities. Plans showing these measures shall be submitted to the City for review.

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

Mitigation:

Implementation of the following measure would meet SCAQMD requirements for minimizing emissions for dust generating activities.

MMAIR-1, Dust Minimization. Pursuant to Rule 403 of the SCAQMD, the following dust minimizing measures shall be implemented.

- a) The simultaneous disturbance of the site shall be minimized to the extent feasible.
- b) The project proponent shall comply with all applicable SCAQMD Rules and Regulations, including Rule 403 insuring the clean up of construction-related dirt on approach routes to the site. Rule 403 prohibits the release of fugitive dust emissions from any active operation, open storage pile or disturbed surface area visible beyond the property line of the emission source. Particulate matter on public roadways is also prohibited.
- c) The project proponent shall comply with all SCAQMD established minimum requirements for construction activities to reduce fugitive dust and PM₁₀ emissions.
- d) Adequate watering techniques shall be employed to mitigate the impact of construction-related dust particulates. Portions of the site that are undergoing surface earth moving operations shall be watered such that a crust will be formed on the ground surface, and then watered again at the end of each day. Site watering shall be performed as necessary to adequately mitigate blowing dust.
- e) Any vegetative cover to be utilized onsite shall be planted as soon as possible to reduce the disturbed area subject to wind erosion. Irrigation systems required for these plants shall be installed as soon as possible to maintain good ground cover and to minimize wind erosion of the soil.
- f) Any construction access roads (other than temporary access roads) shall be paved as soon as possible and cleaned up after each work day. The maximum vehicle speed on unpaved roads shall be 15 mph.
- g) Grading operations shall be suspended during first stage ozone episodes or when winds exceed 25 mph. A high wind response plan shall be formulated for enhanced dust control if winds are forecast to exceed 25 mph in any upcoming 24-hour period.
- h) Any construction equipment using direct internal combustion engines shall use a diesel fuel with a maximum of 0.05 percent sulfur and a four-degree retard.
- i) Construction operations affecting off-site roadways shall be scheduled by implementing traffic hours and shall minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes.
- j) The engines of idling trucks or heavy equipment shall be turned off if the expected duration of idling exceeds five (5) minutes.
- k) On-site heavy equipment used during grading and construction shall be equipped with diesel particulate filters unless it is demonstrated that such equipment is not available or its use is not cost-competitive.
- l) All haul trucks leaving or entering the site shall be covered or have at least two feet of freeboard.
- m) Any on-site stockpiles of debris, dirt or other dusty material shall be covered or watered three times daily.
- n) Any site access points within 30 minutes of any visible dirt deposition on any public roadway shall be swept or washed.

The project will result in greenhouse gas emissions through the construction process and operation of the shopping center. The project is required to incorporate enhanced energy efficiency standards to

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

minimize energy consumption, and compliance with measure XVI. The project must exceed 2005 Title 24 building energy efficiency minimum requirements by a minimum of 14% or meet/exceed 2008 Title 24 minimum requirements. Only low-and non-VOC-containing paints, sealants, adhesives, and solvents shall be utilized in the construction of the project.

To reduce diesel truck emissions, the project has been conditioned to install signs in loading areas stating "The driver of a diesel-fueled motor vehicle with a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) greater than 10,000 pounds is prohibited from idling the vehicle's primary engine for more than five (5) minutes at any location and may not operate a diesel fueled auxiliary power system (APS) for more than 5 minutes at any location within 100 feet of a restricted area (residences). Electrical connections have been provided for your use. The minimum penalty for an idling violation is \$300.00. To report a violation please contact 1800-END-SMOG".

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Department of Building & Safety during the plan check process.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

6. Wildlife & Vegetation

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

b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?

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

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) 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?

f) 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?

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

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

Source: GIS database, WRCMSHCP, On-site Inspection, and MSHCP Compliance Report and Burrowing Owl Habitat Assessment, prepared by Principe & Associates (PDB05042)

Findings of Fact:

6a) The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan; however, the project is not located within a Criteria Cell or Cell Group. Therefore, the project shall not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

6b) The project site is free from suitable habitat for wildlife, as well as native plant species. No evidence of endangered species or suitable habitat was found on-site according to the habitat assessment. The project shall not have an effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12). Therefore, there is no impact.

6c) The site was surveyed for evidence of candidate, sensitive, or special status species, particularly for burrowing owl habitat. No small mammal burrows or signs of the presence burrowing owl within the project site where observed within the site. Although no burrowing owls or burrowing owl habitat was found onsite during the habitat assessment, to ensure no burrowing owls are affected by the project, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction presence/absence survey for burrowing owl prior to grading permit issuance. The results of the survey shall be submitted to the EPD for review. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

6d) The project site is located in an area that is disturbed and there are existing residential uses to the south and east of the site and also a middle school to the west. The site is primarily devoid of wildlife habitat. Although wildlife currently can move freely throughout the site, this parcel is not considered a corridor or constrained linkage area. Therefore the project shall not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, there is no impact.

6e) The project site does not contain any riparian or riverine habitat. Therefore, the project shall not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, there is no impact.

6f) The project site does not contain wetlands. Therefore, the project shall not 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. Therefore, there is no impact.

6g) The proposed project site does not contain any oak trees or other protected resources. Therefore, the project shall not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned prior to grading permit issuance to conduct a presence/absence survey for the burrowing owl.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Environmental Programs Department during the building and safety plan check process.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Historic Resources

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, PDA4510 and PDA4532

Findings of Fact:

7a) The project site is currently vacant and is not classified as an historic site. Therefore, there is no impact.

7b) The project site does not contain a historical resource and therefore, shall not cause a substantial adverse change in the significant of a historical resources as defined in California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

8. Archaeological Resources

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, PDA4510 and PDA4532

Findings of Fact:

8a-b. According to the archeological reports prepared for the proposed project, there were no archeological sites or resources within the project site. However, the project is located within an area that is archeologically sensitive and there could be a potential for uncovering resources during grading

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

activities. Therefore, the project has been conditioned by Planning to have a qualified archaeologist retained to monitor the project grading and shall have the authority to halt grading activity to allow recovery of archaeological and/or cultural resources. In addition, tribal monitor(s) from the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) shall be required on-site during all ground disturbing activities. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall submit a copy of a fully signed contract between the above mentioned Tribe and the land divider/permit holder for the monitoring and any necessary mitigation of the project to the Planning Department and to the Department of Building and Safety. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall also provide the Planning director evidence of an Agreement with the appropriate Native American Tribe that addresses the treatment and disposition of all cultural resources and human remains impacted as a result of the development. The developer shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including archeological artifacts that are of Native American origin, found in the Project area to the approved curation facility for proper treatment and disposition. Conditions are in place to avert the destruction or alteration of an archeological site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

8c. The project site is not anticipated to contain human remains; however, the project has been conditioned by Planning that if human remains are encountered during grading, State 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 the origin. Further, pursuant to Public Resource 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. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

8d. The project site is not used for religious or sacred uses; therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned to have a qualified archaeologist retained to monitor the project grading and shall have the authority to halt grading activity to allow recovery of archaeological and/or cultural resources. In addition, tribal monitor(s) from the appropriate Native American Tribe(s) shall be required on-site during all ground disturbing activities. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall submit a copy of a fully signed contract between the above mentioned Tribe and the land divider/permit holder for the monitoring and any necessary mitigation of the project to the Planning Department and to the Department of Building and Safety. The applicant shall also provide the Planning Director evidence of an Agreement with the appropriate Native American Tribe that addresses the treatment and disposition of all cultural resources and human remains impacted as a result of the development. The developer shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including archeological artifacts that are of Native American origin, found in the Project area to the approved curation facility for proper treatment and disposition.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the plan check process.

9. Paleontological Resources

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

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

Source: Riverside County General Plan Figure OS-8 "Paleontological Sensitivity", County Archeologist Review

Findings of Fact:

9a. The proposed project is located within an area that has a High B sensitivity for Paleontological Resources. An Archeologist will be retained to monitor the project grading and shall have the authority to halt grading activity to allow recovery resources. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned by Planning, prior to grading permit issuance for an Archeologist to be retained to monitor the project grading and shall have the authority to halt grading activity to allow recovery resources.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the plan check process.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project

10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan Figure S-2 "Earthquake Fault Study Zones," GIS database, Geologist Comments, GEO1895

Findings of Fact:

10a-b. The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death or be subject to rupture of a known earthquake fault. The Geologic Investigation determined that there was no evidence of active faulting, crossing or projecting toward this site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone

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

Source: General Plan Figure S-3 "Generalized Liquefaction", GEO1895

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

Findings of Fact:

11a) The Geologic Investigation determined that the site appears to be free of secondary seismically induced hazards such as liquefaction. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

12. Ground-shaking Zone

Be subject to strong seismic ground shaking?

Source: General Plan Figure S-4 "Earthquake-Induced Slope Instability Map," and Figures S-13 through S-21 (showing General Ground Shaking Risk), GEO1895

Findings of Fact:

12a. The proposed project site is located within an area that is designated as having very high levels of seismic ground shaking. California Building Code (CBC) related to building standards will mitigate this impact to less than significant levels. Building standards are not considered mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: All new construction shall be designed in accordance with the seismic parameters in the California Building Code.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the building and safety plan check process.

13. Landslide Risk

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

Source: On-site Inspection, General Plan Figure S-5 "Regions Underlain by Steep Slope", GEO1895

Findings of Fact:

13a. Due to the relatively flat local topography of the project site and surrounding area, the potential for the site to be affected by secondary seismic hazards such as landslides, rockfall hazards, or collapse is considered low to very low for this site. Lateral spreading was also not identified by the County Geologist as an issue of concern. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No monitoring is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

14. Ground Subsidence

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

Source: County Geologist Review, GEO1895

Findings of Fact:

14a. Subsidence refers to the sudden sinking or gradual downward settling and compaction of soil and other surface material with little or no horizontal motion. It may be caused by a variety of human and natural activities, including earthquakes. The Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS) identified the site as having a susceptibility to subsidence. This impact was analyzed in the Geological Study, which did not identify subsidence as an issue of concern. Soils are dense and groundwater is located at a low depth. Therefore, less than significant impacts related to subsidence are expected.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

15. Other Geologic Hazards

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, GEO1895

Findings of Fact:

15a. Due to the lack of significant local bodies of water in the area, the project site would not be subject to seismically induced flooding, seiches, or tsunamis. In addition, the project site is not subject to mudflow or volcanic hazards. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

16. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

Source: Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan, Figure 12, "Steep Slope", GEO1895

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

Findings of Fact:

16a-b. The project site is relatively flat and has previously been used for agricultural purposes. It is not anticipated that additional project grading will substantially alter topography or ground surface relief features. The proposed project has been conditioned to limit the steepness of slopes to a ratio of 2:1 unless otherwise approved. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

16c. The project site shall utilize sewer. Therefore, the project will not result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: The proposed project has been conditioned by the Building and Safety Grading Division, to limit the steepness of slopes to a ratio of 2:1 unless otherwise approved.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety plan check process.

17. Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, On-site Inspection, GEO1895

Findings of Fact:

17a. The project site is relatively flat. Since the site will be fully developed with hardscape and County-approved landscaping, onsite soils will be more stable than under current conditions. Stormwater runoff will flow through a system of water quality swales before entering into drainage facilities. During the construction phase, the applicant will be required to implement temporary erosion control measures immediately after rough grading to prevent deposition of debris onto downstream properties or drainage facilities. Plans showing these measures will be submitted to the Flood Control District for review. With these measures, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

17b. The geologic report prepared for the project did not identify any expansive soils on the surface of the site. The project may be located on expansive soil; however, California Building Code (CBC) requirements pertaining to residential development will mitigate the potential impact to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: During the construction phase, the applicant will be required to implement temporary erosion control measures immediately after rough grading to prevent deposition of debris onto downstream properties or drainage facilities. Plans showing these measures will be submitted to the Flood Control District for review. The project shall comply with California Building Code pertaining to expansive soils.

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

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety Plan Check process.

18. Erosion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, Flood Control Review, Department of Building & Safety (Grading) Review

Findings of Fact:

18a. The subject property is relatively flat. Additionally, the Building and Safety Department's plan check approval of this project would include the requirement that the reviewed and approved conceptual grading plan comply with any Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) required by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District . Also, within the project site, there are no rivers or streams. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to change deposition, siltation, or erosion that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake. Therefore the impact is considered less than significant.

18b. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any increase in water erosion either on or off-site. Flood has conditioned the project prior to grading permit issuance to have temporary erosion control measures implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent deposition of debris onto downstream properties or drainage facilities. Plans showing these measures shall be submitted to the Flood Control District for review. In addition, according to the Flood Hazard Report, with the construction of Homeland Line A and Line A-2 (of the Romoland/Homeland Master Drainage Plan), the project will have adequate outlet for the onsite flows generated by the development. The Riverside County Flood Control District will not issue grading permits until the plans for these facilities have been approved, bonds have been posted, and the offsite rights of way acquired. Occupancy will not be granted for any unit until all downstream facilities are deemed functional by the District. With the construction of these drainage facilities, the proposed project shall not result in an increase in water erosion either on or offsite. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned prior to grading permit issuance to have plans for the Homeland Line A and Line A-2 (of the Romoland/Homeland Master Drainage Plan) approved, bonds have been posted, and the offsite rights of way acquired. Occupancy will not be granted for any unit until all downstream facilities are deemed functional by the District.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during by Flood during the building and safety plan check process.

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Source: Riverside County Geologist, General Plan, Figure S-8, "Wind Erosion Susceptibility Map"

Findings of Fact:

19a. Wind erosion occurs when loose soil—usually sand—is moved by wind force against unstabilized ground surfaces. According to the County of Riverside General Plan, the project site is located within an area with moderate wind-erosion potential. Presently, the site can be characterized as vacant, disturbed land with exposed topsoil. Implementation of the proposed project will stabilize soils within the project site through the construction of impervious surfaces and irrigated landscaping, which will reduce the potential for wind erosion and blowsand to less than significant levels. During construction, however, the project site will be susceptible to wind erosion. Building and Safety—Grading standard Conditions of Approval will limit this exposure and reduce impacts to less than significant levels. The project has been conditioned to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 in regards to fugitive dust. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 in regards to fugitive dust.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety Plan Check process.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

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

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

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

e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

20a. The proposed project is for a commercial shopping center. Typically, this type of development does not require the routine use of acutely hazardous materials and will not generate hazardous

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

waste. However, the project does include gasoline fueling pumps. The project has been conditioned by Environmental Health, prior to building final inspection to have construction plans reviewed and approved by the Hazardous Materials Division prior to the installation of the underground storage tank (UST) system. The facility will also require a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet or 500 pounds, or any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances. The project has been conditioned that if further review of the site indicates additional environmental health issues, the Hazardous Materials Management Division reserves the right to regulate the business in accordance with applicable Ordinances. With the above mitigation measures it is not anticipated that the project will create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

In addition, during construction, hazardous materials such oil, diesel fuel, and gasoline may be transported to and used at the project site. The California State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) operates programs for proper hazardous waste disposal and transport and takes enforcement actions against those who mishandle or dispose of hazardous wastes improperly. The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health, also requires licensed hazardous waste haulers to collect and transport hazardous wastes. Compliance with the requirements of the California State Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health would reduce the impact to less than significant levels. Compliance with the requirements of the California DTSC and Riverside County of Environmental Health is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA.

20b. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project has been conditioned by Environmental Health to have a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet, or 500 pounds, or for any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

20c. The proposed project does not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan. The project site allows adequate emergency access. In addition, the project has been conditioned to have a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet, or 500 pounds, or for any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances. This is a standard condition of approval and is not considered unique mitigation pursuant to CEQA. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

20d. This conditional use permit proposes to construct a commercial shopping center including gasoline fueling pumps/station. Boulder Ridge Middle School is located to the west of the site. The project has been conditioned to have a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet, or 500 pounds, or for any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances. In addition, the project has been conditioned to have construction plans reviewed and approved by the Hazardous Materials Division prior to the installation of the underground storage tank (UST) system. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

20e. The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned by Environmental Health, prior to final inspection to have a business emergency plan for the storage of hazardous materials greater than 55 gallons, 200 cubic feet, or 500 pounds, or for any acutely hazardous materials or extremely hazardous substances. Also, the project has been conditioned prior to occupancy that if further review of the site indicates additional environmental health issues, the Hazardous Materials Management Division reserves the right to regulate the business in accordance with applicable County Ordinances. The project has also been conditioned to have construction plans reviewed and approved by the Hazardous Materials Division prior to the installation of the underground storage tank (UST) system.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Environmental Health Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

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

Source: Riverside County Integrated Project (RCIP), Figure S-19 "Airport Locations"; Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS)

Findings of Fact:

21a. The project site is not located within an Airport Master Plan; therefore will not result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan. Therefore, there is no impact.

21b. The project site is not located within an Airport Master Plan; therefore will not require to be reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission. Therefore, there is no impact.

21c. The project site is not located within an airport land use plan; therefore the project will not create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area in reference to a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, there is no impact.

21d. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, and therefore would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

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

22. Hazardous Fire Area

a) 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?

Source: Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan, Figure 10, "Wildfire Susceptibility," Riverside County Land Information System (RCLIS)

Findings of Fact:

22a. According to Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan, Figure 10, "Wildfire Susceptibility," the proposed development site is not located within a Hazardous Fire Area. In addition, the site is located along an Urban Arterial roadway, a significant distance from fire-prone wildlands. No impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation: No mitigation required.

Monitoring: No monitoring required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

23. Water Quality Impacts

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

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

c) 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)?

d) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

e) 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?

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

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

h) Include new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands), the operation of which could result in significant environmental effects (e.g. increased vectors and odors)?				

Source: Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition.

Findings of Fact:

23a. The project's grading shall be designed in a manner that perpetuates the existing natural drainage patterns with respect to tributary drainage area, outlet points and outlet conditions. In addition, according to the Flood Hazard Report, with the construction of Homeland Line A and Line A-2 (of the Romoland/Homeland Master Drainage Plan), the project will have adequate outlet for the onsite flows generated by the development. The Riverside County Flood Control District will not issue grading permits until the plans for these facilities have been approved, bonds have been posted, and the offsite rights of way acquired. Occupancy will not be granted for any unit until all downstream facilities are deemed functional by the District. With the construction of these drainage facilities, the proposed project shall not result in an increase in water erosion either on or offsite. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

23b. The proposed project has been designed to comply with the current water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The proponent submitted a preliminary project specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) which proposes extensive site design to significantly reduce the amount of impervious surfaces within the project area. Water quality impacts of this site are proposed to be mitigated with three (3) infiltration trench/bio swales. These basins then outlet to the extension of the Homeland/Romoland MDP Line A-2. Riverside County Flood Control District has deemed this mitigation plan acceptable. The applicant's engineer has submitted calculations showing that adequate area is available to accommodate these features. The infiltration trench/bio swales will require maintenance by a public agency or commercial property owners association. To ensure that the public is not unduly burdened with future costs, prior to final approval or recordation of this case, the Flood District will require an acceptable financial mechanism to be implemented to provide for maintenance of the infiltration trench/bio swales.

Additionally, the project has been conditioned to provide to the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement and to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) prior to issuance of any grading or construction permit. The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger (the project site is 2.73 acres). The owner/operator would comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

23c. The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

23d. On-site flows will be treated using infiltration trenches/bio swales. These basins then outlet to the extension of the Homeland/Romoland MDP Line A-2. According to the Flood Hazard Report, with the construction of Homeland Line A and Line A-2 (of the Romoland/Homeland Master Drainage Plan), the project will have adequate outlet for the onsite flows generated by the development. The Riverside County Flood Control District will not issue grading permits until the plans for these facilities have been approved, bonds have been posted, and the offsite rights of way acquired. Occupancy will not be granted for any unit until all downstream facilities are deemed functional by the District. With the construction of these drainage facilities, the proposed project shall not result in an increase in additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

23e. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project shall not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, there is no impact.

23f. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the proposed project shall not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, there is no impact.

23g. The proposed project is not anticipated to otherwise substantially degrade water quality. To avoid the substantial degradation of water quality, the project has been conditioned prior to the issuance of any grading or construction permits, to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, by developing and implementing a storm water pollution prevention plan, as well as a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site. The project has also been conditioned to submit a Final Water Quality Management Plan prior to grading permit issuance for review and approval. The WQMP addresses post-development water quality impacts from new development and re-development projects. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

23h. The proposed project will include the construction of new or retrofitted stormwater Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) (e.g. water quality treatment basins, constructed treatment wetlands). The project shall include three infiltration trenches/bio swales. Prior to grading permit issuance, a copy of the improvement plans, grading plans, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review. The plans must receive District approval prior to the issuance of grading permits to ensure that the operation of the BMP's shall not result in significant environmental effects. The infiltration trench/bio swales will require maintenance by a public agency or commercial property owners association. To ensure that the public is not unduly burdened with future costs, prior to final approval or recordation of this case, the district will require an acceptable financial mechanism to be implemented to provide for maintenance of the infiltration trench/bio swales. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation: The Riverside County Flood Control District will not issue grading permits until the plans for these facilities have been approved, bonds have been posted, and the offsite rights of way acquired. Occupancy will not be granted for any unit until all downstream facilities are deemed functional by the District. Prior to grading permit issuance, a copy of the improvement plans, grading plans, BMP improvement plans and any other necessary documentation along with supporting hydrologic and hydraulic calculations shall be submitted to the District for review. The plans must receive District approval prior to the issuance of grading permits to ensure that the operation of the BMP's shall not result in significant environmental effects. The infiltration trench/bio swales will require maintenance by a public agency or commercial property owners association. To ensure that

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

the public is not unduly burdened with future costs, prior to final approval or recordation of this case, the district will require an acceptable financial mechanism to be implemented to provide for maintenance of the infiltration trench/bio swales. Additionally, the project has been conditioned to provide to the Building and Safety Department evidence of compliance with the N.P.D.E.S. (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirement and to obtain a construction permit from the State Water Resource Control Board (SWRCB) prior to issuance of any grading or construction permit. The permit requirement applies to grading and construction sites of "ONE" acre or larger. The owner/operator would comply by submitting a "Notice of Intent" (NOI), develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a monitoring program and reporting plan for the construction site.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Riverside County Flood Control District during the plan check process.

24. Floodplains

Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	U - Generally Unsuitable <input type="checkbox"/>	R - Restricted <input type="checkbox"/>
a) 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
c) 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 (Dam Inundation Area)? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Source: General Plan Figure S-9 "100- and 500-Year Flood Hazard Zones," Figure S-10 "Dam Failure Inundation Zone," Riverside County Flood Control District Flood Hazard Report/Condition, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

24a. The proposed project is not located within a 100 year flood plain. Therefore, the project shall not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.

24b. The project is not within a 100-year Floodplain. Therefore, the project shall not result in changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.

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

24c. The project is not within a 100-year Floodplain. Therefore, the project shall not 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 within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.

24d. The project is not within a 100-year Floodplain. Therefore, the project shall not result in changes in the amount of surface water in any water body within a floodplain. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

25. Land Use

a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?

b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?

Source: RCIP, GIS database, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

25a. The project site is designated for Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio). The proposed commercial project is consistent with the planned general plan land use of the site. Therefore, there is no impact.

25b. The project site is located within the City of Menifee. The project proposes to change the zoning classification of the northwestern portion of the site from One-Family Dwellings to Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). The remainder of the site is currently designated as Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S). The existing One-Family Dwelling zoning classification is not consistent with the existing general plan land use designation of the site. The zone change will result in consistency between the zoning and general plan land use of the site. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

26. Planning

a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?

b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?

c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?

d) Be consistent with the land use designations and

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?				
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: Riverside County General Plan Land Use Element, Staff review, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

26a. The project site is designated Scenic Highway Commercial within the southeastern portion of the site. The remainder or the site is designated as One-Family Dwellings. The project proposes to alter the zoning classification of the portion of the site designated One-Family Dwelling to Scenic Highway Commercial. The project proposes a shopping center and is consistent with the Scenic Highway Commercial zoning classification. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

26b. The surrounding properties are zoned One-Family Dwellings (R-1) to the north, Menifee Valley Ranch Specific Plan No. 301 Planning Areas 16, 17, and 23 (Residential) to the east, Scenic Highway Commercial (C-P-S), Rural Residential (R-R), Controlled Development Areas (W-2), and One-Family Dwellings (R-1) to the south, and One-Family Dwellings (R-1) to the west. The project will be consistent with the surrounding zoning by allowing for a commercial neighborhood shopping center to serve the residents in the surrounding residential zones. The project is also consistent with the surrounding commercial zoning to the south of the site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

26c. The existing and planned surrounding land uses include planned residential uses to the north, planned commercial uses and existing single family residential uses to the south, existing single family residential uses to the east and a school to the west. The project is compatible with the surrounding existing and planned residential land uses by providing a neighborhood shopping center for surrounding residential. The project will include buffers, such as fencing and landscaping, and shall have enhanced architecture to make the shopping center attractive. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

26d. The project site's general plan land use designation is Community Development: Commercial Retail (CD: CR) (0.20-0.35 floor area ratio). The proposed project for a commercial/retail shopping center is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and all applicable policies of the General Plan. The project is also located within the Highway 79 Policy Area. The project has been reviewed by the Transportation Department for consistency with the policy area and traffic counts. It has been determined that the project will provide adequate transportation facilities and is therefore consistent with the policy area. Therefore, there is no impact.

26e. The proposed project site is currently vacant. Therefore, the proposed project shall not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: The project provides landscape screening, enhanced architecture, and the use of natural colors and materials. The project has been conditioned to submit elevations and landscaping plans to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to building permit issuance. These plans shall be in conformance with the conceptual plans which have been submitted and reviewed for compliance with standards and guidelines. The landscaping shall be installed in compliance with the approved

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

landscaping plans. The developer is also required to submit fees to cover the cost of a six-month and one-year landscape inspection to verify that the landscaping is properly installed and maintained.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

27. Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?

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?

c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?

d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?

Source: General Plan, Figure OS-5 "Mineral Resources Area"

Findings of Fact:

27a-b. According to General Plan Figure OS-5, the proposed project is located in an area that is designated MRZ-3. MRZ-3 is an area where mineral deposits are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposits is undetermined. Since the value of the mineral resources which are likely to exist is undetermined the proposed development will have a less than significant impact with regard to impact such deposits.

27c-d. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a surface mine, therefore it is not subject to creating an incompatible land use. The proposed project will have no impact with regard to incompatible land uses located adjacent to an existing surface mine. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of any quarries or mines which may pose a risk for people or property. The proposed project will have no impact with regard to exposure to quarries or mines. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation is required.

Monitoring: No monitoring is required.

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable

A - Generally Acceptable

B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable

D - Land Use Discouraged

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

28. Airport Noise

a) 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?

NA A B C D

b) 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?

NA A B C D

Source: General Plan Figure S-19 "Airport Locations," County of Riverside Airport Facilities Map

Findings of Fact:

28a. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan; therefore will not expose people residing or working to excessive noise levels. Therefore, there is no impact.

28b. The proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip; therefore will not expose people residing or working to excessive noise levels. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: General Plan Figure C-1 "Circulation Plan", GIS database, On-site Inspection

Findings of Fact:

29a. The proposed project is not located adjacent to or in the vicinity of a railroad. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

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

30a. The project is located along McCall Boulevard and Menifee Road. Both roads are designated as Urban Arterial Highways (152-foot ROW) according to the Riverside County Circulation Element. Noise will be elevated in the project vicinity due to the proximity to these roads; however, the project proposes commercials uses which are considered less sensitive to noise. Building design must be shown to reduce interior noise to at or below 50 Ldn for those buildings along Menifee Road and McCall Boulevard. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: Building design must be shown to reduce interior noise to at or below 50 Ldn for those buildings along Menifee Road and McCall Boulevard.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

31. Noise Effects on or by the Project	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials, "Preliminary Acoustical Impact Analysis, Heritage Square", prepared by Albert A. Webb & Associates, dated August 27, 2008, Office of Industrial Hygiene Report dated October 7, 2008

Findings of Fact:

31a. The project shall result in an increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project; however, this impact is not anticipated to be substantial. The project is located adjacent to McCall Boulevard and Menifee Road and due to the existing traffic and related vehicular noise, noise levels in the project vicinity are currently elevated. All loading areas located in the rear of the project site and adjacent to residential have included eight foot screen walls around the loading areas and there is another eight foot block wall along the property line adjacent to the future residential uses to buffer noise impacts. The project also includes landscaping for buffering. In addition, the project has been conditioned by Planning to limit facility related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home must not exceed the following worst-case noise levels 45 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. and 65 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level, between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

31b. The project may result in temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels during the project's construction. Construction activities are limited to between the hours of 6:00am and 6:00pm between the months of June through September and between the hours of 7:00am and 6:00pm between the months of October through May; all construction vehicles, equipment fixed or mobile shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and during construction, best efforts shall be made to locate stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas as far as practicable from existing residential dwellings, an eight foot high control barrier is to be constructed around loading bays of Majors A-E; and truck deliveries and trash compactor activities are to be limited to daytime hours (7:00 am to 10:00pm). Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

31c. The proposed project shall not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. There are residential uses located to the south of the project site. The project has been conditioned that exterior noise levels created by the proposed project, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a sensitive receptor, shall not exceed 45 db(A) 10-minute LEQ, between the hours of 10:00pm to 7:00am, and 55 db(A) at all other times. The project has also prepared an acoustical study which has been reviewed by the Office of Industrial Hygiene. The Office of Industrial Hygiene has submitted a letter stating their recommendations required in order to meet noise standards. The project has been conditioned to comply with the Industrial Hygiene Recommendations which include the following:

1. Facility related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "sensitive receiver, habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home", must not exceed the following worst-case noise levels 45 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level ("leq"), between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. (nighttime standard) and 65 dB (A) – 10 minute leq, between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. (daytime standard).
2. Whenever a construction site is within one-quarter of a mile of an occupied residence or residences, no construction activities shall be undertaken between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. during the months of June through September and between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. during the months of October through May. Exceptions to these standards shall be allowed only with the written consent of the building official.
3. All construction vehicles, equipment fixed or mobile shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.
4. During construction, best efforts should be made to locate stockpiling and/or vehicle staging area as far as practicable from existing residential dwellings.
5. An eight foot high control barrier is to be constructed around loading bays of Majors A-E. The barrier shall be positioned so that it breaks the line of sight of the nearest adjacent property. The barrier is to be built as close to the bay perimeter as is feasible to achieve maximum noise attenuation.
6. Truck deliveries and trash compactor activities are to be limited to daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.).

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

7. The Office of Industrial Hygiene must receive, review and approve an acoustical report (as listed above) addressing the noise that might be produced from speaker phones and air conditioning unit location and specifications from each specific tenant/plot plan. Building design must be shown to reduce interior noise to at or below 50 Ldn for those buildings along Menifee Road and McCall Boulevard. The Office of Industrial Hygiene will determine which businesses will be required to have an acoustical report.

Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

31d. The proposed project is not anticipated to expose people to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned to provide landscape screening located along the northern property line. The project has been conditioned by Planning to limit facility related noise, as projected to any portion of any surrounding property containing a "habitable dwelling, hospital, school, library or nursing home must not exceed the following worst-case noise levels 45 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level, between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. and 65 dB(A) – 10 minute noise equivalent level, between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. Construction activities are limited to between the hours of 6:00am and 6:00pm between the months of June through September and between the hours of 7:00am and 6:00pm between the months of October through May; all construction vehicles, equipment fixed or mobile shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers; and during construction, best efforts shall be made to locate stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas as far as practicable from existing residential dwellings, an eight foot high control barrier is to be constructed around loading bays of Majors A-E; and truck deliveries and trash compactor activities are to be limited to daytime hours (7:00 am to 10:00pm). The project has also been conditioned by Planning to comply with the recommendations of the Office of Industrial Hygiene which includes a wall around portions of the site to mitigate noise.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the building and safety plan check process.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

32. Housing

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

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

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

b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?

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

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

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

d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?

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

e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

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

f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of

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

roads or other infrastructure)?

Source: Project Application Materials, GIS database, General Plan Housing Element

Findings of Fact:

32a. The project site is currently vacant. Therefore, the proposed project shall not displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there is no impact.

32b. The project proposes a commercial shopping center. The proposed project is surrounded by planned and existing single family residential. Although the commercial shopping center will bring jobs to the area, it is not anticipated that the proposed project will result in a substantial demand for additional housing within the project vicinity due the existing and planned residential developments in the area. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

32c. The project site is currently vacant. Therefore, the proposed project shall not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, there is no impact.

32d. The proposed project site is not located within a County Redevelopment Area. Therefore, the project shall not affect a County Redevelopment Area. Therefore, there is no impact.

32e. The project proposes a commercial shopping center. Therefore, the proposed project shall not exceed regional or local population projections. Therefore, there is no impact.

32f. Currently there is infrastructure available in the project vicinity. The surrounding area is currently existing and planned for residential and commercial uses. Therefore, the proposed project shall not induce substantial population growth in an area due current and planned developments in the area and the existence of existing infrastructure in the area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

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

33. Fire Services

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

Source: General Plan Safety Element

Findings of Fact:

33a. The proposed project will have a less than significant impact on the demand for Fire services. Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall comply with the provisions of

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

Ordinance 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance. Ordinance 659 established to set forth policies, regulations and fees related to the funding and construction of facilities necessary to address the direct cumulative environmental effect generated by new development projects. With compliance to Ordinance No 659, impacts to Fire services are viewed as less than significant.

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

Mitigation: The applicant shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety plan check process.

34. Sheriff Services

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

Source: General Plan, Riverside County Sheriff Correspondence

Findings of Fact:

34a. The Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD) provides law enforcement and crime prevention services to the project site and Sun City/Menifee area. The RCSD operates out of stations in Perris, Elsinore and the Southwest Station for Sun City/Menifee area. Similar to fire protection services, the proposed project will incrementally increase the demand for sheriff services in the project area; however, due to its limited size, the proposed project will not create a significant impact on sheriff services. The development impact fee Ordinance No. 659 also collects fees for sheriff services, which is intended to offset any incremental increases in need for sheriff services. The proposed project is required to pay these development impact fees prior to issuance of building permits. Therefore, with payment of the development impact fees pursuant to Ordinance No. 659, the proposed project will not have a significant impact on sheriff services.

Mitigation: The applicant shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety plan check process.

35. Schools

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

Source: Romoland and Perris Union School District correspondence, GIS database

Findings of Fact:

35a. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. The proposed project is located within the Romoland and Perris Union

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

High School Districts. This project has been conditioned to comply with School Mitigation Impact fees in order to mitigate the potential effects to school services. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: The applicant shall pay school mitigation fees.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety plan check process.

36. Libraries

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact:

36a. The proposed development will have impacts on Library resources because it will generate end users. However, the development impact fee Ordinance No. 659 also collects fees for library services, which is intended to offset any incremental increases in need for libraries. The proposed project is required to pay these development impact fees prior to issuance of building permits.

Mitigation: The applicant shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety plan check process.

37. Health Services

Source: General Plan

Findings of Fact:

37a. The use of the proposed project would not cause an impact on health services. The site is located within the service parameters of health centers. The project will not physically alter existing facilities or result in the construction of new or physically altered facilities. This project shall comply with Ordinance No. 659 to mitigate the potential effects to library services. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: The applicant shall comply with the provisions of Ordinance 659 which requires payment of the appropriate fees set forth in the Ordinance

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted during the Building and Safety plan check process.

RECREATION

38. Parks and Recreation

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
environment?				
b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Findings of Fact:

38a. The scope of the proposed project does not involve the construction of expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

38b. Patrons and employees could potentially use neighboring recreational facilities. Due to the size and type of use of the proposed development, it is not anticipated that the project will generate significant impacts to nearby parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

38c. The project could potentially incrementally increase the use of some types of recreational facilities in the Sun City/Menifee Valley area. However, as a commercial use, this increase would be minimal. The proposed project would not be assessed Quimby Fees. These fees are required of residential uses only. Thus, impacts would not be considered significant, since commercial uses are not required to pay park and recreation impact fees.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

39. Recreational Trails

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

Source: Department of Recreation and Open Space (Parks) Review

Findings of Fact:

39a. The Sun City/Menifee Area Plan identifies a community trail along the project's eastern border along Menifee Road. The project has been conditioned by Parks to offer for dedication to the City of Menifee or other entity acceptable to the Planning Director an easement for trails purposes. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a trails plan to the City Engineer for review and approval. Prior to the issuance of the second building permit, the applicant shall build the trail as shown on the approved trails plan. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned by Parks to offer for dedication to the City of Menifee or other entity acceptable to the Planning Director an easement for trails purposes. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a trails plan to the City Engineer for review and approval. Prior to the issuance of the second building permit, the applicant shall build the trail as shown on the approved trails plan.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the Building and Safety Plan check process.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

40. Circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: General Plan, Riverside County Transportation Department Review, Traffic Study

Findings of Fact:

40a. The proposed project will result in an increase in traffic loads; however, the increase is not considered substantial and the project site is located along McCall Boulevard and Menifee Road which will be improved to accommodate the increased traffic trips. A traffic study was prepared for the proposed project. The traffic study analyzed project specific and cumulative traffic impacts. The traffic study determined that adequate levels of service could be maintained in the project vicinity with the incorporation of improvements. Transportation has conditioned the project prior to building final inspection for the following: the project proponent shall be responsible for the installation and/or

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

modification of traffic signals at the intersections of Menifee Road and McCall Blvd., Menifee Road and North Project Driveway, Junipero Road and McCall Blvd., and Project access drive and McCall Blvd.

The following improvements shall be constructed prior to building permit issuance:

The intersection of Menifee Road and the north project driveway shall be improved to provide:

Northbound: one left-turn lane, two through lanes

Southbound: three through lanes

Eastbound: one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane

The intersection of Menifee Road and the south project driveway shall be improved to provide:

Northbound: two through lanes

Southbound: three through lanes

The intersection of Menifee Road and McCall Boulevard shall be improved to provide:

Northbound: one left-turn lane, two through lanes

Southbound: one left-turn lane, tow through lanes, one right-turn lane

Eastbound: two left-turn lanes, two through lanes

Westbound: two left-turn lanes, three through lanes, on right-turn lane

The intersection of the project driveway and McCall Boulevard shall be improved with the following:

Southbound: one left-turn lane, one right-turn lane

Eastbound: one left turn lane, two through lanes

Westbound: tree through lanes

The intersection of Junipero Road and McCall Boulevard shall be improved to provide:

Northbound: one left-turn/through/right-turn lane

Southbound: one left-turn lane, one through/right-turn lane

Eastbound: one left-turn lane, two through lanes

Westbound: one left-turn lane, tow through lanes, one right-turn lane

The intersection of Junipero Road and the School/Project Driveway shall be improved to provide:

Northbound: one left-turn lane, one through/right-turn lane

Southbound: one left-turn lane, one through/right-turn lane

Eastbound: one left-turn/through/right-turn lane

Westbound: one left-turn/through/right-turn lane

With the above mentioned improvements, the project shall have a less than significant impact on increases in traffic.

40b. The project meets all parking requirements of Ordinance 348 Section 18.12 "Off-Street Parking." Therefore, there is no impact.

40c. A traffic study was prepared for this project and analyzed project specific and cumulative traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for this report determined that the project would achieve adequate levels of service within the project vicinity with the incorporation of mitigation. In order to maintain adequate levels of service, the project has been conditioned to design and construct a traffic signal and road improvements along Menifee Road, McCall Boulevard, and Junipero Road. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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

40d. The proposed project will not change air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Therefore, there is no impact.

40e. The proposed project will not change or alter waterborne, rail or air traffic. Therefore, there is no impact.

40f. The proposed project will not substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment). Therefore there is no impact.

40g. The project would contribute to the cumulative deterioration of nearby roadways. The assessment of County fees, such as Development Impact Fees (DIF) and Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF), however, would reduce any impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

40h. During project construction, roadway segments and intersections may be temporarily affected and temporary construction detours may be necessary. However, the effect to circulation is not anticipated to be substantial. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

40i. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses. The project has been conditioned to make road improvements and add signals to maintain levels of service in the project vicinity. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

40j. The project does not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation and shall include bike racks. The project also will provide a bus turnout along McCall Boulevard. Therefore, there is no impact.

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned by Transportation to design and construct a traffic signal and road improvements along Menifee Road, McCall Boulevard, and Junipero Road. The developer shall also pay the Transportation Uniform Mitigation fee.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Transportation Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

41. Bike Trails

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

Source: On-site Inspection, Project Application Materials, Sun City/Menifee Valley Area Plan Figure 7 "Trails and Bikeway System"

Findings of Fact:

41a. The project site does not contain a designated bike trail; however, there is a community trail designated along Menifee Road on the project's eastern border. The trail could possibly accommodate bicycles. The project has been conditioned to construct the community trail prior to the issuance of the second building permit. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

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

Mitigation: The project has been conditioned to construct the community trail prior to the issuance of the second building permit.

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Planning Department during the Building and Safety plan check process.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

42. Water

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

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

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) Review, General Plan, EIR411

Findings of Fact:

42a. The project will be served by the Eastern Municipal Water District. The proposed project may require the expansion of water treatment facilities to the site; however, the expansion of these facilities is not anticipated to have a significant effect on the environment because the site will already be disturbed by grading and other construction activities. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

42b. The project shall be served by the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) which has sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. The proposed project was transmitted to the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) for their review. The developer is responsible for ensuring that all requirements to obtain water service for the site are met with the EMWD, as well as all other applicable agencies. The project landscaping is consistent with Ordinance No. 859, which requires water efficient landscaping. In addition, the project has been conditioned to connect to a reclaimed water supply for landscape water purposes and the car wash when secondary or reclaimed water is made available to the site. Cumulative water impacts were analyzed by the Riverside County General Plan and Environmental Impact Report No. 441. The project is consistent with the General Plan land use of the site and corresponding population projections. According to EMWD's Urban Water Management Plan, the District will be able to meet water demand based on population projections. Such demands will be met through water supplied by MWD, groundwater supplies and recycled water. The development of the proposed project, in conjunction with related projects, would have a less than significant impact on the City's water supply and distribution system. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: The developer is responsible for ensuring that all requirements to obtain water service for the site are met with the EMWD, as well as all other applicable agencies. The project has been conditioned to connect to a reclaimed water supply for landscape water purposes and the car wash when secondary or reclaimed water is made available to the site. Landscaping shall be consistent with Ordinance No. 859 and EMWD requirements for drought tolerant landscaping.

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

Monitoring: Monitoring shall be conducted by the Department of Environmental Health during the Building and Safety plan check process.

43. Sewer

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?

b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Source: Department of Environmental Health Review

Findings of Fact:

43a. The project will be served by sewer and is not anticipated to result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects due to the location of existing sewer facilities in the project vicinity. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

43b. The project shall be served by the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) which has sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. The developer is responsible for ensuring that all requirements to obtain sewer service for the site are met with the EMWD, as well as all other applicable agencies. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

44. Solid Waste

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

b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?

Source: RCIP, Riverside County Waste Management District correspondence

Findings of Fact:

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

44a. The proposed project is located within the jurisdictional area of the Riverside County Waste Management Department. Waste Management, Inc. provides solid waste service to the project area. The majority of collected waste is hauled to the Perris transfer station and disposed in the Lamb Canyon Landfill. The Lamb Canyon landfill is classified as a Class 3, Solid Waste Municipal Landfill suitable for disposal of non-hazardous and general municipal waste. The landfill is owned and operated by the County of Riverside. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

44b. The project is not expected to significantly contribute to the area's solid waste disposal needs and there is adequate capacity at the Lamb Canyon landfill to dispose of the solid waste generated by the proposed project. All local, state, and federal guidelines regarding solid waste will be satisfied during project construction and after completion. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

45. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact:

a-h) Implementation of the project will result in an incremental system capacity demand for energy systems, communication systems, storm water drainage systems, street lighting systems, maintenance of public facilities, including roads and potentially other governmental services. Each of the utility systems, including collection of solid waste, is available at the project site and lines will have to be extended onto the site, which will already be disturbed by grading and other construction activities. These impacts are considered less than significant based on the availability of existing public facilities that support local systems. The project will not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

Compliance with the requirements of Southern California Edison, Eastern Municipal Water District, Verizon, Riverside County Flood Control and Riverside County Transportation Department will ensure that potential impacts to utility systems are reduced to a non-significant level.

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

Based on data available at this time, no offsite utility improvements will be required to support this project, other than improvement of local roadways, street lighting and drainage facilities. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation: No mitigation measures are required.

Monitoring: No monitoring measures are required.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

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

47. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one that occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The proposed project does not have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

48. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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 as

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

defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15130)?

Source: Staff review, Project Application Materials

Findings of Fact: The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

49. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Source: Staff review, project application

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

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

Earlier Analyses Used, if any:

Traffic Impact Study Report Heritage Square, prepared by Albert A. Webb Associates, prepared February 19, 2007 and revised June 25, 2007

MSHCP Compliance Report and Burrowing Owl Habitat Assessment, prepared by Principe & Associates (PDB05042)

GEO1895: "Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Retail Center, Heritage Square, County of Riverside, California", prepared by Geotechnical Professionals, Inc., dated June 7, 2006

PDA4510: "Archaeological Testing and Evaluation of CA-RIV-7129 and CA-RIV-7130", prepared by Christopher E. Dровер, Ph.D., dated September 14, 2003.

PDA4532: "Phase I Archaeological Assessment" prepared by CRM TECH, dated September 25, 2008.

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

County of Riverside Planning Department
4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
Riverside, CA 92505

City of Menifee Planning Department
29714 Haun Road
Menifee, CA 92586

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Summer Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name:

Project Name: Heritage Square

Project Location: Riverside County

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Summary Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>Dust</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>Exhaust</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>Dust</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>Exhaust</u>	<u>CO2</u>
2010 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	9.64	49.10	38.64	0.02	40.01	3.64	41.57		8.36	3.34	9.79		5,955.47
2010 TOTALS (lbs/day mitigated)	9.64	37.70	38.64	0.02	2.79	0.59	2.92		0.58	0.54	0.70		5,955.47
2011 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	32.93	18.61	20.17	0.01	0.05	1.32	1.37		0.02	1.21	1.23		3,031.17
2011 TOTALS (lbs/day mitigated)	29.98	13.85	20.17	0.01	0.05	0.17	0.22		0.02	0.15	0.17		3,031.17

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	1.37	1.18	8.64	0.00	0.03	0.03	1,315.28
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	1.17	0.95	6.91	0.00	0.02	0.02	1,055.03
Percent Reduction	14.60	19.49	20.02	NaN	33.33	33.33	19.79

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	74.08	92.04	774.28	0.75	115.14	23.15	73,917.50
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	41.02	49.88	419.74	0.40	62.12	12.50	39,912.02
Percent Reduction	44.63	45.81	45.79	46.67	46.05	46.00	46.00

SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	75.45	93.22	782.92	0.75	115.17	23.18	75,232.78
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	42.19	50.83	426.65	0.40	62.14	12.52	40,967.05
Percent Reduction	44.08	45.47	45.51	46.67	46.04	45.99	45.55

Construction Unmitigated Detail Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10 Dust</u>	<u>PM10 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5 Dust</u>	<u>PM2.5 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Time Slice 6/1/2010-7/30/2010	3.73	30.38	16.77	0.00	40.01	1.56	41.57	8.36	1.44	9.79	2,897.05
Active Days: 44											
Mass Grading 06/01/2010-07/30/2010	3.73	30.38	16.77	0.00	40.01	1.56	41.57	8.36	1.44	9.79	2,897.05
Mass Grading Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.00	0.00	40.00	8.35	0.00	8.35	0.00
Mass Grading Off Road Diesel	3.69	30.30	15.36	0.00	0.00	1.56	1.56	0.00	1.43	1.43	2,734.02
Mass Grading On Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mass Grading Worker Trips	0.04	0.07	1.40	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	163.02

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Time Slice 8/2/2010-8/20/2010	3.73	30.38	16.77	0.00	<u>40.01</u>	1.56	<u>41.57</u>	<u>8.36</u>	1.44	<u>9.79</u>	2,897.05
Active Days: 15											
Fine Grading 08/02/2010-08/20/2010	3.73	30.38	16.77	0.00	40.01	1.56	41.57	8.36	1.44	9.79	2,897.05
Fine Grading Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	40.00	0.00	40.00	8.35	0.00	8.35	0.00
Fine Grading Off Road Diesel	3.69	30.30	15.36	0.00	0.00	1.56	1.56	0.00	1.43	1.43	2,734.02
Fine Grading On Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fine Grading Worker Trips	0.04	0.07	1.40	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	163.02
Time Slice 8/23/2010-9/10/2010	3.76	27.72	15.20	0.00	0.01	1.73	1.74	0.00	1.59	1.60	2,620.66
Active Days: 15											
Trenching 08/23/2010-09/10/2010	3.76	27.72	15.20	0.00	0.01	1.73	1.74	0.00	1.59	1.60	2,620.66
Trenching Off Road Diesel	3.71	27.63	13.51	0.00	0.00	1.73	1.73	0.00	1.59	1.59	2,425.03
Trenching Worker Trips	0.05	0.09	1.69	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	195.63
Time Slice 9/13/2010-9/24/2010	5.92	29.27	17.80	0.01	0.05	2.24	2.29	0.02	2.06	2.08	2,969.23
Active Days: 10											
Asphalt 09/13/2010-10/01/2010	5.92	29.27	17.80	0.01	0.05	2.24	2.29	0.02	2.06	2.08	2,969.23
Paving Off-Gas	1.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	3.81	22.86	12.67	0.00	0.00	1.98	1.98	0.00	1.82	1.82	1,730.32
Paving On Road Diesel	0.46	6.26	2.32	0.01	0.03	0.25	0.28	0.01	0.23	0.24	912.87
Paving Worker Trips	0.08	0.15	2.81	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	326.05

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Time Slice 9/27/2010-10/1/2010	<u>9.64</u>	<u>49.10</u>	<u>38.64</u>	<u>0.02</u>	0.10	<u>3.64</u>	3.73	0.03	<u>3.34</u>	3.38	<u>5,955.47</u>
Active Days: 5											
Asphalt 09/13/2010-10/01/2010	5.92	29.27	17.80	0.01	0.05	2.24	2.29	0.02	2.06	2.08	2,969.23
Paving Off-Gas	1.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	3.81	22.86	12.67	0.00	0.00	1.98	1.98	0.00	1.82	1.82	1,730.32
Paving On Road Diesel	0.46	6.26	2.32	0.01	0.03	0.25	0.28	0.01	0.23	0.24	912.87
Paving Worker Trips	0.08	0.15	2.81	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	326.05
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.72	19.84	20.84	0.01	0.05	1.39	1.45	0.02	1.28	1.30	2,986.23
Building Off Road Diesel	3.37	18.22	11.38	0.00	0.00	1.32	1.32	0.00	1.21	1.21	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.10	1.18	1.05	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	243.50
Building Worker Trips	0.25	0.44	8.42	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.74
Time Slice 10/4/2010-12/31/2010	3.72	19.84	20.84	0.01	0.05	1.39	1.45	0.02	1.28	1.30	2,986.23
Active Days: 65											
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.72	19.84	20.84	0.01	0.05	1.39	1.45	0.02	1.28	1.30	2,986.23
Building Off Road Diesel	3.37	18.22	11.38	0.00	0.00	1.32	1.32	0.00	1.21	1.21	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.10	1.18	1.05	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	243.50
Building Worker Trips	0.25	0.44	8.42	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.74
Time Slice 1/3/2011-4/1/2011 Active Days: 65	3.43	18.59	19.81	0.01	0.05	1.32	1.37	0.02	1.21	1.23	2,986.28
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.43	18.59	19.81	0.01	0.05	1.32	1.37	0.02	1.21	1.23	2,986.28
Building Off Road Diesel	3.11	17.14	11.06	0.00	0.00	1.25	1.25	0.00	1.15	1.15	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.09	1.06	0.97	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.04	243.52
Building Worker Trips	0.22	0.40	7.78	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.77

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Time Slice 4/4/2011-5/27/2011	<u>32.93</u>	<u>18.61</u>	<u>20.17</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.05</u>	<u>1.32</u>	<u>1.37</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>1.21</u>	<u>1.23</u>	<u>3.031.17</u>
Active Days: 40											
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.43	18.59	19.81	0.01	0.05	1.32	1.37	0.02	1.21	1.23	2,986.28
Building Off Road Diesel	3.11	17.14	11.06	0.00	0.00	1.25	1.25	0.00	1.15	1.15	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.09	1.06	0.97	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.04	243.52
Building Worker Trips	0.22	0.40	7.78	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.77
Coating 04/04/2011-07/29/2011	29.50	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Architectural Coating	29.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.01	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Time Slice 5/30/2011-7/29/2011	29.50	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Active Days: 45											
Coating 04/04/2011-07/29/2011	29.50	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Architectural Coating	29.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.01	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89

Phase Assumptions

Phase: Fine Grading 8/2/2010 - 8/20/2010 - Default Fine Site Grading/Excavation Description

Total Acres Disturbed: 19.6

Maximum Daily Acreage Disturbed: 4

Fugitive Dust Level of Detail: Low

Onsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day; Offsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 0

Off-Road Equipment:

2 Graders (174 hp) operating at a 0.61 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Water Trucks (189 hp) operating at a 0.5 load factor for 8 hours per day

Page: 6

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Phase: Mass Grading 6/1/2010 - 7/30/2010 - Default Mass Site Grading/Excavation Description

Total Acres Disturbed: 19.6

Maximum Daily Acreage Disturbed: 4

Fugitive Dust Level of Detail: Low

Onsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day; Offsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 0

Off-Road Equipment:

2 Graders (174 hp) operating at a 0.61 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Water Trucks (189 hp) operating at a 0.5 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Trenching 8/23/2010 - 9/10/2010 - Default Trenching Description

Off-Road Equipment:

2 Excavators (168 hp) operating at a 0.57 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Other General Industrial Equipment (238 hp) operating at a 0.51 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 0 hours per day

2 Trenchers (63 hp) operating at a 0.75 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Paving 9/13/2010 - 10/1/2010 - Default Paving Description

Acres to be Paved: 9

Off-Road Equipment:

4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 6 hours per day

2 Pavers (100 hp) operating at a 0.62 load factor for 7 hours per day

2 Paving Equipment (104 hp) operating at a 0.53 load factor for 6 hours per day

2 Rollers (95 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 7 hours per day

Phase: Building Construction 9/27/2010 - 5/27/2011 - Default Building Construction Description

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Cranes (399 hp) operating at a 0.43 load factor for 6 hours per day

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

2 Forklifts (145 hp) operating at a 0.3 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Generator Sets (49 hp) operating at a 0.74 load factor for 8 hours per day

2 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Welders (45 hp) operating at a 0.45 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Architectural Coating 4/4/2011 - 7/29/2011 - Default Architectural Coating Description

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 50

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Nonresidential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Construction Mitigated Detail Report:**CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Mitigated**

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10 Dust</u>	<u>PM10 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5 Dust</u>	<u>PM2.5 Exhaust</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Time Slice 6/1/2010-7/30/2010	3.73	21.97	16.77	0.00	<u>2.79</u>	0.12	<u>2.92</u>	<u>0.58</u>	0.11	<u>0.70</u>	2,897.05
Active Days: 44											
Mass Grading 06/01/2010-07/30/2010	3.73	21.97	16.77	0.00	2.79	0.12	2.92	0.58	0.11	0.70	2,897.05
Mass Grading Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.79	0.00	2.79	0.58	0.00	0.58	0.00
Mass Grading Off Road Diesel	3.69	21.89	15.36	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.11	0.11	2,734.02
Mass Grading On Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mass Grading Worker Trips	0.04	0.07	1.40	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	163.02

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Time Slice 8/2/2010-8/20/2010	3.73	21.97	16.77	0.00	<u>2.79</u>	0.12	<u>2.92</u>	<u>0.58</u>	0.11	<u>0.70</u>	2,897.05
Active Days: 15											
Fine Grading 08/02/2010-08/20/2010	3.73	21.97	16.77	0.00	2.79	0.12	2.92	0.58	0.11	0.70	2,897.05
Fine Grading Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.79	0.00	2.79	0.58	0.00	0.58	0.00
Fine Grading Off Road Diesel	3.69	21.89	15.36	0.00	0.00	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.11	0.11	2,734.02
Fine Grading On Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fine Grading Worker Trips	0.04	0.07	1.40	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	163.02
Time Slice 8/23/2010-9/10/2010	3.76	20.05	15.20	0.00	0.01	0.14	0.14	0.00	0.12	0.13	2,620.66
Active Days: 15											
Trenching 08/23/2010-09/10/2010	3.76	20.05	15.20	0.00	0.01	0.14	0.14	0.00	0.12	0.13	2,620.66
Trenching Off Road Diesel	3.71	19.96	13.51	0.00	0.00	0.13	0.13	0.00	0.12	0.12	2,425.03
Trenching Worker Trips	0.05	0.09	1.69	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	195.63
Time Slice 9/13/2010-9/24/2010	5.92	22.92	17.80	0.01	0.05	0.41	0.46	0.02	0.38	0.39	2,969.23
Active Days: 10											
Asphalt 09/13/2010-10/01/2010	5.92	22.92	17.80	0.01	0.05	0.41	0.46	0.02	0.38	0.39	2,969.23
Paving Off-Gas	1.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	3.81	16.52	12.67	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.15	0.00	0.14	0.14	1,730.32
Paving On Road Diesel	0.46	6.26	2.32	0.01	0.03	0.25	0.28	0.01	0.23	0.24	912.87
Paving Worker Trips	0.08	0.15	2.81	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	326.05

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Time Slice 9/27/2010-10/1/2010	<u>9.64</u>	<u>37.70</u>	<u>38.64</u>	<u>0.02</u>	0.10	<u>0.59</u>	0.68	0.03	<u>0.54</u>	0.57	<u>5,955.47</u>
Active Days: 5											
Asphalt 09/13/2010-10/01/2010	5.92	22.92	17.80	0.01	0.05	0.41	0.46	0.02	0.38	0.39	2,969.23
Paving Off-Gas	1.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	3.81	16.52	12.67	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.15	0.00	0.14	0.14	1,730.32
Paving On Road Diesel	0.46	6.26	2.32	0.01	0.03	0.25	0.28	0.01	0.23	0.24	912.87
Paving Worker Trips	0.08	0.15	2.81	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	326.05
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.72	14.78	20.84	0.01	0.05	0.18	0.23	0.02	0.16	0.18	2,986.23
Building Off Road Diesel	3.37	13.17	11.38	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.09	0.09	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.10	1.18	1.05	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	243.50
Building Worker Trips	0.25	0.44	8.42	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.74
Time Slice 10/4/2010-12/31/2010	3.72	14.78	20.84	0.01	0.05	0.18	0.23	0.02	0.16	0.18	2,986.23
Active Days: 65											
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.72	14.78	20.84	0.01	0.05	0.18	0.23	0.02	0.16	0.18	2,986.23
Building Off Road Diesel	3.37	13.17	11.38	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.09	0.09	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.10	1.18	1.05	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	243.50
Building Worker Trips	0.25	0.44	8.42	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.74
Time Slice 1/3/2011-4/1/2011 Active Days: 65	3.43	13.83	19.81	0.01	0.05	0.17	0.22	0.02	0.15	0.17	2,986.28
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.43	13.83	19.81	0.01	0.05	0.17	0.22	0.02	0.15	0.17	2,986.28
Building Off Road Diesel	3.11	12.38	11.06	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.09	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.09	1.06	0.97	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.04	243.52
Building Worker Trips	0.22	0.40	7.78	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.77

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Time Slice 4/4/2011-5/27/2011	<u>29.98</u>	<u>13.85</u>	<u>20.17</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.05</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>0.22</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.15</u>	<u>0.17</u>	<u>3.031.17</u>
Active Days: 40											
Building 09/27/2010-05/27/2011	3.43	13.83	19.81	0.01	0.05	0.17	0.22	0.02	0.15	0.17	2,986.28
Building Off Road Diesel	3.11	12.38	11.06	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.09	1,765.99
Building Vendor Trips	0.09	1.06	0.97	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.04	243.52
Building Worker Trips	0.22	0.40	7.78	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.04	976.77
Coating 04/04/2011-07/29/2011	26.55	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Architectural Coating	26.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.01	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Time Slice 5/30/2011-7/29/2011	26.55	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Active Days: 45											
Coating 04/04/2011-07/29/2011	26.55	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89
Architectural Coating	26.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.01	0.02	0.36	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	44.89

Construction Related Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures apply to Phase: Fine Grading 8/2/2010 - 8/20/2010 - Default Fine Site Grading/Excavation Description

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 84% PM25: 84%

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Replace ground cover in disturbed areas quickly mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 5% PM25: 5%

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Water exposed surfaces 2x daily watering mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 55% PM25: 55%

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Equipment loading/unloading mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 69% PM25: 69%

For Unpaved Roads Measures, the Reduce speed on unpaved roads to less than 15 mph mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 44% PM25: 44%

For Unpaved Roads Measures, the Manage haul road dust 2x daily watering mitigation reduces emissions by:

Page: 11

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

PM10: 55% PM25: 55%

For Graders, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Graders, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Graders, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Rubber Tired Dozers, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Rubber Tired Dozers, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Rubber Tired Dozers, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Water Trucks, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Water Trucks, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Water Trucks, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

The following mitigation measures apply to Phase: Mass Grading 6/1/2010 - 7/30/2010 - Default Mass Site Grading/Excavation Description

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Apply soil stabilizers to inactive areas mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 84% PM25: 84%

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Replace ground cover in disturbed areas quickly mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 5% PM25: 5%

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Water exposed surfaces 2x daily watering mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 55% PM25: 55%

For Soil Stabilizing Measures, the Equipment loading/unloading mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 69% PM25: 69%

For Unpaved Roads Measures, the Reduce speed on unpaved roads to less than 15 mph mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 44% PM25: 44%

For Unpaved Roads Measures, the Manage haul road dust 2x daily watering mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 55% PM25: 55%

For Graders, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Graders, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Graders, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Rubber Tired Dozers, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Rubber Tired Dozers, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Rubber Tired Dozers, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Water Trucks, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Water Trucks, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

Page: 13

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

For Water Trucks, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

The following mitigation measures apply to Phase: Trenching 8/23/2010 - 9/10/2010 - Default Trenching Description

For Excavators, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Excavators, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Excavators, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Other General Industrial Equipment, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Other General Industrial Equipment, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Other General Industrial Equipment, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Trenchers, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Trenchers, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Trenchers, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

The following mitigation measures apply to Phase: Paving 9/13/2010 - 10/1/2010 - Default Paving Description

For Cement and Mortar Mixers, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

Page: 14

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

For Cement and Mortar Mixers, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Cement and Mortar Mixers, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Pavers, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Pavers, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Pavers, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Rollers, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Rollers, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Rollers, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Paving Equipment, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Paving Equipment, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Paving Equipment, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

The following mitigation measures apply to Phase: Building Construction 9/27/2010 - 5/27/2011 - Default Building Construction Description

For Cranes, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Cranes, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Cranes, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Forklifts, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

Page: 15

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Forklifts, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Forklifts, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Generator Sets, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Generator Sets, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Generator Sets, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

For Welders, the Use Aqueous Diesel Fuel mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15% PM10: 50% PM25: 50%

For Welders, the Diesel Particulate Filter (DPF) 1st Tier mitigation reduces emissions by:

PM10: 85% PM25: 85%

For Welders, the Diesel Oxidation Catalyst 15% mitigation reduces emissions by:

NOX: 15%

The following mitigation measures apply to Phase: Architectural Coating 4/4/2011 - 7/29/2011 - Default Architectural Coating Description

For Nonresidential Architectural Coating Measures, the Nonresidential Exterior: Use Low VOC Coatings mitigation reduces emissions by:

ROG: 10%

For Nonresidential Architectural Coating Measures, the Nonresidential Interior: Use Low VOC Coatings mitigation reduces emissions by:

ROG: 10%

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

<u>Source</u>	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas	0.08	1.08	0.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,301.24
Hearth - No Summer Emissions							
Landscape	0.61	0.10	7.73	0.00	0.03	0.03	14.04
Consumer Products	0.00						
Architectural Coatings	0.68						
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	1.37	1.18	8.64	0.00	0.03	0.03	1,315.28

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Area Source Mitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Mitigated

<u>Source</u>	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas	0.06	0.87	0.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,040.99
Hearth - No Summer Emissions							
Landscape	0.49	0.08	6.18	0.00	0.02	0.02	14.04
Consumer Products	0.00						
Architectural Coatings	0.62						
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	1.17	0.95	6.91	0.00	0.02	0.02	1,055.03

Area Source Mitigation Measures Selected

<u>Mitigation Description</u>	<u>Percent Reduction</u>
Commercial Increase Energy Efficiency Beyond Title 24	20.00
Percent of Commercial and Industrial Landscape Equipment that are Electrically Powered and have Electrical Outlets Available	20.00
For Nonresidential Interior Use Low VOC Coating	10.00
For Nonresidential Exterior Use Low VOC Coating	10.00

Area Source Changes to Defaults

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Operational Unmitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

<u>Source</u>	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
Fast food rest. w/ drive thru	15.53	20.58	173.37	0.17	26.30	5.28	16,837.60
Regnl shop. center	12.60	16.60	139.24	0.14	21.37	4.29	13,657.42
Supermarket	24.19	30.66	257.55	0.25	38.66	7.77	24,785.34
Convenience market with gas pumps	14.31	14.78	125.03	0.11	16.94	3.42	11,025.52
Pharmacy/drugstore with drive through	7.45	9.42	79.09	0.08	11.87	2.39	7,611.62
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	74.08	92.04	774.28	0.75	115.14	23.15	73,917.50

Operational Mitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Mitigated

<u>Source</u>	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
Fast food rest. w/ drive thru	8.44	11.17	94.07	0.09	14.27	2.87	9,136.44
Regnl shop. center	6.42	8.19	68.69	0.07	10.54	2.12	6,737.04
Supermarket	12.06	15.05	126.45	0.12	18.98	3.81	12,168.83
Convenience market with gas pumps	9.84	10.15	85.87	0.08	11.63	2.35	7,571.72
Pharmacy/drugstore with drive through	4.26	5.32	44.66	0.04	6.70	1.35	4,297.99
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	41.02	49.88	419.74	0.40	62.12	12.50	39,912.02

Operational Mitigation Options SelectedResidential Mitigation MeasuresNonresidential Mitigation Measures

Non-Residential Mix of Uses Mitigation

Page: 19

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Nonresidential Mitigation Measures

NOTE this mitigation measure INCREASES Trips by 2.4%

Inputs Selected:

The number of housing units within a 1/2 mile radius of the project, plus the number of residential units included in the project are 5200.

The employment for the study area (within a 1/2 mile radius of the project) is 200.

Non-Residential Local-Serving Retail Mitigation

Percent Reduction in Trips is 2%

Inputs Selected:

The Presence of Local-Serving Retail checkbox was selected.

Non-Residential Transit Service Mitigation

Percent Reduction in Trips is 0.47%

Inputs Selected:

The Number of Daily Weekday Buses Stopping Within 1/4 Mile of Site is 0

The Number of Daily Rail or Bus Rapid Transit Stops Within 1/2 Mile of Site is 20

The Number of Dedicated Daily Shuttle Trips is 0

Non-Residential Pedestrian/Bicycle Friendliness Mitigation

Page: 20

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Nonresidential Mitigation Measures

Percent Reduction in Trips is 3.61%

Inputs Selected:

The Number of Intersections per Square Mile is 200

The Percent of Streets with Sidewalks on One Side is 10%

The Percent of Streets with Sidewalks on Both Sides is 90%

The Percent of Arterials/Collectors with Bike Lanes or where Suitable,

Direct Parallel Routes Exist is 10%

Non-Residential Parking Supply Mitigation for Fast food rest. w/ drive thru

Percent Reduction in Trips is 45.74%

The Parking Supply reduction is larger than the sum of Mix of Uses, Local Serving Retail,

Transit Service and Bike/Ped mitigation measures: 3.68%

Therefore the Parking Supply percent will be used in place of these other mitigation reductions.

Inputs Selected:

For the 3.86 units of Fast food rest. w/ drive thru the Parking Provision was set to 18

The ITE Parking Rate manual states that: 147.51 spaces should be provided.

Non-Residential Parking Supply Mitigation for Regnl shop. center

Percent Reduction in Trips is 50.67%

The Parking Supply reduction is larger than the sum of Mix of Uses, Local Serving Retail,

Transit Service and Bike/Ped mitigation measures: 3.68%

Page: 21

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Nonresidential Mitigation Measures

Therefore the Parking Supply percent will be used in place of these other mitigation reductions.

Inputs Selected:

For the 49.84 units of Regnl shop. center the Parking Provision was set to 354

The ITE Parking Rate manual states that: 15152.56 spaces should be provided.

Non-Residential Parking Supply Mitigation for Supermarket

Percent Reduction in Trips is 50.9%

The Parking Supply reduction is larger than the sum of Mix of Uses, Local Serving Retail,

Transit Service and Bike/Ped mitigation measures: 3.68%

Therefore the Parking Supply percent will be used in place of these other mitigation reductions.

Inputs Selected:

For the 43.83 units of Supermarket the Parking Provision was set to 241

The ITE Parking Rate manual states that: 12871.16 spaces should be provided.

Non-Residential Parking Supply Mitigation for Convenience market with gas pumps

Percent Reduction in Trips is 31.33%

The Parking Supply reduction is larger than the sum of Mix of Uses, Local Serving Retail,

Transit Service and Bike/Ped mitigation measures: 3.68%

Therefore the Parking Supply percent will be used in place of these other mitigation reductions.

Inputs Selected:

For the 3.88 units of Convenience market with gas pumps the Parking Provision was set to 21

Page: 22

12/4/2009 7:55:04 AM

Nonresidential Mitigation Measures

The ITE Parking Rate manual states that: 51.18 spaces should be provided.

Non-Residential Parking Supply Mitigation for Pharmacy/drugstore with drive through

Percent Reduction in Trips is 43.53%

The Parking Supply reduction is larger than the sum of Mix of Uses, Local Serving Retail,

Transit Service and Bike/Ped mitigation measures: 3.68%

Therefore the Parking Supply percent will be used in place of these other mitigation reductions.

Inputs Selected:

For the 15.61 units of Pharmacy/drugstore with drive through the Parking Provision was set to 85

The ITE Parking Rate manual states that: 511.71 spaces should be provided.

Operational Settings:

Includes correction for passby trips

Includes the following double counting adjustment for internal trips:

Residential Trip % Reduction: 0.00 Nonresidential Trip % Reduction: 0.00

Analysis Year: 2011 Temperature (F): 85 Season: Summer

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Summary of Land Uses

Land Use Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT
Fast food rest. w/ drive thru		716.00	1000 sq ft	3.86	2,763.76	15,086.21
Regnl shop. center		42.94	1000 sq ft	49.84	2,140.13	12,261.36
Supermarket		102.24	1000 sq ft	43.83	4,481.18	22,175.61

Summary of Land Uses

Land Use Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT
Convenience market with gas pumps		845.60	1000 sq ft	3.88	3,280.93	9,700.40
Pharmacy/drugstore with drive through		88.16	1000 sq ft	15.61	1,376.18	6,810.17
					14,042.18	66,033.75

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Light Auto	45.5	0.9	98.9	0.2
Light Truck < 3750 lbs	9.6	2.1	92.7	5.2
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs	21.8	0.5	99.5	0.0
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs	12.1	0.8	98.4	0.8
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs	1.9	0.0	78.9	21.1
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs	0.6	0.0	50.0	50.0
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs	0.8	0.0	12.5	87.5
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Urban Bus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Motorcycle	4.5	62.2	37.8	0.0
School Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Motor Home	1.5	0.0	86.7	13.3

	<u>Travel Conditions</u>					
	Residential			Commercial		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Urban Trip Length (miles)	12.7	7.0	9.5	13.3	7.4	8.9
Rural Trip Length (miles)	17.6	12.1	14.9	15.4	9.6	12.6
Trip speeds (mph)	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1			
 % of Trips - Commercial (by land use)						
Fast food rest. w/ drive thru				5.0	2.5	92.5
Regnl shop. center				2.0	1.0	97.0
Supermarket				2.0	1.0	97.0
Convenience market with gas pumps				2.0	1.0	97.0
Pharmacy/drugstore with drive through				2.0	1.0	97.0

Operational Changes to Defaults

Ambient summer temperature changed from 80 degrees F to 85 degrees F