



# **INITIAL STUDY & MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

**Faith Bible Church Project  
(Planning Application No. 17-0111)**

**Lead Agency:**

City of Wildomar  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, CA 92595

**Prepared by:**

PlaceWorks  
3910 Normal Street, Suite C  
San Diego, CA 92103

May 2019



# Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
	PROJECT SITE .....	1
	SURROUNDING AREA.....	1
<b>III.</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM .....</b>	<b>41</b>
	A. BACKGROUND.....	41
	B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED .....	43
	C. DETERMINATION .....	44
<b>VI.</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>45</b>
	1. AESTHETICS .....	45
	2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES .....	51
	3. AIR QUALITY .....	53
	4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	63
	5. CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	70
	6. ENERGY .....	72
	7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	77
	8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.....	82
	9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	89
	10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .....	93
	11. LAND USE AND PLANNING .....	98
	12. MINERAL RESOURCES .....	99
	13. NOISE .....	100
	14. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	111
	15. PUBLIC SERVICES.....	112
	16. RECREATION.....	114
	17. TRANSPORTATION .....	115
	18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	131
	19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.....	135
	20. WILDFIRE.....	140

<b>VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE .....</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>VIII. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>148</b>

## TABLES

Table 1 Project Impact and Mitigation Summary .....	6
Table 3-1 Trip Generation – Existing Land Uses.....	54
Table 3-2 Trip Generation – Proposed Project Land Uses .....	55
Table 3-3 Construction-Related Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day) .....	57
Table 3-4 Long-Term Operational Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day) .....	58
Table 3-5 Equipment-Specific Grading Rates.....	60
Table 3-6 Localized Significance of Construction Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day) .....	60
Table 3-7 Localized Significance of Operational Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day) .....	61
Table 6-1 Estimated Project Electricity Demands .....	73
Table 6-2 Estimated Project Natural Gas Demands.....	74
Table 6-3 Operation-Related Vehicle Fuel and Energy Usage .....	75
Table 8-1 Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	82
Table 8-2 Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	83
Table 8-3 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Consistency .....	84
Table 8-4 Project Consistency with Applicable CARB Scoping Plan Measures .....	86
Table 13-1 Noise Measurements .....	100
Table 13-2 Sensitive Receptors .....	101
Table 13-3 Existing Traffic Noise Levels .....	101
Table 13-4 Typical Construction Noise Levels .....	104
Table 13-5 Future Traffic Noise Levels .....	106
Table 13-6 Typical Construction Equipment Vibration Levels .....	108
Table 17-1 Proposed Project Trip Generation .....	116
Table 17-3 Existing Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions .....	117
Table 17-5 Existing Plus Project Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions .....	123
Table 17-6 Existing Plus Project Plus Ambient Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions .....	124
Table 17-7 Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions .....	125
Table 17-8 Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Plus Project Mid-Day (Sunday) Intersection Conditions .....	126

## FIGURES

Figure 1	Regional Location.....	27
Figure 2	Local Vicinity .....	29
Figure 3	Aerial Photograph .....	31
Figure 4	Existing Drainage.....	33
Figure 5	Offsite Drainage Conditions .....	35
Figure 6	Existing Land Use and Zoning.....	37
Figure 7	Site Plan .....	39
Figure 8	Site Renderings .....	49
Figure 9	Existing Travel Lanes and Intersections .....	119
Figure 10	Project Only Daily Traffic.....	121

## APPENDICES

1. **Appendix 1.0** – Development Plans, Visioneering Studios and David Neault Associates (January 2019)
2. **Appendix 2.0** – Air Quality Assessment, Kimley-Horn Associates (January 2019)
3. **Appendix 3.0** – Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation, ELMT Consulting (October 2018)
4. **Appendix 4.0** – Jurisdictional Delineation of State and Federal Jurisdictional Waters, ELMT Consulting (October 2018)
5. **Appendix 5.0** – Energy Calculations. (February 2019)
6. **Appendix 6.0** – Fault Hazards Investigation, Aragon Geotechnical (February 2017)
7. **Appendix 7.0** – Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment, Kimley-Horn Associates (January 2019)
8. **Appendix 8.0** – Preliminary Drainage Study, FM Civil Engineers (January 2019)
9. **Appendix 9.0** – Water Quality Management Plan, FM Civil Engineers (February 2019)
10. **Appendix 10.0** – Acoustical Assessment, Kimley-Horn Associates, (January 2019)
11. **Appendix 11.0** – Traffic Impact Analysis and Addendum, Michael Baker International (January 2019)

**Note to Reader:** To save natural resources, the appendices are contained on a CD-ROM included with the printed copy of this Initial Study. The Initial Study/MND document and Appendices are also available on the Environmental Documents Center of the City of Wildomar Planning Department website (<http://www.cityofwildomar.org/cms/One.aspx?portalId=9894827&pageId=10911316>). :

**City of Wildomar, Planning Department**

23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201

Wildomar, CA 92595

Hours: Monday–Thursday, 8 a.m. – 5 p.m. (closed Fridays)

## I. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### Purpose and Project Overview

This Initial Study evaluates the following development applications:

- **General Plan Amendment (GPA):** The project would require approval of a General Plan Amendment to convert the existing land uses of Commercial Office (CO) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Commercial Retail (CR) on two parcels (APN: 376-410-002 & 376-410-024).
- **Lot Line Adjustment:** The proposed project will require a lot line adjustment prior to project approval to move the line adjoining the existing parcels (APN: 376-410-002 & 376-410-024) westward. The project site is 25.58 acres total. The lot line adjustment would expand APN 376-410-002 to 24.31 acres and reduce APN 376-410-024 to 1.27 acres. All physical improvements would occur within APN 376-410-002 (24.31 acres). APN 376-410-024 (1.27 acres) would remain undeveloped and is not proposed for development under this project; any future proposed development would require separate CEQA review and discretionary approvals.
- **Plot Plan (PP):** The project requires approval of a plot plan for the Faith Bible Church development including related on-/off-site improvements. The worship area, children's ministry building, and the gymnasium would be approximately 27,489 square feet, 16,486 square feet, and 18,024 square feet, respectively. The proposed project would result in a total of 795 parking spaces upon completion of all construction phases.

The purpose of this Initial Study is to evaluate the potential environmental effects associated with construction and occupancy of the planned development project and to provide mitigation where necessary to avoid, minimize, or lessen environmental effects. All square footages provided in this Initial Study are approximate, and are subject to modification during the final design process which will be reviewed and approved by the City of Wildomar.

## II. EXISTING CONDITIONS

### Project Site

The project site encompasses APN: 376-410-024 and 376-410-002 and is in an undeveloped area of Wildomar on the eastern side of the Interstate-15 (I-15) freeway. Access to the site is provided by Depasquale and Glazebrook Roads to the south and southeast. There is no public roadway access to the site from the north. The regional and local vicinity of the project site are shown in **Figure 1, Regional Location**, and **Figure 2, Local Vicinity**. An aerial photograph of the project site is shown in **Figure 3, Aerial Photograph**.

### Surrounding Area

The project site is surrounded by single family residences and vacant land to the north and east, and by Interstate 15 and single-family residences to the south and west. Further north and northeast are single family residences, undeveloped land, and the Ronald Reagan Elementary School. West of the I-15 Freeway are single family residences (Windsong Valley community) and Donald Graham Elementary School. Regional access is provided by the I-15 freeway adjacent to the project south and west.

## Physical Setting

The project site is approximately 25.58 acres and is predominately undeveloped with topography varying from 1,328 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 1,368 feet amsl. The developed portion of the site includes unfinished asphalt roadway near the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road, and drainage channel inlets. The site has been subject to a variety of man-made disturbances which includes illegal off-road activities, weed abatement, and dirt trails for recreational uses. The site consists of rolling terrain and is dominated by three plant communities; mulefat scrub, non-native grassland, and disturbed Riversidian sage scrub.

### Drainage

The site is traversed by three (3) major offsite drainage areas. Existing offsite flows enter the property at various locations along the northerly boundary line and the easterly boundary where they travel south west towards the westerly property line and Caltrans Right-of-way (ROW). The off-site drainage watercourse that enters from the east is currently being collected by Line E, an existing 78-inch storm drain pipe part of the Murrieta Valley Glazebrook Storm Drain (RCFCD DWG No. 7-404). These flows are conveyed via Line E storm drain line where it terminates with a headwall west of Depasquale Road. (see **Figure 4, Existing Drainage**).

Developed flows are then collected by two separate existing culverts with concrete headwalls which are located on near the easterly Caltrans ROW, and east of the westerly property line. The two culverts are located within Caltrans ROW. The northerly culvert is a 72-inch pipe, and the southerly culvert is an 84-inch storm drain pipe; it is understood that they are owned and maintained by Caltrans. The storm drain culverts, however, have been extended through development and as part of the Wildomar Valley Twinflower Storm Drain & Trillium Lateral (RCFCD DWG No. 7-141). Both storm drain culverts converge at 650 feet west of the westerly property line at Twinflower Avenue, and continue southwest for approximately 4,000 feet through residential development to Palomar Street, where it enters an open channel traveling west for 1,400 feet where it ultimately discharges to Murrieta Creek (see **Figure 5, Off-Site Drainage**).

### Fault Activity and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone

A fault line traverses the site from the northwestern portion to the southern near the intersection of Glazebrook Road and Depasquale Road. Additionally, the site is in a very high fire hazard severity zone. Refer to VI. 20, Wildfire, for further discussion on wildfire impacts. Appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed to mitigate these potential impacts (see Executive Summary below).

## Regulatory Setting

The City of Wildomar General Plan land use designations for the project site are Commercial Office (CO) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) (see **Figure 6, Existing Land Use and Zoning**). The CO land use allows for a variety of office related uses including financial, legal, insurance, and other office uses with a 0.35 to 1.0 floor area ratio. The MDR land use allows for single-family detached and attached residences with a density range of 2 to 5 dwelling units per acre, limited agriculture and animal keeping, and lot sizes ranging from 5,500 to 20,000 square feet would be allowed.

The proposed Faith Bible Church project would require a General Plan Amendment (GPA) of the existing CO and MDR land uses to Commercial Retail (CR) to be brought into conformance with the site's existing C-1/C-P zoning. The Commercial Retail land use would allow for local and regional serving retail and service uses with a FAR of 0.20 to 0.35. In addition, pursuant to Municipal Code Section 17.72.010 (Uses



Permitted within the C-1 and C-P General Commercial Zones), a plot plan would be required as part of project approval.

### III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed development includes construction of a 27,489 square -foot worship building with ultimate capacity for 1,030 seats and includes assembly areas, rooms for bible study/religious education, and training and worship rooms. The project also includes construction of a 16,486 square-foot children's ministry/child care building (to be used during worship services only), an 18,024 square-foot gymnasium, three (3) residential dwellings (to be used for visiting missionaries), amphitheater, and 795 parking spaces. **Figure 7, Site Plan**, shows a site plan of the proposed improvements. Additionally, the project includes a lot line adjustment of APNs 376-410-024 and -002, expanding APN 376-410-002 to 24.31 acres and reducing APN 376-410-024 to 1.27 acres. All physical improvements would be constructed on APN 376-410-002; APN 376-410-024 would be left undeveloped for a potential new use in the future, which would be evaluated under separate CEQA review.

#### Construction Phasing

The proposed project would be constructed in seven (7) phases. Although it is unlikely, it is possible that some phases may be built simultaneously, or that more than seven phases would be needed for construction. **Figure 7, Site Plan**, shows the proposed improvements that would be constructed within each phase. The analysis assumes full build out of the seven phases of the proposed project as shown in **Figure 7**. For the purposes of this analysis, construction is anticipated to begin at the end of 2019 and be completed by 2021.

##### Phase 1

Phase 1 includes rough grading of the entire site and construction of water quality basins and major drainage structures. For Phase 1 the worship building would be approximately 8,279 square feet with a seating capacity of 584 seats. Two parking lots would be constructed south and southwest of the proposed worship building and would have 205 and 117 parking spaces (399 total), respectively. A roadway with the entrance from the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road would bisect the two lots and connect to a roundabout near the north-central portion of the site.

##### Phase 2

Phase 2 would include the expansion of the worship building to approximately 27,489 square feet with a total capacity of 1,030 seats. The finished worship building would be 34 feet 4 inches tall at the peak of the pitch roof. The church building would consist of the worship area with a stage, sound booth, three storage areas, lobby area, meeting room, nursery, two classrooms, group room, counseling room, work room, study area, kitchen/café, and restrooms.

Phase 2 would also include construction of the Children's Building. The Children's Building would be approximately 16,486 square feet, and would include a group room, nine classrooms, volunteer room, café/lounge, storage, and restrooms. The main courtyard area would be constructed between and to the south of the Children's Building and the Faith Bible Church with stairway and ADA ramp that leads to the parking lot to the south.

A tot-lot/playground would also be constructed on the west side of the Children's Building and would be surrounded by a security fence. The tot playground would be equipped with a playhouse, shade structure, swings, seat walls and benches with backs.

### Phase 3

Phase 3 includes construction of an 18,024 square-foot gymnasium and a restroom, equipment room, and a pad for construction of a future outdoor room to the east of the Faith Bible Church.

### Phase 4

Phase 4 includes construction of a future athletic field which would also serve as overflow parking, with space for 172 parking stalls.

### Phase 5

Phase 5 includes construction of an amphitheater and pavilion at the northeastern portion of the project site. Phase 5 also includes construction of an additional overflow parking area with 64 stalls at the southern corner of the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road. Glazebrook Road would be extended westward between the Phase 4 and Phase 5 parking lots and would run parallel to the Interstate 15 freeway.

### Phase 6

Phase 6 includes construction of an additional overflow parking area with space for 160 parking stalls near the northwestern portion of the site. The parking lot would be accessed by the extended Glazebrook Road or the roundabout constructed in Phase 1 (see **Figure 7, Site Plan**).

### Phase 7

Phase 7 includes construction of three detached single-family units, which would be accessory uses to the church and not available for resale. These three units are proposed near the southeast portion of the site. These residences will be used to house church guests such as visiting missionaries and their families.

The proposed development plans, including architectural renderings and elevations, are provided in **Appendix 1**.

## **Roadway Access**

The proposed project would provide two points of vehicular access. The primary access would be a full-access driveway at the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road and the secondary access would be a full-access driveway on Glazebrook Road approximately 230 feet east of Depasquale Road. The project would include modification of the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road to include a driveway connection adding the north leg of the intersection and extending Glazebrook Road to the west then along the I-15 freeway right-of-way, up to the northern boundary of the project site. The Glazebrook Road extension would bisect the parking lots constructed in Phases 4 and 5 and would extend along the northern boundary of the site, around the eastern side of the church and connect to the Phase 6 parking lot. Glazebrook Road would ultimately link up to Bayless Road to the north providing street access to Baxter Road per the General Plan Circulation Element.

## **Utilities**

There are no existing utility connections on the project site. Water and sewer connections for the surrounding vicinity are provided by the Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD). There are 12-inch sewer and water lines beneath Depasquale Road and 8-inch sewer and water lines beneath Glazebrook Road. Power and telephone service in the project site vicinity is provided by underground

lines on Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road. The proposed improvements would be connected to these water, sewer, power, and telecommunication lines.

## **Grading and Drainage**

### Grading

The entire 25.58-acre site would be graded to accommodate the proposed development and would include approximately 80,000 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill.

Additionally, retaining walls would be installed at the northern portion of the site due to the significant topography of the area. A 9-foot 5-inch retaining wall would be constructed along the northern portion of the Faith Bible Church area and the northwestern parking lot. An additional 5-foot 5-inch retaining wall would be constructed north of the proposed roundabout.

### Drainage

The project will utilize a subsurface storm drain, drainage inlets, to convey peak flows and utilize two onsite infiltration basins to mitigate for water quality and hydromodification requirements. The two infiltration basins would be installed at the southwestern portion of the site between the I-15 and the Phase 4 overflow parking lot.

All onsite surface storm flows will be directed to onsite drop curb and street inlets and conveyed via the storm drain pipe system where they will discharge to two infiltration basins; an emergency overflow (weir) will be utilized to by-pass the 100-year storm flow where they will be collected and conveyed by street storm drain system and ultimately by the existing culverts crossing below I-15.

## **Other Offsite Improvements**

The project entails construction of offsite improvements to adjoining roadways which include the following: construct partial width improvements on the northerly side of Glazebrook Road at its ultimate cross-section as a Collector with a curb-to-curb width of 60 feet and 80-foot right-of-way adjacent to the project's property boundary line; and modify the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road to include a project driveway connection forming the north and west legs of the intersection.

## **IV. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Through analysis provided in this IS/MND, it was determined that the proposed project has the potential to result in significant environmental impacts with regard to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, transportation and traffic, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire. Mitigation measures are identified that would reduce all impacts to less than significant levels. **Table 1** presents an at-a-glance summary of the identified significant impact issue areas and required mitigation measures.

**Table 1**  
**Project Impact and Mitigation Summary**

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Biological Resources</b>			
<p>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p><b>BIO-1</b> Due to the presence of potentially suitable habitat on the project site and in adjacent off-site areas, a 30-day preconstruction survey for burrowing owl is required pursuant to the MSHCP. If burrowing owls are determined present during this survey, occupied burrows shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible, following the guidelines in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation published by Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW 2012), including but not limited to, conducting additional preconstruction surveys, avoiding occupied burrows during the nesting and nonbreeding seasons, implementing a worker awareness program, biological monitoring, establishing avoidance buffers, and flagging burrows for avoidance with visible markers. If occupied burrows cannot be avoided, acceptable methods may be used to exclude burrowing owl either temporarily or permanently, pursuant to a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan that shall be prepared and approved by the County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department (EPD), in coordination with the CDFW. The Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation and the MSHCP.</p> <p>In accordance with the MSHCP, take of active nests will be avoided. Passive relocation (i.e., the scoping of the burrows by a burrowing owl biologist and collapsing burrows free of young) will occur when owls are present outside</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>the nesting season. The EPD may require translocation sites for the burrowing owl to be created in the MSHCP reserve for the establishment of new colonies, pursuant to MSHCP objectives for the species. Translocation sites, if required, will be identified in consultation with EPD and/or CDFW, taking into consideration unoccupied habitat areas, presence of burrowing mammals, existing colonies, and effects to other MSHCP-covered species.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> No more than 30 days prior to/during any vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager, project applicant</p>	
<p>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p><b>BIO-2</b> To offset direct impacts to 0.17-acre of riparian/riverine habitat, the applicant would create a mitigation site to enhance habitat within Drainage C totaling 0.30-acre of riparian/riverine habitat and 1.71-acre of Riversidean sage scrub (RSS) habitat on-site. Habitat “enhancement” activities shall include the removal of all non-native plant species from the entire mitigation site and non-riparian/wetland plant species (establishment only) from within the streambed, the removal of trash and debris; the installation of temporary irrigation; and the installation of appropriate container stock and seed mixes. Native plant materials (including seeds) that are proposed for removal during project activities will be used for restoration purposes, as will native riparian vegetation that is not proposed for removal but is already located within the mitigation site. Refer to Exhibit 10, <i>Proposed Mitigation Site</i>, of <b>Appendix</b></p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p><b>3.0</b>, for a depiction of the proposed mitigation site. The enhancement of 0.30-acre of riparian/riverine habitat and restoration/enhancement of 1.71-acre of RSS habitat that is biologically superior habitat to the riparian/riverine habitat within Drainage C and surrounding habitat that currently exists onsite, including that which will be directly impacted by site development.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> During construction</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager, project applicant</p> <p><b>BIO-3</b> All plant species installed within the mitigation site shall include only local California native container plants and cuttings and shall be typical of the existing native plant species present in the existing riparian/riverine areas within and adjacent to the project site. The streambed bottom is proposed to be revegetated with native riparian vegetation, and the streambanks are proposed to be revegetated/enhanced with native RSS plant species. Drainages A and B shall be pipelined underground across the project site and discharged into the mitigation site to provide increased water flows for the riparian vegetation during rain events. Plant material should be installed between October 1 and April 30 to maximize the benefits of the winter rainy season. The planted area would have a conservation easement placed over it and would be maintained by a third party approved by the regulatory agencies that would provide for the long-term management and maintenance in perpetuity.</p>	

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> Prior to any vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager, project applicant</p> <p><b>BIO-4</b> The applicant will be responsible for implementing the requirements of the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) and initial establishment. The HMMP will describe the methods used for invasive species, trash removal, fencing and signage replacement, will identify success criteria and reporting requirements, and will define responsibilities, adaptive management, and expected maintenance. The long-term management and maintenance costs would transfer to a third party as approved by the regulatory agencies. The mitigation site would be off-limits to the public and residents. Furthermore, signage and homeowner education materials would be provided to local residents, as well as the staff and members of the Faith Bible Church, regarding these restrictions.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> During occupancy</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> Project applicant</p> <p><b>BIO-5</b> To reduce impacts to the portions of Drainages A and C, and riparian/riverine habitat, the following minimization measures to reduce direct and indirect impacts, outlined in <b>Appendix 3.0</b>, shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Temporarily blocking off portions of Drainages A and C with silt fencing or another permeable material that would</li> </ul>	

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>prevent construction from depositing sediment into areas outside the project site while still allowing water to flow through the site should there be a rain event;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Minimizing measures to reduce impacts caused by fugitive dust would include watering soil or applying chemical stabilizer to construction egress/ingress points; covering stockpiles or spraying stockpiles with chemical stabilizer; minimizing the amount of area disturbed by clearing, grading, and other earthmoving activities;</li> <li>▪ Preventing toxic runoff by implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) which shall identify BMPs; BMPs shall be monitored and repaired as appropriate;</li> <li>▪ Minimizing impacts as a result of accidental encroachment during construction by training construction workers by a qualified biologist during pre-construction meeting, incorporating exclusionary fencing and signs near the top of slopes adjacent to conserved riparian/riverine habitat, and ensuring that a qualified biologist be onsite during initial clearing/grubbing and o/or construction activities within the riparian/riverine habitat within Drainages A and B; and</li> <li>▪ Reducing post-construction human disturbances by incorporating special edge treatments designed to minimize edge effects by providing a safe transition between developed areas and conserved riparian/riverine habitat.</li> </ul> <p><i>Timing/Implementation: During construction</i></p>	



Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<i>Enforcement/Monitoring: Project applicant</i>	
Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Potentially significant	<b>BIO-1 (refer to mitigation language above)</b>	Less than significant
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Potentially significant	<b>TRI-1</b> through <b>TRI-5</b> (see <i>Tribal Cultural Resources</i> , below).	Less than significant
Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	Potentially significant	<b>CUL-1</b> If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the most likely descendant and notify them of discovery. The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in	Less than significant

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> During any ground-disturbing construction activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department</p>	
<b>Geology and Soils</b>			
Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Potentially significant	<p><b>GEO-1</b> The project applicant shall incorporate the recommendations of the Fault Report prepared by Aragon Geotechnical, Inc. (2017; <b>Appendix 6.0</b>) into project plans related to the proposed project. The project's building plans shall demonstrate that they incorporate all applicable recommendations of the design-level Fault Report and comply with all applicable requirements of the latest adopted version of the California Building Code. A licensed professional engineer shall prepare the plans, including those that pertain to soil engineering, structural foundations, pipeline excavation, and installation. All plans will be subject to the approval of the City Engineer.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> Prior to any ground-disturbing construction activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Planning Department and Building and Safety Department</p>	Less than significant
Strong seismic ground shaking?	Potentially significant	<b>GEO-1</b>	Less than significant

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	Potentially significant	<b>GEO-1</b>	Less than Significant
Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Potentially significant	<b>GEO-1</b>	Less than Significant
Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Potentially significant	<b>GEO-2</b> Construction personnel involved in excavation and grading activities shall be informed of the possibility of discovering fossils at any location and the protocol to be followed if fossils are found. A professional meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's standards shall provide the preconstruction training. The City shall ensure the grading plan notes include specific reference to the potential discovery of fossils. If potentially unique paleontological resources (fossils) are inadvertently discovered during project construction, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City shall be notified, and a professional paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. The paleontologist	Less than Significant

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance throughout project construction and shall establish, in cooperation with the project applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. Excavated finds shall be offered to a State-designated repository such as the Museum of Paleontology at the University of California, Berkeley, or the California Academy of Sciences.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> During any ground-disturbing construction activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department</p>	
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>			
Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	Potentially significant	<p><b>HAZ-1</b> Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Building Official and the Riverside County Fire Chief, compliance with the 2016 California Building Code (or the most recent edition) (Part 2 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations) and the 2016 California Fire Code (or the most recent edition) (Part 9 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations), including those regulations pertaining to materials and construction methods intended to mitigate wildfire exposure as described in the 2016 California Building Code and California Residential Code (or most recent edition); specifically California Building Code Chapter 7A; California Residential Code Section R327; California Residential Code Section</p>	Less than significant

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>R337; California Referenced Standards Code Chapter 12-7A; and California Fire Code Chapter 49.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> Prior to issuance of building permits</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Building Department and Riverside County Fire Department</p> <p><b>HAZ-2</b> Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Building Official and the County Fire Chief, compliance with the vegetation management requirements prescribed in California Fire Code Section 4906, including California Government Code Section 51182.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Building Department and Riverside County Fire Department</p>	
<b>Noise</b>			
Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Potentially significant	<p><b>NOI-1</b> Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of Wildomar Planning Department that the project complies with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction contracts specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices.</li> <li>Property owners and occupants located within 200 feet of the</li> </ul>	Less than significant

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>project boundary shall be sent a notice, at least 15 days prior to commencement of construction of each phase, regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the project construction site. All notices and signs shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Wildomar Community Development Director (or designee), prior to mailing or posting and shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Contractor shall provide evidence that a construction staff member will be designated as a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and will be present on-site during construction activities. The Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall notify the City within 24-hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the Community Development Director (or designee). All notices that are sent to residential units immediately</li> </ul>	

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>surrounding the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall include the contact name and the telephone number for the Noise Disturbance Coordinator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to issuance of any Grading or Building Permit, the project Applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director (or designee) that construction noise reduction methods shall be used where feasible. These reduction methods include shutting off idling equipment, installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and electric air compressors and similar power tools.</li> <li>• Construction haul routes shall be designed to avoid noise sensitive uses (e.g., residences, convalescent homes, etc.), to the extent feasible.</li> <li>• During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.</li> <li>• Construction activities shall not take place outside of the allowable hours specified by the City's Municipal Code Section 9.48.020, (6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM during the months of</li> </ul>	

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>October through July).</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> Prior to grading permit issuance and during construction phase or any ground-breaking activity</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Planning Department and Public Works Department</p>	
<b>Transportation</b>			
Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Potentially significant	<p><b>TRAF-1</b> If the following improvements are included in the City of Wildomar Capital Improvement and Development Impact Fee Programs, the proposed project shall pay the City fees necessary to meet their fair share of the improvements. If the following improvements are not constructed prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant will construct the improvement and be able to seek reimbursement of its costs beyond its fair share amount through a reimbursement agreement to be developed with the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Installation of a traffic signal at Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive and provide a dedicated eastbound left-turn lane.</li> <li>• Convert the two-way stop control to all-way stop control at Depasquale Road / George Avenue and provide striping in eastbound approach to include a through-shared-left turn lane and a dedicated right-turn lane.</li> <li>• At Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Northbound</i> – Restripe to provide one dedicated left-turn lane, one through lane and one</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Less than significant



Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>dedicated right-turn lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Southbound</i> – Restripe to provide one dedicated left-turn lane and one through-shared right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> Prior to Occupancy</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Planning Department and Public Works Department</p>	
<b>Tribal Cultural Resources</b>			
Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k).	Potentially significant	<p><b>TRI-1</b> To address the possibility that historical, archaeological, and/or tribal cultural resources (collectively referred to as “cultural resources” in these mitigation measures) may be encountered during grading or construction, a qualified professional archaeologist shall monitor all construction activities that could potentially impact cultural resources (e.g., grading, excavation, and/or trenching). The Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians may assign individuals to monitor all grading, excavation, and groundbreaking activities as well, and the tribal monitors shall be allowed on-site during any construction activities that could potentially impact cultural resources. However, monitoring may be discontinued as soon the qualified professional and the appropriate tribe(s) are satisfied that construction will not disturb cultural resources.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> During any ground-disturbing construction activities</p>	Less than significant

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Planning Department and Building and Safety Department</p> <p><b>TRI-2</b> At least 30 days but no more than 60 days prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation which will be determined in consultation with the tribe(s) that intend to assign tribal monitors pursuant to mitigation measure <b>CUL-1</b>. The archaeologist and the tribal monitor(s) will have the authority to temporarily halt and redirect grading activities in order to evaluate the significance of any cultural resources discovered on the project site.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> Thirty days prior to any ground-disturbing construction activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department</p> <p><b>TRI-3</b> At least 30 days but no more than 60 days prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project applicant shall contact the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians with notification of the proposed grading and shall enter into a Tribal Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement with the tribe(s). The agreements shall include, but not be limited to, outlining provisions and requirements for addressing the handling of tribal cultural resources; project grading and development scheduling; terms of</p>	

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>compensation for tribal monitors; treatment and final disposition of any tribal cultural resources, including but not limited to sacred sites, burial goods, and human remains, discovered on the site; and establishing on-site monitoring provisions and/or requirements for professional tribal monitors during all ground-disturbing activities. The terms of the agreements shall not conflict with any of these mitigation measures. A copy of the signed agreement shall be provided to the Planning Director and the Building Official prior to the issuance of the first grading permit.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> : At least thirty days but no more than sixty days prior to ground-disturbing construction activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department</p> <p><b>TRI-4</b> If during grading or construction activities, cultural resources are discovered on the project site, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery and the resources shall be evaluated by the archaeologist and the tribal monitor(s). Any cultural resources that are discovered shall be evaluated and a final report prepared by the archaeologist. The report shall include a list of the resources discovered; documentation of each site/locality; interpretation of the resources identified; a determination of whether the resources are historical resources, unique or non-unique archeological resources, and/or tribal cultural resources; and the method of preservation and/or recovery for the identified resources. If the</p>	

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>archaeologist, in consultation with the tribes, determines the cultural resources to be either historic resources or unique archaeological resources, avoidance and/or mitigation will be required pursuant to and consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the City, project applicant, project archaeologist, and consulting tribe(s) reach an agreement regarding the appropriate treatment of the cultural resources, which may include avoidance or appropriate mitigation. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b), avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological and cultural resources. Work may continue outside of the buffer area and will be monitored by additional tribal monitors, if needed as determined by the project archaeologist and the consulting tribe(s).</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> During any ground-disturbing construction activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department</p> <p><b>TRI-5</b> In the event that cultural resources are discovered during the course of grading (inadvertent discoveries), the following shall be carried out for final disposition of the discoveries:</p> <p>a. The landowner(s) shall agree to relinquish ownership of all recovered tribal cultural resources to the consulting tribe(s), including</p>	

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>sacred items and all artifacts, as part of the required treatment for impacts to cultural resources.</p> <p>b. One or more of the following treatment, in order of preference below, with (i) being the preferred treatment and (ii) being the secondary preferred treatment, shall be employed with the agreement of all parties. Evidence of such agreement shall be provided to the City:</p> <p>i. Preservation in place of the cultural resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in place they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.</p> <p>ii. On-site relocation to a preservation area shall be accomplished as requested by the consulting tribe(s). The preservation area location shall be governed by measures and provisions to protect the preservation area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Relocation shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed. No recordation of sacred items is permitted without the written consent of the consulting tribe(s).</p> <p>iii. Only if (i) and (ii) above cannot be employed, curation shall be arranged with an appropriate qualified repository that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79. The cultural resources</p>	


Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
		<p>would be professionally curated and made available to other archeologists/researchers/tribal governments for further research and culturally appropriate use. The collections and associated records shall be transferred to a curation facility meeting the above federal standards to be accompanied by a curation agreement and payment of any fees necessary for permanent curation.</p> <p><i>Timing/Implementation:</i> During any ground-disturbing construction activities</p> <p><i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i> City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department</p>	
<p>A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>	<p>Potentially significant</p>	<p><b>CUL-1 and TRI-1 through TRI-5</b></p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Impact	Level of Significance without Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Resulting Level of Significance
<b>Wildfire</b>			
Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Potentially significant	<b>HAZ-1</b> and <b>HAZ-2</b>	Less than significant
Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	Potentially significant	<b>HAZ-1</b> and <b>HAZ-2</b>	Less than significant

*This page intentionally left blank.*




Figure 1 - Regional Location



Source: ESRI, 2018

*This page intentionally left blank.*

Figure 2 - Local Vicinity



*This page intentionally left blank.*



Figure 3 - Aerial Photograph



— Project Site

0 1000  
Scale (Feet)




Source: Google Earth, 2018

*This page intentionally left blank.*




Figure 4 - Existing Drainage Conditions




*This page intentionally left blank.*



Figure 5 - Off-Site Drainage





0 1000  
Scale (Feet)



*This page intentionally left blank.*



Figure 6 - Existing Land Use and Zoning




Source: City of Wildomar, 2018.


*This page intentionally left blank.*



Figure 7 - Site Plan



0 200  
Scale (Feet)



*This page intentionally left blank.*

## V. ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

### A. BACKGROUND

1. **Project Title:**

Faith Bible Church Project (Planning Application No. 17-0111)

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:**

City of Wildomar, 23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201, Wildomar, CA 92595

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Matthew Bassi, Planning Director; (951) 677-7751, ext. 213

4. **Project Location:**

The project site encompasses APN: 376-410-024 and 376-410-002, and is northwest and northeast of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road in Wildomar, California.

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

Faith Bible Church, 23811 Washington Avenue, #C110-313, Murrieta CA, 92562

6. **General Plan Designation:**

Commercial Office (CO) and Medium Density Residential (MDR). The project would require a General Plan Amendment to convert the land use designation to Commercial Retail (CR).

7. **Zoning:**

C-1/C-P (General Commercial)

8. **Description of Project:**

The proposed development includes construction of a an approximately 27,489 square foot church building with 1,030 seats and includes assembly areas, rooms for bible study/religious education, and training and worship rooms. The project also includes construction of a 16,486 square-foot child care building, an 18,024 square foot gymnasium, three residential dwellings to be used for visiting missionaries, amphitheater, and 795 parking spaces. **Figure 7, Site Plan**, shows a site plan of the proposed improvements.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

ADJACENT LAND USE, LAND USE, AND ZONING			
Location	Current Land Use	General Plan Land Use Designation	Zoning
North	Residences and Vacant	BP (Business Park); MDR (Medium Density Residential)	R-R (Rural Residential)
South	Interstate 15 and Residences	MDR (Medium Density Residential); CR (Commercial Retail)	R-1 (One Family Dwelling); C-P-S (Scenic Highway Commercial)

ADJACENT LAND USE, LAND USE, AND ZONING			
Location	Current Land Use	General Plan Land Use Designation	Zoning
East	Residences and Vacant	MDR (Medium Density Residential)	R-R (Rural Residential); R-1 (One Family Dwelling)
West	Interstate 15, Residences	MDR (Medium Density Residential)	R-1 (One Family Dwelling)

**10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval May Be Required:**

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District

**11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

The City of Wildomar sent notices to 27 tribes in accordance with SB 18. Four tribes responded, three of which requested formal consultation in accordance with AB 52 (Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians); the Pala Band of Mission Indians Tribe stated they do not have tribal lands within the project site. The City of Wildomar also sent notice to tribes that have requested to be notified of projects pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. The City has completed consultations with the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians. (Please refer to section VI.18 of the Initial Study, Tribal Cultural Resources.)



## B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project involving at least one impact that is “Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

### C. DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

#### City Representative



04/24/2019

Matthew C. Bassi, Planning Director

Date

#### Applicant

Pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the California Environmental Quality Act, as the project applicant, I agree to revisions of the project plans or proposals as described in this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration to avoid or reduce environmental impacts of my project to a less than significant level.



John Pleasnick, Faith Bible Church,  
Applicant

04/24/2019

Date

## VI. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

### 1. Aesthetics

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			✓	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			✓	
c) In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? ( <i>Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point</i> ). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			✓	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	

### DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Scenic vistas and scenic backdrops in the project vicinity include views of mountain ridgelines such as Mt. Palomar to the south, Bachelor and Black Mountains to the east, Santa Rosa Mountains to the west and the Elsinore Mountains to the north and west. Southerly views of mountain ridgelines from the northern portion of the project site are generally obstructed by residences and trees. Northward views of the mountain ridgelines from the southern portion of the project site are generally unobstructed with some residences visible at the base of the mountain. Easterly views of the mountain ridgelines from the western portion of the site and I-15 Freeway are generally obstructed by up-sloping topography and residences. Westerly views of the mountain ridgelines from the eastern portion of the project site include views of I-15 and residential uses at the base of the mountain.

The proposed Faith Bible Church building would be the tallest structure proposed on the project site at approximately 34 feet and 4 inches in height. Although the site is currently vacant and the proposed buildings would alter views of the surrounding mountain ridgelines, the existing grade where the structures are proposed is approximately 1,375 feet amsl, and the finished grade of the Church would be approximately 1,354 feet amsl; therefore, the peak of the tallest proposed building would be approximately 13 feet above the existing grade, or approximately the height of a single story building. Furthermore, views of the surrounding ridgelines extend across the length of the project site from all view points and the proposed improvements would only obstruct a portion of views. In addition, the applicant worked with the City of Wildomar during the site design process to reduce the height of the secondary buildings and increase separation between buildings to further reduce the profile of the improvements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and this impact would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed structures would alter the existing visual character of the area by removing naturally occurring vegetation. Construction of the project would not require the removal of any tree, rock outcropping, or historic building that has been recognized as a scenic resource, and the proposed buildings would not block any scenic view or resource. Through the site design process, the project applicant and City worked to reduce the overall profile and massing of the buildings. In order to screen public views of the project site, the proposed project would include landscape screening along the southern perimeter (see **Figure 8, Site Renderings**). The nearest officially designated State Scenic Highway to the site is the eastern portion of State Route (SR) 74, approximately 25-miles east (Caltrans 2011). The I-15 freeway, which bounds the western portion of the project site, is listed as an eligible State Scenic Highway, but is not officially designated (Caltrans 2011). Therefore, impacts to scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is an urbanized area, but is vacant with ornamental vegetation and has been previously disturbed by illegal off-road vehicles activities, weed abatement, and informal dirt trails for recreational use. The surrounding area consists of vacant land and residences to the north, south, and west of I-15; east of I-15 and south and east of the site are single family residences. Although the project would change the undeveloped character of the site, the proposed project would be compatible with the existing development pattern and character along Glazebrook Road, with building materials and colors that complement the existing and planned development on adjacent properties. Furthermore, the proposed project would be designed in consideration of the City of Wildomar Design Standards and Guidelines and in consultation with the City staff. Compliance with these existing standards would ensure that the proposed project would feature quality design and architecture and would be compatible with the character of the adjacent uses. Additionally, the proposed site plan, including the proposed buildings, have been reviewed by the City of Wildomar for conformance with the City's standards and found acceptable. For subsequent phases, if there are changes from the project as-proposed they would be reviewed for consistency by the Planning Commission. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. This impact would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would result in construction of new parking lots and facilities that would result in an increase in glare and night time lighting. Sources of new and increased nighttime lighting and illumination include, but are not limited to, lights associated with vehicular travel (e.g., car headlights), street lighting, parking lot lights, exterior lighting for buildings and related facilities, and security-related lighting. Light pollution is regulated by Chapter 8.64, *Light Pollution*, of the Wildomar Municipal Code. The City's light pollution ordinance establishes limits on the types of fixtures and size of bulbs for all aspects of development. Compliance with the ordinance, which is verified as part of building permit application review and then prior to occupancy to ensure correct installation and operation, would result in a less than significant impact on nighttime light pollution. Night-time recreation at the project site is not anticipated. The project site is zoned C-1/C-P (General Commercial) and is located adjacent to a residential community with similar lighting. Moreover, consistent with the City's lighting standards (Municipal Code Section 8.64.090), all proposed exterior light fixtures must have full cutoff so that there is no light pollution created above the 90-degree plane of the light fixtures. Additionally, per Section 8.64.090, all light fixtures installed along the perimeter would include house-side shields to eliminate the spillover of light pollution onto streets and neighboring properties. The light fixtures would be reviewed on the development plan and verified during building and site inspections to ensure compliance with the ordinance. Compliance with the ordinance would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and the project would not contribute to night sky and would be in

compliance with the Wildomar development standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

**STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. The project is required to comply with the provisions of Wildomar Municipal Code Chapter 8.64, Light Pollution.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

*This page intentionally left blank.*

Figure 8 - Site Renderings



*This page intentionally left blank.*



## 2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			✓	
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?				✓
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✓
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			✓	

### DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The southern boundary and a portion of the center of the project site are mapped as Farmland of Local Importance (DLRP 2016a); the remainder of the site is not defined. According to the City of Wildomar General Plan, farmlands of local importance include the following:

- Lands with soils that would be classified as Prime or Statewide Important Farmlands but lack available irrigation water.
- Lands planted in 1980 or 1981 in dry land grain crops such as barley, oats, and wheat.

- Lands producing major crops for Riverside County but that are not listed as Unique Farmland crops. Such crops are permanent pasture (irrigated), summer squash, okra, eggplant, radishes, and watermelon.
- Dairylands including corrals, pasture, milking facilities, hay and manure storage areas if accompanied with permanent pasture or hayland of 10 acres or more.
- Lands identified by the County with Agriculture land use designations or contracts.
- Lands planted with jojoba that are under cultivation and are of producing age (Wildomar 2003).

The project site is currently zoned C-1/C-P (General Commercial), and is not designated for agricultural uses in the General Plan (Wildomar 2003). The proposed project would construct non-agricultural uses on Farmland of Local Importance uses within the City of Wildomar. However, the site has historically not been used for farmland, and the project would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

b) **No Impact.** The project site is zoned C-1/C-P (General Commercial) and is not zoned for agricultural use (Wildomar 2016). The project site is located on land not enrolled in a Williamson Act contract (DLRP 2016b). No impact would occur.

c) **No Impact.** The project site is zoned C-1/C-P; project implementation would not cause rezoning of forestland or timberland. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) **No Impact.** The project site does not contain forestland, nor is the project site zoned forestland. Implementation of the proposed project would not convert forestland to non-forest use and would not result in a loss of forestland. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) **Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would result in the construction of a church building, children's building, gymnasium, three single-family dwelling units, a parking lot, maintenance/equipment building, athletic field/facility, and an amphitheater. The proposed project, which is zoned C-1/C-P, would convert construct non-agricultural uses on locally designated farmland. However, the site does not operate as farmland and conversion of locally designated farmland would not constitute a significant environmental impact; therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

None required.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

### 3. Air Quality

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			✓	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				✓

An Air Quality Assessment was prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc. (2019a) (see **Appendix 2.0**). The analysis was prepared to evaluate the potential for construction and operation of the proposed project to contribute to air quality.

#### DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is in the South Coast Air Basin (SoCAB), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the basin is in nonattainment: ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), coarse particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). These are considered criteria pollutants because they are three of several prevalent air pollutants known to be hazardous to human health. (An area designated as nonattainment for an air pollutant is an area that does not achieve national and/or state ambient air quality standards for that pollutant.)

In order to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the SoCAB is in nonattainment, the SCAQMD has adopted the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The 2016 AQMP establishes a program of rules and regulations directed at reducing air pollutant emissions and achieving state (California) and national air quality standards. The 2016 AQMP is a regional and multi-agency effort including the SCAQMD, the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), and the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The 2016 AQMP pollutant control strategies are based on the latest scientific and technical information and planning assumptions, including SCAG's 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, updated emission inventory methodologies for various source categories, and SCAG's latest growth forecasts, defined in consultation with local governments and with reference to local general plans. The project is subject to the SCAQMD's AQMP.

Criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP are defined by the following indicators:

- Consistency Criterion No. 1: The proposed project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the

timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP.

- Consistency Criterion No. 2: The proposed project will not exceed the assumptions in the AQMP based on the years of project buildout phase.

The violations to which Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers are the California ambient air quality standards (CAAQS) and the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). As evaluated under Issue b) below, the project will not exceed the short-term construction standards or long-term operational standards and in so doing will not violate any air quality standards. Thus, no impact would occur, and the project would be consistent with the first criterion.

Concerning Consistency Criterion No. 2, the AQMP contains air pollutant reduction strategies based on SCAG's latest growth forecasts. SCAG's growth forecasts were defined in consultation with local governments and with reference to local guidelines. Growth projections from local general plans adopted by cities in the district are provided to SCAG, which develops regional growth forecasts that are used to develop future air quality forecasts for the AQMP. Development consistent with the growth projections in the Wildomar General Plan is considered to be consistent with the AQMP.

The project site is currently designated as Commercial Office and Medium Density Residential. The proposed General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation to Commercial Retail would match the existing zoning designation of C-1/C-P on both parcels. The proposed development of a religious institution would comply with the Municipal Code Section 17.72.010, under which churches, temples, and other places of religious worship are permitted. The project is expected to result in job growth for employment at the church, but it is not expected to exceed the population or job growth and associated trip projections used by the SCAQMD to develop the Air Quality Management Plan, which were based on the current General Plan commercial land use designations for the project site.

**Table 3-1, Trip Generation – Existing Land Uses**, shows the trip generation with buildout of the existing land uses, and **Table 3-2, Trip Generation – Proposed Project Land Uses**, shows the project generated traffic that would result from the General Plan Amendment proposed by the project.

**Table 3-1 Trip Generation – Existing Land Uses**

<b>Weekday Trips</b>			
<i>Land Use/ITE Code<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Trip Rate<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Existing General Plan Intensity</i>	<i>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</i>
Commercial Office (General Office Building [710])	11.03 trips/day/1,000 square feet	220,849 square feet <sup>2</sup>	2,436 trips
Medium Density Residential (Single-Family Residential [220])	9.52 trip/DU	20 DU <sup>3</sup>	190 trips
		<b>Total Daily Weekday Trips</b>	<b>2,626</b>

**Table 3-1 Trip Generation – Existing Land Uses**

<b>Weekday Trips</b>			
<b>Sunday Trips</b>			
<i>Land Use/ITE Code<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Trip Rate<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Existing General Plan Intensity</i>	<i>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</i>
Commercial Office (General Office Building [710])	1.05 trips/1,000 square feet	220,849 square feet <sup>2</sup>	232 trips
Medium Density Residential (Single-Family Residential [220])	8.62 trip / DU	20 DU <sup>3</sup>	172 trips
		<b>Total Sunday Trips</b>	<b>404</b>
Source: Appendix 11, Traffic Impact Analysis and Addendum. <sup>1</sup> ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition. <sup>2</sup> Minimum CO density is 0.35 dwelling units (DU) per acre. APN 376-410-024 is 14.49 acres. 0.35 DU x 14.49-acres = 5.07 x (43,560 square feet/1 acre) = 220,849 square feet of office space. <sup>3</sup> Minimum MDR density is 2 DU per acre. APN 376-410-002 is 10.04 acres. 2 DU x 10.04 acres = 20 DU			

**Table 3-2 Trip Generation – Proposed Project Land Uses**

<b>Weekday Trips</b>			
<i>Land Use/ITE Code<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Trip Rate<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Proposed Intensity</i>	<i>Average Daily Trips</i>
Church (560)	9.11 trips/1,000 square feet	74,309 square feet	677
		<b>Total Daily Weekday Trips</b>	<b>677</b>
<b>Sunday Trips</b>			
<i>Land Use/ITE Code<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Trip Rate<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Proposed Intensity</i>	<i>Average Daily Trips</i>
Church (560)	1.85 trips / seat	1,112 seats	2,057
		<b>Total Sunday Trips</b>	<b>2,057</b>
Source: Appendix 11, Traffic Impact Analysis and Addendum. <sup>1</sup> ITE Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition.			

To provide a more conservative analysis that would result in the least amount of average daily trips the lowest density for each respective land use was assumed (0.35 DU/acre for Commercial Office; and 2 DU/acre for Medium Density Residential). As shown in **Table 3-2**, above, the proposed project would result in 677 ADT on weekdays and 2,057 ADT on Sundays; based on the existing land uses and buildout within the minimum allowable building intensity at the site could average a minimum of 2,626 ADT on weekdays and 404 ADT on Sundays (see **Table 3-1**). Therefore, on weekdays the proposed project would generate 1,949 less ADT than the existing land uses would allow under the minimum allowable density for the Commercial Office and Medium Density Residential parcels, APNs 376-410-024 and -002, respectively. Although the project would generate 1,653 more ADT on Sundays than the existing land

uses, Sunday traffic is off-peak and would generate less ADT than generated on weekdays under existing conditions, which would occur more frequently (Monday through Friday). Therefore, the proposed land uses would generate less ADT over the course of a week and the proposed land uses would have a beneficial impact to the AQMP. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan and is expected to result in a less than significant impact.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed previously, the project site is located in the SoCAB. State and federal air quality standards are often exceeded in many parts of the basin. A discussion of the project's potential short-term construction-period and long-term operational-period air quality impacts is provided below.

#### Construction Emissions

Construction associated with the proposed project would generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. The criteria pollutants of primary concern within the Project area include ozone-precursor pollutants (i.e., ROG and NO<sub>x</sub>) and PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Construction-generated emissions are short term and of temporary duration, lasting as long as construction activities occur, but are considered a significant air quality impact if the volume of pollutants generated exceeds the SCAQMD's thresholds of significance.

Project emissions were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model version 2016.3.2 (CalEEMod). Construction results in the temporary generation of emissions resulting from site grading, road paving, motor vehicle exhaust associated with construction equipment and worker trips, and the movement of construction equipment, especially on unpaved surfaces. Emissions of airborne particulate matter are largely dependent on the amount of ground disturbance associated with site preparation activities as well as weather conditions and the appropriate application of water. On-site earthwork for the project is designed to be balanced with approximately 80,000 cubic yards of cut and fill. To conservatively account for potential soil shrinkage and other adjustments, an additional 15,000 cubic yards of imported fill were included in CalEEMod, which was included in the 1,875 estimated haul trips (see **Appendix 2.0**). Grading of the entire project site would occur at once; however, the project is expected to be built in separate construction phases, but the funding and timing of these separate phases is unknown. Therefore, the emissions were modeled as if the entire project was built in a single construction phase to conservatively capture the emissions of the full development, and the maximum daily emissions that could occur as a result of construction.

Conservatively assuming that construction would occur in a single phase, the duration of construction activities associated with the project is estimated to be approximately 18 months. Construction-generated emissions associated with the Project were calculated using the CARB-approved CalEEMod computer program, which is designed to model emissions for land use development projects, based on typical construction requirements. See **Appendix 2.0** for more information regarding the construction assumptions used in this analysis. Predicted maximum daily construction-generated emissions for the proposed project are summarized in in **Table 3-3, Construction-Related Emissions**.

The emissions rates in CalEEMod decrease in future years due to improved emissions controls, fleet turnover, and inspection and maintenance programs. If future development phases occur in later years, the daily emissions would be lower than what is shown in **Table 3-3, Construction-Related Emissions**.

**Table 3-3**  
**Construction-Related Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day)**

Construction Year	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxide (NO <sub>x</sub> )	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )
2019	7.55	90.58	52.65	0.11	6.50	10.31
2020	16.07	83.41	49.90	0.13	4.73	7.87
2021	15.58	35.90	40.28	0.13	2.81	7.62
<i>SCAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>75</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>150</i>
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
Notes: SCAQMD Rule 403 Fugitive Dust applied. The Rule 403 reduction/credits include the following: properly maintain mobile and other construction equipment; replace ground cover in disturbed areas quickly; water exposed surfaces three times daily; cover stock piles with tarps; water all haul roads twice daily; and limit speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour. Reductions percentages from the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook (Tables XI-A through XI-E) were applied. No mitigation was applied to construction equipment. Refer to Appendix 2.0 for Model Data Outputs.						
Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix 2.0 for model outputs.						

As shown in **Table 3-3**, all criteria pollutant emissions would remain below their respective thresholds and included SCAQMD Rule 403. While impacts would be considered less than significant, the proposed project would also be subject to SCAQMD Rules 402 and 1113 to further reduce specific construction-related emissions.

The SCAQMD's Rule 402 prohibits a person from discharging from any source such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property. Through compliance with the SCAQMD's Rule 402, no significant impact related to odors would occur during the ongoing operations of the proposed project. Rule 403 requires fugitive dust sources to implement Best Available Control Measures for all sources, and all forms of visible particulate matter are prohibited from crossing any property line. SCAQMD Rule 403 is intended to reduce PM<sub>10</sub> emissions from any transportation, handling, construction, or storage activity that has the potential to generate fugitive dust. The proposed project would also be subject to SCAQMD Rule 1113, which limits the volatile organic compounds of architectural coatings used in the SoCAB, thus reducing the amount of reactive organic gas (ROG) off-gassed as paint dries.

#### Operational Emissions

Project-generated emissions would be associated with motor vehicle use and area sources, such as the use of landscape maintenance equipment and architectural coatings. Emissions rates differ from summer to winter because weather factors are dependent on the season and these factors affect pollutant mixing, dispersion, ozone formation, and other factors. Operational activities associated with the proposed project will result in emissions of ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, sulfur oxide (SO<sub>x</sub>), PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Operational emissions would be expected from area sources, energy sources, and mobile sources. Operational-source emissions are summarized in **Table 3-4 Long-Term Operational Emissions**.

**Table 3-4**  
**Long-Term Operational Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day)**

Source	Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	Nitrogen Oxide (NO <sub>x</sub> )	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )
<b>Summer Emissions</b>						
Area Source Emissions	1.71	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Emissions	0.06	0.53	0.44	0.00	0.04	0.04
Mobile Emissions	3.64	24.82	34.15	0.14	2.59	9.45
Total Emissions	5.41	25.36	34.92	0.14	2.63	9.49
<i>SCAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>Winter Emissions</b>						
Area Source Emissions	1.71	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.00
Energy Emissions	0.06	0.53	0.44	0.00	0.04	0.04
Mobile Emissions	3.05	24.63	30.54	0.13	2.59	9.45
Total Emissions	4.82	25.16	31.32	0.13	2.64	9.49
<i>SCAQMD Threshold</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>55</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>150</i>	<i>55</i>
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix 2.0 for model outputs.						

As shown in **Table 3-4**, the project emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria air pollutants for area source, energy, or mobile source emissions under summer and winter scenarios. Therefore, regional operations emissions would result in a less than significant long-term regional air quality impact.

#### Cumulative Short-Term Emissions

The SCAB is designated nonattainment for O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> for State standards and nonattainment for O<sub>3</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> for Federal standards. As discussed above, the project's construction-related emissions by themselves would not have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds for criteria pollutants. Since these thresholds indicate whether individual project emissions have the potential to affect cumulative regional air quality, the project-related construction emissions would not be cumulatively considerable. The SCAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the AQMP pursuant to the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) mandates. The analysis assumed fugitive dust controls would be utilized during construction, including frequent water applications.

SCAQMD rules, mandates, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures would also be imposed on construction projects throughout the Air Basin, which would include related projects.



Compliance with SCAQMD rules and regulations would reduce the proposed Project construction-related impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, project-related construction emissions, in combination with those from other projects in the area, would not substantially deteriorate the local air quality. Construction emissions associated with the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative air quality impacts.

#### Cumulative Long-Term Impacts

The SCAQMD has not established separate significance thresholds for cumulative operational emissions. The nature of air emissions is largely a cumulative impact. As a result, no single project is sufficient in size to, by itself, result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Instead, individual project emissions contribute to existing cumulatively significant adverse air quality impacts. The SCAQMD developed the operational thresholds of significance based on the level above which individual project emissions would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the SoCAB's existing air quality conditions. Therefore, a project that exceeds the SCAQMD operational thresholds would also be a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

As shown in **Table 3-3**, the proposed project operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. As a result, operational emissions associated with the proposed Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative air quality impacts. Additionally, adherence to SCAQMD rules and regulations would alleviate potential impacts related to cumulative conditions on a project-by-project basis. Project operations would not contribute a cumulatively considerable net increase of any nonattainment criteria pollutant.

#### **c) Less Than Significant Impact.**

##### Localized Construction Impacts

The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the single-family residences located 50 feet north of the project site. To identify impacts to sensitive receptors, the SCAQMD recommends addressing localized significance thresholds (LSTs) for construction and operational impacts. LSTs were developed in response to SCAQMD Governing Boards Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative. The SCAQMD (2008) published its Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, recommending that certain air quality analyses include an assessment of both construction and operational impacts on the air quality of nearby sensitive receptors. The LST methodology assists lead agencies in analyzing localized impacts associated with Project-specific emissions.

Since CalEEMod calculates construction emissions based on the number of equipment hours and the maximum daily soil disturbance activity possible for each piece of equipment, **Table 3-5, Equipment Specific Grading Rates**, is used to determine the maximum daily disturbed acreage for comparison to LSTs. The appropriate Source Receptor Area (SRA) for the localized significance thresholds is the Lake Elsinore area (SRA 25) since this area includes the project site. LSTs apply to CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. The SCAQMD produced lookup tables for projects that disturb areas less than or equal to 5 acres in size. Project construction is anticipated to disturb a maximum of 6.5 acres in a single day.

**Table 3-5  
Equipment-Specific Grading Rates**

Construction Phase	Equipment Type	Equipment Quantity	Acres Graded per 8-Hour Day	Operating Hours per Day	Acres Graded per Day
Grading	Graders	2	0.5	8	1.0
	Rubber Tired Dozers	1	0.5	8	0.5
	Scrapers	4	1.0	8	4.0
	Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	0.5	8	1.0
<b>Total Acres Graded per Day</b>					<b>6.5</b>
Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix 2.0 for model outputs.					

The SCAQMD's methodology states that "off-site mobile emissions from the project should not be included in the emissions compared to LSTs." Therefore, for the purposes of the construction LST analysis, only emissions included in the CalEEMod "on-site" emissions outputs were considered. The nearest sensitive receptors are the single-family residences located 50 feet (15 meters) north of the site. LST thresholds are provided for distances to sensitive receptors of 25, 50, 100, 200, and 500 meters. Therefore, LSTs for receptors located at 25 meters were utilized in this analysis. **Table 3-6, Localized Significance of Construction Emissions**, presents the results of localized emissions during construction.

**Table 3-6  
Localized Significance of Construction Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day)**

Construction Activity	Nitrogen Oxide (NO <sub>x</sub> )	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )
Site Preparation (2019)	45.57	22.06	6.44	10.11
Grading (2019)	86.93	51.34	4.86	7.32
Grading (2020)	80.03	48.69	4.57	7.01
Building Construction (2020)	19.19	16.85	1.05	1.12
Building Construction (2021)	17.43	16.57	0.90	0.96
Architectural Coating (2020)	1.68	1.83	0.11	0.11
Architectural Coating (2021)	1.53	1.82	0.09	0.09
Paving (2021)	12.92	14.65	0.62	0.68
<i>SCAQMD Localized Screening Threshold (adjusted for 5 acres at 25 meters)</i>	<i>371</i>	<i>1,732</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>13</i>
<b>Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>
Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix 2.0 for model outputs.				

**Table 3-6** shows that the emissions of these pollutants on the peak day of construction would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. Architectural coatings would overlap with the building and paving phases. The architectural coating PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions of 0.11

lbs/day for both pollutants in 2020 and 0.09 lbs/day in 2021 combined with either of the other phases would not exceed thresholds. Therefore, construction activities would result in a less than significant impact to LSTs.

#### Localized Operational Impacts

According to the SCAQMD localized significance threshold methodology, LSTs apply to on-site sources. LSTs for receptors located at 25 meters for SRA 25 were utilized in this analysis. LSTs are only provided for 1-, 2-, and 5-acre sites. As the LSTs increase with site acreage, the 5-acre LST thresholds were conservatively used for the 25.58-acre project site. The on-site operational emissions are compared to the LST thresholds in **Table 3-7, Localized Significance of Operational Emissions**.

**Table 3-7**  
**Localized Significance of Operational Emissions (Maximum Pounds per Day)**

Construction Activity	Nitrogen Oxide (NO <sub>x</sub> )	Carbon Monoxide (CO)	Fine Particulate Matter (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	Coarse Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )
On-Site Emissions	0.00	0.34	0.00	0.00
SCAQMD Localized Screening Threshold (adjusted for 5 acres at 25 meters)	371	1,732	2	4
Exceed SCAQMD Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix 2.0 for model outputs.				

As shown in **Table 3-7**, the maximum daily emissions of pollutants during operations would not exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds. Therefore, the project would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors and operational LST impacts would be less than significant.

#### Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

An analysis of CO "hot spots" is needed to determine whether the change in the level of service of an intersection resulting from the proposed project would have the potential to result in exceedances of the CAAQS or NAAQS. It has long been recognized that CO exceedances are caused by vehicular emissions, primarily when vehicles are idling at intersections. Vehicle emissions standards have become increasingly stringent in the last 20 years. Currently, the CO standard in California is a maximum of 3.4 grams per mile for passenger cars (requirements for certain vehicles are more stringent). With the turnover of older vehicles, introduction of cleaner fuels, and implementation of control technology on industrial facilities, CO concentrations have steadily declined.

Accordingly, with the steadily decreasing CO emissions from vehicles, even very busy intersections do not result in exceedances of the CO standard. The 2016 AQMP is the most recent version that addresses CO concentrations. As part of the SCAQMD CO Hotspot Analysis, the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection, one of the most congested intersections in Southern California with an average daily traffic (ADT) volume of approximately 100,000 vehicles per day, was modeled for CO concentrations. This modeling effort identified a CO concentration high of 4.6 ppm, which is well below the 35-ppm Federal standard. The proposed Project considered herein would not produce the volume of traffic required to generate a CO hot spot in the context of SCAQMD's CO Hotspot Analysis. As the CO hotspots were not experienced at the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection even as it accommodates 100,000 vehicles daily, it can be reasonably inferred that CO hotspots would not be experienced at any vicinity intersections resulting from 2,057 additional Sunday vehicle trips (peak

generation period) and 678 peak hour trips, and 677 additional daily weekday vehicle trips attributable to the project (see **Appendix 11.0**).

#### Construction-Related Diesel Particulate Matter

Construction would result in the generation of DPM emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required. The amount to which the receptors are exposed (a function of concentration and duration of exposure) is the primary factor used to determine health risk (i.e., potential exposure to TAC emission levels that exceed applicable standards). Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily linked to long-term exposure and the associated risk of contracting cancer.

The use of diesel-powered construction equipment would be temporary and episodic. The duration of exposure would be short and exhaust from construction equipment dissipates rapidly. Current models and methodologies for conducting health risk assessments are associated with longer-term exposure periods of 9, 30, and 70 years, which do not correlate well with the temporary and highly variable nature of construction activities. The closest sensitive receptors are located approximately 50 feet from the property boundary and major project construction areas.

California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment has not identified short-term health effects from DPM. Construction is temporary and would be transient throughout the site (i.e., move from location to location) and would not generate emissions in a fixed location for extended periods of time. Construction would be subject to and would comply with California regulations (Airborne Toxic Control Measure; Title 13, CCR Section 2485) limiting the idling of heavy-duty construction equipment to no more than 5 minutes to further reduce nearby sensitive receptors' exposure to temporary and variable DPM emissions. For these reasons, DPM generated by construction activities, in and of itself, would not be expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial amounts of air toxics and the Project would have a less than significant impact.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Potential odors could arise from the diesel construction equipment used on-site, as well as from architectural coatings and asphalt off-gassing. Odors generated from the referenced sources are common in an urban environment and are not known to be substantially offensive to adjacent receptors. Additionally, odors generated during construction activities would be temporary and would disperse rapidly.

The SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook identifies certain land uses as sources of odors. These land uses include agriculture (farming and livestock), wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The proposed project would not include land uses identified by the SCAQMD as odor sources. Therefore, the project would result in no impact to odor.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. The applicant shall include the measures listed below (or equivalent language) on all project grading plans, construction specifications, and bid documents, and the City shall ensure such language is incorporated prior to issuance of any development permits.
2. SCAQMD Rules shall be applicable during construction activity for this project include but are not limited to: Rule 402 (Nuisance), Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), and Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings) (see **Appendix 2.0**).

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

#### 4. Biological Resources

Issues: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		✓		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				✓
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			✓	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			✓	
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		✓		

A determination of biologically equivalent or superior preservation (DBESP) report was prepared for the project site by ELMT Consulting, Inc., and is included as **Appendix 3.0** of this report (ELMT 2018a). The report analyzes how the proposed project would comply with the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) for impacts to riparian/riverine resources. Additionally, a Delineation of State and Federal Jurisdictional Waters report prepared by ELMT Consulting, Inc. provides mapped jurisdictional features on the project site and is included as **Appendix 4.0** of this report (ELMT 2018b).

#### DISCUSSION

**a) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site has been subject to anthropogenic disturbances including illegal off-road activities, weed abatement, and dirt trails for recreational use; these disturbances have prevented the site from returning to its previous natural condition, thereby reducing the suitability of the on-site habitat to support special-status plant and wildlife species (ELMT 2018a). The project site is dominated by non-native grasses and contains mulefat

scrub, non-native grassland, and disturbed Riversidian sage scrub, as well as ornamental, disturbed, and developed land cover types.

The project site is not within designated survey areas for any special-status wildlife species associated with riparian/riverine habitat, as listed in Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, and does not contain soils known to be associated with listed or sensitive plant species (see **Appendix 3.0**). Burrowing owls are currently designated as a California Species of Special Concern and are considered a partially covered species under the MSHCP; however, based on the habitat assessment, it is presumed that burrowing owls are absent from the project site. Nonetheless, the project site is within the burrowing owl survey area. To ensure the project site does not contain burrowing owls, mitigation measure **BIO-1** shall be implemented which would require a preconstruction site survey for burrowing owls. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife has a protocol for addressing the presence of burrowing owls that can include waiting until the young have fledged, relocating the owl(s) and/or designing around the owl nest if necessary. By requiring a pre-construction survey in coordination with CDFW, Implementation of **BIO-1** would reduce impacts to burrowing owls to a less than significant level.

Based on historical aerial review, previous human disturbances, and current hydrologic regimes of the project site, the project site lacks astatic conditions (ELMT 2018a). Astatic pools, otherwise known as vernal pools, occur as a result of seasonal ponding in an area of topographic depression that is not subject to flowing waters (ELMT 2018a). The lack of astatic pools on the project site indicates that the site does not provide suitable fairy shrimp habitat (ELMT 2018a). Therefore, fairy shrimp habitat and sensitive plant or wildlife species associated with vernal pools, are presumed absent from the project site (ELMT 2018a).

Therefore, impacts to candidate, sensitive, and special-status species as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of **BIO-1**.

**b) Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** Sensitive habitats include (a) areas of special concern to resource agencies; (b) areas protected under CEQA; (c) areas designated as sensitive natural communities by the CDFW; (d) areas outlined in Section 1600 of the California Fish and Game Code (FGC); (e) areas regulated under Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act; and (f) areas protected under local regulations and policies (MSHCP).

During the survey of the project site field staff identified three drainage features classified as riparian/riverine habitat under Section 6.12 of the MSHCP. Two of the three riparian/riverine features (Drainage A and B) have been altered over the years due to extensive on-site disturbances but have maintained flow patterns out of the hills; whereas the other riparian/riverine feature (Drainage C) has been undisturbed within the project site, but was channelized into an underground box culvert running beneath a residential community (ELMT 2018a). According to the DBESP, these riparian/riverine features can be considered to have limited resource value to local and migratory wildlife since these features are generally disturbed and receive flows from and convey immediate flows to developed areas (ELMT 2018a). Additionally, although the riparian/riverine features are ephemeral, with the exception of the small downstream are in Drainage C, they do not support riparian plant communities (ELMT 2018a).

However, all three drainage features eventually discharge into Murrieta Creek, which exhibits a surface hydrologic connection to the Santa Margarita River, and ends in the Pacific Ocean; therefore, the three drainages qualify as waters of the United States and are under regulatory authority of the Corps, Regional Board, and CDFW. Project impacts to these waters of the U.S. are included in **Table 4-1, Jurisdictional Area and Impact Analysis**, below.

**Table 4-1**  
**Jurisdictional Area and Impact Analysis**

Jurisdictional Feature	Corps/Regional Board Jurisdiction Non-Wetland Waters		CDFW Jurisdiction Streambed/Riparian	
	On-site Jurisdiction Acreage (Linear Feet)	Project Impact Acreage (Linear Feet)	On-site Jurisdiction Acreage (Linear Feet)	Project Impact Acreage (Linear Feet)
Drainage A	0.063 (619)	0.052 (465)	0.082 (1,306)	0.071 (1,152)
Drainage B	0.026 (243)	0.026 (243)	0.097 (820)	0.097 (805)
Drainage C	0.248 (1,135)	0.002 (50)	0.328 (1,135)	0.002 (50)
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.337 (1,997)</b>	<b>0.08 (758)</b>	<b>0.507 (3,261)</b>	<b>0.17 (2,007)</b>
Source: <i>Faith Bible Church Delineation of State and Federal Jurisdictional Waters</i> . ELMT Consulting Inc., October 2018.				

As provided in Table 4-1, most of Drainage A (0.071-acre of 0.082-acre of riparian/riverine habitat) and Drainage B (all 0.097-acre of riparian/riverine habitat) would be permanently impacted from project implementation. Approximately 0.002-acre riparian/riverine habitat out of 0.328-acre from Drainage C would be permanently impacted.

Due to the extent of the development that the proposed project requires over jurisdictional wetlands and streambed/riparian habitat, complete avoidance of direct impacts is not feasible. However, the project would avoid 0.011-acre of riparian/riverine habitat within Drainage A and 0.326-acre of riparian/riverine habitat within Drainage C (0.337-acre total on site). Because the project would result in alteration or loss of riparian/riverine habitat a DBESP report was prepared in accordance with the MSCHP. As recommended by the DBESP report, because the project would result in permanent impacts to riparian/riverine habitat, implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-2** would result in enhancement of 0.30-acre of riparian riverine habitat and restoration/enhancement of 1.71-acres of Riversidean Sage scrub (riparian/riverine habitat buffer) on-site.

Moreover, the implementation of mitigation measures **BIO-2**, **BIO-3**, **BIO-4**, and **BIO-5**, which include the creation of a mitigation site to enhance habitat within Drainage C, installation of plant species that are native to California, installation of underground pipelines in Drainages A and B to provide increased water flows to the mitigation site would reduce impacts to riparian habitats to less than significant. Further, implementation of the requirements of the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan, which will describe methods used for invasive species and trash removal, fencing and signage replacement, and will identify success criteria and reporting requirements, as well as adaptive management and expected maintenance would reduce impacts associated to riparian habitats to a less than significant level.

**c) No Impact.** The project site contains three drainage features. Drainages A and B are ephemeral drainages that flow in a north to south direction and Drainage C is an ephemeral drainage that enters the project site near its eastern boundary. According to the Jurisdictional Delineation Report, none of the drainages meet the requirements to be considered a wetland, but are still considered jurisdictional waters under the US Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the CDFW (see **Appendix 4.0**). Drainages A, B, and C were primarily dominated by upland/facultative upland plant species and lacked the necessary amount of hydrophytic vegetation, which are plants that may occur in wetlands, to meet the wetland vegetation parameter; therefore, no wetland features are anticipated to occur on the site (ELMT 2018b).

Moreover, through historic aerial review, existing human disturbances, and current hydrologic regimes of the project site, no vernal pool conditions exist on site, and no impacts to wetlands would occur as a result of the project.

**d) Less Than Significant Impact.** Wildlife corridors refer to established migration routes commonly used by resident and migratory species for passage from one geographic location to another. Movement corridors may provide favorable locations for wildlife to travel between different habitat areas, such as foraging sites, breeding sites, cover areas, and preferred summer and winter range locations. They may also function as dispersal corridors allowing animals to move between various locations within their range. No wildlife corridors or MSHCP linkages are found within the project site boundaries; however, the Proposed Linkage 8, composed of largely upland habitat in the Sedco Hill and Wildomar area, is located approximately 0.64-mile northeast of the project site (see **Appendix 3.0**). The project site has limited potential to be used for wildlife crossing between the Sedco Hills and Elsinore Mountains due to I-15, where all terrestrial wildlife would have to cross through the culvert system going underneath the freeway; the project site also provides limited stopover habitat for avian species (ELMT 2018a). Therefore, impacts to wildlife corridors, as a result of project implementation, would be less than significant.

**e) Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site contains ornamental trees but no trees in the public right of way of Glazebrook Road. Section 12.08.050, *Tree Removal*, of the City of Wildomar Municipal Code states that severely trimming or removing trees within the right-of-way can only be performed after obtaining a permit from the Transportation Director. The City of Wildomar Municipal Code contains fees for tree removal (Municipal Code Section 3.44.260). Payment of all fees is required as a standard condition of approval. While there are currently no trees in the public right of way affected by the project, if trees were to grow in later phases, the City's municipal code states that removal or severe trimming of those trees would be required to comply with the Municipal Code. Impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

**f) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The MSHCP is a habitat conservation plan and natural community conservation plan to which the City of Wildomar is a permittee (i.e., signatory). The project site is located in the Elsinore Area Plan of the MSHCP, but it is not located in or adjacent to a Criteria Cell, conservation area, core, or linkage (ELMT 2018a). Since the site is not located in a Criteria Cell, there are no conservation requirements on the property. The project site is subject to review for consistency with MSHCP Section 6.3.2—Additional Survey Needs and Procedures. The section sets forth the survey requirements for various plant and animal surveys. The project site is not located within a Criteria Area Species Survey Area. However, the project is located in an additional survey area for burrowing owl. No signs of burrowing owl were observed during the field survey; however, there is the potential that this species could become established on-site in the future. As such, project-related activities could result in impacts to burrowing owl. Implementation of mitigation measure **BIO-1** would ensure that potential impacts to burrowing owls are avoided or mitigated to a less than significant level by requiring that a 30-day preconstruction survey for burrowing owls is conducted.

In addition to the preparation of the DBESP required by the MSHCP, the final component of the MSHCP is mitigation fee areas, which are land areas that occur within the MSHCP and require a fee for development activities to occur. These fees are used to fund the minimization of impacts to certain endemic species. The proposed project is located in the MSHCP mitigation fee area (per Wildomar Municipal Code Section 3.42.080) and the Stephens' kangaroo rat mitigation fee area (Wildomar Municipal Code Section 3.43.070). A standard condition for the proposed project includes the payment of these fees to comply with the overlying habitat conservation plan (the MSHCP).



With implementation of the mitigation measure and adherence to the standard conditions and requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. As required by Section 3.42.070 of the Wildomar Municipal Code, the project applicant is required to submit fees to the City in accordance with the requirements of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation Fee.
2. As required by Section 3.43.070 of the Wildomar Municipal Code, the project applicant is required to submit fees to the City in accordance with the requirements of the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation Fee Area.
3. As required by Section 12.08.050 of the Wildomar Municipal Code, any future trees that would be planted in the right-of-way that would require removal or severe trimming can only be performed after obtaining a permit from the Transportation Director. Municipal Code Section 3.44.260, Tree Removal Fees, requires that the appropriate fees be paid in order to remove trees.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

**BIO-1** Due to the presence of potentially suitable habitat on the project site and in adjacent off-site areas, a 30-day preconstruction survey for burrowing owl is required pursuant to the MSHCP. If burrowing owls are determined present during this survey, occupied burrows shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible, following the guidelines in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation published by Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW 2012), including but not limited to, conducting additional preconstruction surveys, avoiding occupied burrows during the nesting and nonbreeding seasons, implementing a worker awareness program, biological monitoring, establishing avoidance buffers, and flagging burrows for avoidance with visible markers. If occupied burrows cannot be avoided, acceptable methods may be used to exclude burrowing owl either temporarily or permanently, pursuant to a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan that shall be prepared and approved by the County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department (EPD), in coordination with the CDFW. The Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation and the MSHCP.

In accordance with the MSHCP, take of active nests will be avoided. Passive relocation (i.e., the scoping of the burrows by a burrowing owl biologist and collapsing burrows free of young) will occur when owls are present outside the nesting season. The EPD may require translocation sites for the burrowing owl to be created in the MSHCP reserve for the establishment of new colonies, pursuant to MSHCP objectives for the species. Translocation sites, if required, will be identified in consultation with EPD and/or CDFW, taking into consideration unoccupied habitat areas, presence of burrowing mammals, existing colonies, and effects to other MSHCP-covered species.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *No more than 30 days prior to/during any vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager, project applicant*

**BIO-2** To offset direct impacts to 0.17-acre of riparian/riverine habitat, the applicant would create a mitigation site to enhance habitat within Drainage C totaling 0.30-acre of riparian/riverine

habitat and 1.71-acre of Riversidean sage scrub (RSS) habitat on-site. Habitat “enhancement” activities shall include the removal of all non-native plant species from the entire mitigation site and non-riparian/wetland plant species (establishment only) from within the streambed, the removal of trash and debris; the installation of temporary irrigation; and the installation of appropriate container stock and seed mixes. Native plant materials (including seeds) that are proposed for removal during project activities will be used for restoration purposes, as will native riparian vegetation that is not proposed for removal but is already located within the mitigation site. Refer to Exhibit 10, Proposed Mitigation Site, of Appendix 3.0, for a depiction of the proposed mitigation site. The enhancement of 0.30-acre of riparian/riverine habitat and restoration/enhancement of 1.71-acre of RSS habitat that is biologically superior habitat to the riparian/riverine habitat within Drainage C and surrounding habitat that currently exists onsite, including that which will be directly impacted by site development.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *During construction*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager,  
project applicant*

- BIO-3** All plant species installed within the mitigation site shall include only local California native container plants and cuttings and shall be typical of the existing native plant species present in the existing riparian/riverine areas within and adjacent to the project site. The streambed bottom is proposed to be revegetated with native riparian vegetation, and the streambanks are proposed to be revegetated/enhanced with native RSS plant species. Drainages A and B shall be pipelined underground across the project site and discharged into the mitigation site to provide increased water flows for the riparian vegetation during rain events. Plant material should be installed between October 1 and April 30 to maximize the benefits of the winter rainy season. The planted area would have a conservation easement placed over it and would be maintained by a third party approved by the regulatory agencies that would provide for the long-term management and maintenance in perpetuity.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *During construction*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager,  
project applicant*

- BIO-4** The applicant will be responsible for implementing the requirements of the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) and initial establishment. The HMMP will describe the methods used for invasive species, trash removal, fencing and signage replacement, will identify success criteria and reporting requirements, and will define responsibilities, adaptive management, and expected maintenance. The long-term management and maintenance costs would transfer to a third party as approved by the regulatory agencies. The mitigation site would be off-limits to the public and residents. Furthermore, signage and homeowner education materials would be provided to local residents, as well as the staff and members of the Faith Bible Church, regarding these restrictions.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *Prior to occupancy*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *Project applicant*

**BIO-5** To reduce impacts to the portions of Drainages A and C, and riparian/riverine habitat, the following minimization measures to reduce direct and indirect impacts, outlined in **Appendix 3.0**, shall be implemented:

- Temporarily blocking off portions of Drainages A and C with silt fencing or another permeable material that would prevent construction from depositing sediment into areas outside the project site while still allowing water to flow through the site should there be a rain event;
- Minimizing measures to reduce impacts caused by fugitive dust would include watering soil or applying chemical stabilizer to construction egress/ingress points; covering stockpiles or spraying stockpiles with chemical stabilizer; minimizing the amount of area disturbed by clearing, grading, and other earthmoving activities;
- Preventing toxic runoff by implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) which shall identify BMPs; BMPs shall be monitored and repaired as appropriate;
- Minimizing impacts as a result of accidental encroachment during construction by training construction workers by a qualified biologist during pre-construction meeting, incorporating exclusionary fencing and signs near the top of slopes adjacent to conserved riparian/riverine habitat, and ensuring that a qualified biologist be onsite during initial clearing/grubbing and o/or construction activities within the riparian/riverine habitat within Drainages A and B; and
- Reducing post-construction human disturbances by incorporating special edge treatments designed to minimize edge effects by providing a safe transition between developed areas and conserved riparian/riverine habitat.

*Timing/Implementation:* During construction

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* Project applicant

## 5. Cultural Resources

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				✓
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?		✓		
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?		✓		

## DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Section 15064.5 defines historic resources as resources listed or determined to be eligible for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission, a local register of historical resources, or lead agency. Generally, a resource is considered to be “historically significant” if it meets one of the following criteria:

- i. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
- ii. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- iii. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- iv. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The project site is currently vacant, and there are no buildings or previous construction activity visible onsite. Project implementation would occur within the footprint of the project site. Thus, project development would not damage historic resources, and no impact would occur.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Archaeological resources are prehistoric or historic evidence of past human activities, including structural ruins and buried resources. The project site is undeveloped, and would require connections to utility lines, ground clearing, excavation, grading, and other construction and ground disturbing activities. There is some possibility that prehistoric and/or historic archaeological resources could be buried in site soils and could be damaged by project ground-disturbing activities. Mitigation measures **TRI-1** through **TRI-5** (see VI. 19, Tribal Cultural Resources) would ensure that any archaeological resources discovered on site would be properly managed by having a qualified archaeologist to monitor construction and grading activities, complying with the provisions outlined in the Tribal Cultural Resource Treatment and Monitoring Agreement, and halting construction within 50 feet of discovered resources in the event that they are uncovered and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** While the project site does not contain any obvious surface features that would suggest the presence of cultural resources, construction of the project would involve grading and excavation below the surface. California Health and Safety Code

Section 70520.5 requires that in the event that human remains are discovered within the project site, disturbance of the site shall halt and remain halted until the coroner has conducted an investigation into the circumstances, manner, and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative. If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes or has reason to believe the human remains to be those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission. The project would comply with existing law, and potential impacts to human remains would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure **CUL-1**.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

None required.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

**CUL-1** If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the most likely descendant and notify them of discovery. The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

*Timing/Implementation: During any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring: City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department*

Refer to mitigation measures **TRI-1** through **TRI-5** in section VI. 18, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this document.

## 6. Energy

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			✓	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			✓	

### a) Less Than Significant Impact.

#### Construction

During construction, the project would consume energy in two general forms: (1) the fuel energy consumed by construction vehicles and equipment; and (2) bound energy in construction materials, such as asphalt, steel, concrete, pipes, and manufactured or processed materials such as lumber and glass.

Construction of the proposed project would require the use of construction equipment for grading, hauling, and building activities. Equipment proposed for these types of activities are included in Table 3-3, in section 3, *Air Quality*, above. Electricity use during construction would vary during different phases of construction—the majority of construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas powered or diesel powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment, such as interior construction and architectural coatings. Construction also includes the vehicles of construction workers traveling to and from the project site and haul trucks for the export of materials from site clearing and the export and import of soil for grading.

The surrounding area is already served by electricity provided by Southern California Edison (SCE) and natural gas infrastructure provided by the Southern California Gas Company. The proposed project will connect to the existing lines on Glazebrook and Despacuale Roads. Adequate infrastructure capacity in the vicinity of the site would be available to accommodate the electricity and natural gas demand for construction activities and would not require additional or expanded infrastructure.

The construction contractors are also expected to minimize idling of construction equipment during construction as required by state law (see section 3, *Air Quality*), and reduce construction waste by recycling. These required practices would limit wasteful and unnecessary electrical energy consumption. Furthermore, there are no unusual project characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in other parts of the state. Therefore, the proposed short-term construction activities would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary fuel consumption.

#### Transportation

Transportation energy use depends on the type and number of trips, vehicle miles traveled, fuel efficiency of vehicles, and travel mode. Transportation energy use during construction would come from

the transport and use of construction equipment, delivery vehicles and haul trucks, and construction employee vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would fluctuate according to the phase of construction and would be temporary. The majority of construction equipment during demolition and grading would be gas powered or diesel powered, and the later construction phases would require electricity-powered equipment. Impacts related to transportation energy use during construction would be temporary and would not require expanded energy supplies or the construction of new infrastructure. Impacts would not be significant.

## Operation

Operational use of energy would include heating, cooling, ventilation of buildings, water heating, operation of electrical systems, security, and control center functions, use of on-site equipment and appliances, and indoor, outdoor, perimeter, and parking lot lighting. Additionally, the facilities would operate as a church, and would not result in an excessive consumption of energy compared to other uses allowed within the C-1/C-P zone.

## Electricity

Project operation would use approximately 591,435 kWh or 0.59 Giga-watt hour (GWh), as shown in Table 6-1, Estimated Project Electricity Demands, below. In 2017, the latest year for which data are available, SCE provided over 85,879 (GWh) of electricity to its customers. Therefore, energy demand as a result of operation of the improvements would be less than 0.001 percent of the annual service area demand<sup>1</sup>. In addition, because the proposed project would be subject to the more stringent 2016 Title 24 standards, the project's electricity demand could potentially be lower than the calculations presented in Table 6-1, below. Prior to final building plan submittal, the project applicant would provide project plans to SCE to prepare a Method-of-Service Study to determine exact location of electrical connections at the site and establish estimated electricity demand; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 6-1**  
**Estimated Project Electricity Demands**

Land Use	Square Feet / Unit	Electricity Demands, kWh/yr	
		Per square foot / Unit	Total
Proposed Project <sup>2</sup>			
Church	27,489 square feet	5.2 <sup>1</sup>	142,942.8
Children’s Building	16,486 square feet	8.2 <sup>1</sup>	135,185.2
Gymnasium	18,024 square feet	8.2 <sup>1</sup>	147,796.8
Residences	3 units	15,400 <sup>3</sup>	46,200

<sup>1</sup> 0.59 GWh (project demand) / 87,879 GWh (SCE service area demand) = 0.0000067 = 0.00067 percent

**Table 6-1**  
**Estimated Project Electricity Demands**

Land Use	Square Feet / Unit	Electricity Demands, kWh/yr	
		Per square foot / Unit	Total
Restroom/Storage	1,250 square feet	8.2 <sup>1</sup>	10,250
Parking Lot and Paved Areas	311,600 square feet <sup>2</sup>	0.35 <sup>2</sup>	109,060
<b>Total</b>			<b>591,435</b>

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Energy Information Administration. Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBESCS).

<sup>2</sup> CalEEMod v.2016.3.2. Appendix 2.0 calculation details for CalEEMod

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Energy Information Administration. Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS). Per household consumption in the Pacific Region is 53.1 million British thermal units (Btu) per year. 1 Btu = 0.00029 kWh. 53.1 Btu = 0.0154 kWh per year x 1,000,000 = 15,400 kwh/yr.

### Natural Gas

As shown in **Table 6-2, Estimated Project Natural Gas Demands**, project operation is estimated to use about 2.23 million cubic feet (Mcf) of natural gas per year. SCE's forecast demand is expected to decrease at an average rate of 1.4 percent per year from 6,072 MMcf per day in 2016 to 4,626 MMcf/day by 2035 (CGEU 2016). At project buildout (2021), daily average supply within SCE's service area is estimated to be 5,281 MMcf/day (CGEU 2016). Therefore, the annual gas needs for operation of the proposed improvements would be less than 0.001 percent of the daily gas supply for the SCE service area<sup>2</sup>. Therefore, project development would not require SDGE to obtain new or expanded gas supplies, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Table 6-2**  
**Estimated Project Natural Gas Demands**

Land Use	Square Feet / Unit	Natural Gas Demands, cubic feet/yr	
		Per square foot / Unit	Total
Proposed Project <sup>2</sup>			
Church	27,489 square feet	28.1 <sup>1</sup>	772,440.9
Children’s Building	16,486 square feet	37.6 <sup>1</sup>	629,873.6
Gymnasium	18,024 square feet	37.6 <sup>1</sup>	677,702.4
Residences	3 units	50,000 <sup>2</sup>	150,000
Restroom/Storage	1,250 square feet	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Parking Lot and Paved Areas	311,600 square feet <sup>2</sup>	0 <sup>3</sup>	0
Total			2,230,017

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Energy Information Administration. Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBESCS).

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Energy Information Administration. Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS). Per household consumption in the Pacific Region is 53.1 million British thermal units (Btu) per year. 1 Btu = 0.00098 natural gas cubic foot. 53.1 Btu = 0.05 CF per year x 1,000,000 = 50,000 CF/yr.

<sup>3</sup> Operation of the parking areas and restrooms would not use natural gas.

<sup>2</sup> 5,281 MMcf per day x 365 days = 1,927,565 MMcf/year. 2.23 Mcf x (1 MMcf / 1,000,000 Mcf) = 0.0000022 MMcf. 0.0000022 MMcf / 1,927,565 MMcf = 0.000000000001 or 0.0000000001 percent.



## Renewable Energy

Project development would not interfere with achievement of the 60 percent Renewable Portfolio Standard set forth in SB 100 for 2030 or the 100 percent standard for 2045. These goals apply to SCE and other electricity retailers. As electricity retailers reach these goals, emissions from end user electricity use will decrease from current emission estimates.

## Vehicle Miles Traveled and Fuel Consumption

Transportation energy use depends on the type and number of trips, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), fuel efficiency of vehicles, and travel mode. Transportation energy used during operation of the site would come from delivery, employee, and visitor vehicles that would use diesel fuel and/or gasoline. The use of energy resources by these vehicles would be temporary and would fluctuate throughout the lifespan of the project. According to the Traffic Assessment Letter prepared for the proposed project (see **Appendix 11.0**), the project would generate 2,057 average Sunday trips, with 677 AM peak hour trips on Sunday.

The CalEEMod program estimates average trips associated with commercial and employment land uses. The VMT estimate was 14.7 miles for commercial-customer and commercial-work trips. CARB publishes the EMFAC2019 Web Database, which was used to calculate fuel consumption for the project-generated VMT for the buildout year of 2021. The database search was limited to Riverside County and assumed the 2021 calendar year and light-duty private vehicles with a range of model years and fuel types. **Table 6-3, Operation-Related Vehicle Fuel and Energy Usage**, shows the calculated VMT and fuel consumption based on the project-generated trips.

**Table 6-3**  
**Operation-Related Vehicle Fuel and Energy Usage**

Year	Gas		Diesel		CNG		Electricity	
	VMT	Gallons	VMT	Gallons	VMT	Gallons	VMT	kWh
<b>Proposed Project</b>	1,735,250	65,857	208,652	23,984	1,894	506	16,978	5,687
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,735,250</b>	<b>65,857</b>	<b>208,652</b>	<b>23,984</b>	<b>1,894</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>16,978</b>	<b>5,687</b>

Notes: The full calculations are in Appendix 5 of the MND.

The gas consumption estimates in Table 6-3 would be a conservative figure, because as fuel efficiency in passenger cars increases and electric vehicle use expands, fuel usage will decrease. The calculated fuel use represents less than 0.01 percent of the total fuel usage for light vehicles in the region over the same year in 2021 (723 million gallons) (see **Appendix 5.0**). This increase in fuel usage represents a conservative estimate, with the real use likely being less than calculated. Additionally, the calculated VMT represents less than 0.01 percent of the total VMT in the region over the same year in 2021 (18.7 billion VMT). The 0.01 percent increase in VMT associated with this project is considered negligible when compared to the region as a whole. Furthermore, as shown in **Table 3-1** and **Table 3-2**, above, the proposed project would result in a lower trip generation compared to the existing land use designations of the site. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant use of energy, and a less than significant impact would occur.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Wildomar is within SCAG's 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), which establishes long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public

health goals. As identified in **Table 8-3**, mobile source emissions are the most potent contributor of GHG emissions with the proposed project.

The RTP/SCS sets forth a development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network and other transportation measures and policies, would reduce GHG emissions from transportation (excluding goods movement). The RTP/SCS is meant to provide individual jurisdictions with growth strategies that, when taken together, achieve the regional GHG emissions reduction targets. Specifically, the SCS distributes growth forecast data to transportation analysis zones for the purpose of modeling performance. As discussed in section VI.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, below, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts or interfere with SCAG's ability to achieve the region's post-2020 mobile source GHG reduction targets.

The City of Wildomar does not have its own renewable energy plan, however, the City does encourage the use of renewable energy via solar panels, recycling, etc. The proposed project would be subject to 2016 Title 24, Part 6, standards, which sets standards that improve energy efficiency of newly construction buildings. Additionally, all contractors and waste haulers are required to comply with the county's Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, which requires a minimum diversion of 50 percent of waste project materials from disposal. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. The City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 15.20.010, *Adoption of the Energy Code*, adopted the 2016 California Energy Code, Title 24, Part 6 of the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. All new construction would be required to comply with the standards to ensure energy conservation is incorporated in the construction and operation of the buildings.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

## 7. Geology and Soils

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

Aragon Geotechnical, Inc. prepared a fault hazard investigation (February 2017) for the proposed project and is included as **Appendix 6.0** of this Initial Study.

## DISCUSSION

a) i) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. This state law was a direct result of the 1971 San Fernando earthquake, which was associated with extensive surface fault ruptures that damaged numerous homes, commercial buildings, and other structures. Surface rupture is the most easily avoided seismic hazard. An active fault is one that shows displacement within the last 11,000 years and therefore is considered more likely to generate a future earthquake. The act requires the California State Geologist to establish regulatory zones (now known as Earthquake Fault Zones; prior to January 1, 1994, these zones were known as Special Studies Zones) around the surface traces of active faults that pose a risk of surface ground rupture and to issue appropriate maps in order to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy.

According to the fault hazard investigation prepared by Aragon Geotechnical, Inc., the project site is not located within an official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; however, the project site is located almost wholly within a County Fault Zone established along the mapped southeastern extension of the Glen Ivy North Fault (Aragon 2017). While the project site could be subject to moderate and possibly strong ground motion, such motion would not be greater than at other sites in seismically active southern California. Compliance with seismic design criteria contained in the California Building Code (CBC) would minimize impacts to the extent feasible. Additionally, implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** would ensure project compliance with the recommendations of the Fault Report prepared by Aragon Geotechnical, Inc., and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

ii) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Southern California has numerous active seismic faults subjecting people to potential earthquake and seismic-related hazards. Seismic activity poses two types of potential hazards for people and structures, categorized either as primary or secondary hazards. Primary hazards include ground rupture, ground shaking, ground displacement, subsidence, and uplift from earth movement. Primary hazards can also induce secondary hazards such as ground failure (lurch cracking, lateral spreading, and slope failure), liquefaction, water waves (seiches), movement on nearby faults (sympathetic fault movement), dam failure, and fires.

The project site is located within an official Riverside County Fault Hazard Management Zone for a mapped trace of the Glen Ivy North Fault (Aragon 2017). An active splay fault was encountered within the project site during fault studies conducted for the Fault Report; therefore, portions of the project site are not suitable for building. The report recommends 50-foot lateral buffers between buildings and documented active faults (Aragon 2017). The Fault Report deems that the remainder of the project site can feasibly and safely be developed, pending in-grading geological inspections of soil and bedrock exposures during mass grading, which would be a required as part of implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** (Aragon 2017).

Seismic design of the project would comply with seismic safety requirements of the California Building Code (CBC), which comprises Part 2 of Title 24 of the California Code Regulations. The CBC contains provisions for earthquake safety based on factors including occupancy type, the types of soil and rock onsite, and the strength of ground motion with specified probability occurring at the site.

Adherence to established regulations and the implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** would ensure that impacts would be less than significant.

iii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Liquefaction of cohesionless soils can be caused by strong vibratory motion due to earthquakes. Liquefaction is characterized by a loss of shear strength in the affected soil layers, thereby causing the soils to behave as a viscous liquid. Susceptibility to liquefaction

is based on geologic data. River channels and floodplains are considered most susceptible to liquefaction, while alluvial fans have a lower susceptibility.

According to the Fault Report, the probability of buildings being affected by liquefaction appear to be extremely low or zero (Aragon 2017). Investigation of the site found that the site lacks liquefaction potential due to a lack of shallow groundwater and very low soil susceptibility (Aragon 2017). Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

iv) **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the Fault Report, landslide hazard risks (collectively deep-seated landslides, shallow earth flows, slumps, or rockfall) are very low; high material strengths and steeply inclined, wide-spaced fracturing in the plutonic rocks composing the higher-relief slopes on the site appear to make deep-seated landslide potential unlikely (Aragon 2017). Rockfall potential is zero, and rock slope stabilization measures are not expected (Aragon 2017). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction of the proposed project may result in soil erosion as grading and construction can loosen surface soils and make soils susceptible to the effects of wind and water movement across the surface. The City routinely requires the submittal of detailed erosion control plans with any grading plans. Additionally, construction activities related to the proposed project would be subject to compliance with the CBC and would include best management practices (BMPs). Best management practices may include but are not limited to covering of the soil, use of a dust-inhibiting material, landscaping, use of straw and jute, hydroseeding, and grading in a pattern than slows stormwater flow and reduces the potential for erosion. Compliance with BMPs is required by the federal and state Clean Water Act.

Additionally, since this project involves clearing, grading, or excavation that causes soil disturbance of one or more acres, it is subject to the provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) State General Permit (Order No. R8-2010-0033). Further, the project would be required to prepare and comply with an approved stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) that provides a schedule for the implementation and maintenance of erosion control measures and a description of the erosion control practices, including appropriate design details and a time schedule. The SWPPP would consider the full range of erosion control best management practices (BMPs), including any additional site-specific and seasonal conditions. The State General Permit also requires that those implementing SWPPPs meet prerequisite qualifications that would demonstrate the skills, knowledge, and experience necessary to implement such plans. NPDES requirements would significantly reduce the potential for substantial erosion or topsoil loss to occur in association with new development. Additionally, as part of the approval process, prior to grading plan approval, the project applicant will be required to comply with Wildomar Municipal Code Chapter 13.12, Stormwater Drainage System Protection, which establishes requirements for stormwater and non-stormwater quality discharge and control that requires new development or redevelopment projects to control stormwater runoff by implementing appropriate BMPs to prevent the deterioration of water quality. The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by Chapter 33 of the 2016 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation, other applicable building regulations, and standard construction techniques. Therefore, there will be no significant impact.

As part of the approval process, prior to grading plan approval, the project applicant will be required to comply with Chapter 13.12, Stormwater and Drainage System Protection, of the Wildomar Municipal Code. Water quality features intended to reduce construction-related erosion impacts will be clearly denoted on the grading plans for implementation by the construction contractor. For a discussion of erosion and runoff impact post-construction, see section VI.9, *Hydrology and Water Quality*.

Compliance with the CBC and the NPDES would minimize effects from erosion. Additionally, compliance with Wildomar Municipal Code Chapter 13.12 and NPDES requirements would result in less than significant impacts related to soil erosion. Therefore, project impacts to erosion and topsoil would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** See Issues a.iii) and a.iv). The project site is not at risk for landslide or rockfall, and risk of liquefaction is low based on historical high groundwater level of 13 feet (Aragon 2017). The Fault Report states that permanent ground deformation phenomena such as ground cracking or fissuring, ejection or pressurized sand-water mixtures from shallow liquefied layers, flow slides, and lateral spreading have been dismissed as hazards (Aragon 2017). Site geological units are also judged to have zero subsidence potential from dynamic strain settlement (Aragon 2017). Implementation of CBC and other related construction standards apply seismic requirements and address certain grading activities. The CBC includes common engineering practices requiring special design and construction methods that reduce or eliminate potential expansive soils-related impacts. It is expected that younger alluvium would be fully removed from fill and structural improvement areas (Aragon 2017). Compliance with CBC regulations, as well as the implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1**, would ensure adequate design and construction of building foundations to resist soil movement. Thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Expansive soils contain significant amounts of clay particles that swell considerably when wetted and shrink when dried. Foundations constructed on these soils are subjected to large uplifting forces caused by the swelling. Without proper measures taken, heaving and cracking of both building foundations and slabs-on-grade could result.

Design of the project would comply with seismic safety requirements of the California Building Code (CBC), which comprises Part 2 of Title 24 of the California Code Regulations. The CBC contains provisions for earthquake and geological safety based on factors including occupancy type, the types of soil and rock onsite, and the strength of ground motion with specified probability occurring at the site. The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by Chapter 33 of the 2016 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation, other applicable building regulations, and standard construction techniques. Additionally, implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** would ensure project compliance with the recommendations of the Fault Report prepared by Aragon Geotechnical, Inc., and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

e) **No Impact.** The project does not propose the use or construction of septic tanks or an alternative wastewater disposal system. Therefore, **no impact** would occur.

f) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Paleontological resources are fossilized remains of past life on earth such as bones, shells, leaves, tracks, burrows, and impressions. There are no unique geological features onsite. However, due to the undeveloped nature of the site there is some possibility that fossils could be present in the site soils and thus could be damaged by project grading and/or construction activities. In order to ensure that impacts to paleontological resources do not occur, implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-2** would reduce impacts to less than significant.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. The project shall comply with the California Building Code and Wildomar Municipal Code Chapter 13.12, Stormwater Drainage System Protection.

## MITIGATION MEASURES

**GEO-1** The project applicant shall incorporate the recommendations of the Fault Report prepared by Aragon Geotechnical, Inc. (2017; **Appendix 6.0**) into project plans related to the proposed project. The project's building plans shall demonstrate that they incorporate all applicable recommendations of the design-level Fault Report and comply with all applicable requirements of the latest adopted version of the California Building Code. A licensed professional engineer shall prepare the plans, including those that pertain to soil engineering, structural foundations, pipeline excavation, and installation. All plans will be subject to the approval of the City Engineer.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *During building plan check, prior to any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Planning Department and Building and Safety Department*

**GEO-2** Construction personnel involved in excavation and grading activities shall be informed of the possibility of discovering fossils at any location and the protocol to be followed if fossils are found. A professional meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's standards shall provide the preconstruction training. The City shall ensure the grading plan notes include specific reference to the potential discovery of fossils. If potentially unique paleontological resources (fossils) are inadvertently discovered during project construction, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City shall be notified, and a professional paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance throughout project construction and shall establish, in cooperation with the project applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. Excavated finds shall be offered to a State-designated repository such as the Museum of Paleontology at the University of California, Berkeley, or the California Academy of Sciences.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *During any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department*

## 8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			✓	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			✓	

A Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment was prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc (2019b) (see **Appendix 7.0**). The analysis was prepared to evaluate the potential for the proposed project to contribute to greenhouse gas emissions.

### DISCUSSION

#### a) Less Than Significant Impact.

##### Short-Term Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed project would result in direct emissions of GHGs from construction. The approximate quantity of daily GHG emissions generated by construction equipment utilized to build the proposed project is provided in **Table 8-1, Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions**. Construction phases were modeled under a worst-case scenario (i.e., constructed all at once) to conservatively capture the emissions of the entire development. The GHG report assumed that construction would be completed in 2021; however, if construction phases are delayed, emissions would be lower in future years due to regulatory improvements and fleet turnover.

**Table 8-1**  
**Construction-Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Category	MTCO <sub>2</sub> e
Total Construction Emissions	1,873
30-year Amortized Construction	62

Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix 7.0 for model outputs.

As shown in **Table 8-1**, the project would result in the generation of approximately 1,873 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e over the course of construction. Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the lifetime of the project (assumed to be 30 years), then added to the operational emissions<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> The project lifetime is based on the standard 30-year assumption of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast Air Quality Management District, Minutes for the GHG CEQA Significance Threshold Stakeholder Working Group #13, August 26, 2009).



### Long-Term Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Operational or long-term emissions occur over the life of the proposed Project. GHG emissions would result from direct emissions such as project-generated vehicular traffic, on-site combustion of natural gas, operation of any landscaping equipment. Operational GHG emissions would also result from indirect sources, such as off-site generation of electrical power, the energy required to convey water to, and wastewater from the project site, the emissions associated with solid waste generated from the Project site, and any fugitive refrigerants from air conditioning or refrigerators. Total GHG emissions associated with proposed Project are summarized in **Table 8-2: Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions**.

**Table 8-2**  
**Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

<b>Emissions Source</b>	<b>MTCO<sub>2</sub>e</b>
Construction Amortized Over 30 Years	62
Area Source	0
Energy	339
Mobile	983
Waste	85
Water and Wastewater	51
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,520</b>
<i>SCAQMD Project Threshold</i>	<i>3,000</i>
<b>Exceeds SCAQMD Threshold?</b>	<b>No</b>
Source: CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Refer to Appendix 7.0 for model outputs.	

As shown in **Table 8-2**, the project would generate approximately 1,520 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e annually GHG emissions from both construction and operations and the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD GHG threshold of 3,000 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Therefore, project-related GHG emissions under short-term construction and long-term operations would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** There are currently no adopted local or regional GHG reduction plans applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project would be subject to compliance with all building codes in effect at the time of construction, which include energy conservation measures mandated by California Building Standards Code Title 24–Energy Efficiency Standards. Because Title 24 standards require energy conservation features in new construction (e.g., high- efficiency lighting, high-efficiency heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems, thermal insulation, double-glazed windows, water conserving plumbing fixtures), the indirectly regulate and reduce GHG emissions. California's Building Energy Efficiency Standards are updated on an approximately three-year cycle. The 2016 standards improved upon the 2013 standards for new construction of, and additions and alterations to, residential, commercial, and industrial buildings. The 2016 standards went into effect on January 1, 2017. Additionally, the 2019 building standards further improve upon the 2016 standards and go into effect on January 1, 2020.

### Consistency with the SCAG RTP/SCS

Adopted on April 7, 2016, the RTP/SCS is a long-range visioning plan that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental, and public health goals. The RTP/SCS embodies a

collective vision for the region's future and is developed with input from local governments, county transportation commissions, tribal governments, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and local stakeholders in the counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura. SCAG's RTP/SCS establishes GHG emissions goals for automobiles and light-duty trucks for 2020 and 2035 as well as an overall GHG target for the Project region consistent with both the target date of AB 32 and the post-2020 GHG reduction goals of Executive Orders 5-03-05 and B-30-15.

The RTP/SCS contains over 4,000 transportation projects, ranging from highway improvements, railroad grade separations, bicycle lanes, new transit hubs and replacement bridges. These future investments were included in county plans developed by the six county transportation commissions and seek to reduce traffic bottlenecks, improve the efficiency of the region's network, and expand mobility choices for everyone. The RTP/SCS is an important planning document for the region, allowing project sponsors to qualify for federal funding.

The plan accounts for operations and maintenance costs to ensure reliability, longevity and cost effectiveness. The RTP/SCS is also supported by a combination of transportation and land use strategies that help the region achieve state GHG emissions reduction goals and FCAA requirements, preserve open space areas, improve public health and roadway safety, support our vital goods movement industry, and utilize resources more efficiently. GHG emissions resulting from development-related mobile sources are the most potent source of emissions, and therefore project comparison to the RTP/SCS is an appropriate indicator of whether the proposed Project would inhibit the post-2020 GHG reduction goals promulgated by the state. The proposed Project's consistency with the RTP/SCS goals is analyzed in detail in **Table 8-3: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Consistency**.

**Table 8-3**  
**Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Consistency**

SCAG Goals		Compliance	
GOAL 1:	Align the plan investments and policies with improving regional economic development and competitiveness.	N/A:	This is not a project-specific policy and is therefore not applicable.
GOAL 2:	Maximize mobility and accessibility for all people and goods in the region.	N/A:	This is not a transportation improvement project and is therefore not applicable.
GOAL 3:	Ensure travel safety and reliability for all people and goods in the region.	N/A:	This is not a transportation improvement project and is therefore not applicable.
GOAL 4:	Preserve and ensure a sustainable regional transportation system.	N/A:	This is not a transportation improvement project and is therefore not applicable.
GOAL 5:	Maximize the productivity of our transportation system.	N/A:	This is not a transportation improvement project and is therefore not applicable.

**Table 8-3**  
**Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Consistency**

SCAG Goals	Compliance
GOAL 6: Protect the environment and health of our residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation (e.g., bicycling and walking).	Consistent: The reduction of energy use, improvement of air quality, and promotion of more environmentally sustainable development are encouraged through the development of alternative transportation methods, green design techniques for buildings, and other energy-reducing techniques. This development project is required to comply with the provisions of the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards and the Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen).
GOAL 7: Actively encourage and create incentives for energy efficiency, where possible.	N/A: This is not a project-specific policy and is therefore not applicable.
GOAL 8: Encourage land use and growth patterns that facilitate transit as well as non-motorized	Consistent: See response to RTP/SCS Goal 6.
GOAL 9: Maximize the security of our transportation system through improved system	N/A: This is not a transportation improvement project and is therefore not applicable.
Source: Southern California Association of Governments, <i>Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy</i> , 2016.	

Compliance with applicable State standards would ensure consistency with State and regional GHG reduction planning efforts. The goals stated in the RTP/SCS were used to determine consistency with the planning efforts previously stated. As shown in **Table 8-3**, the proposed project would be consistent with the stated goals of the RTP/SCS. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in any significant impacts or interfere with SCAG's ability to achieve the region's post-2020 mobile source GHG reduction targets.

#### Consistency with the CARB Scoping Plan

The California State Legislature adopted AB 32 in 2006. AB 32 focuses on reducing GHGs (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride) to 1990 levels by the year 2020. Pursuant to the requirements in AB 32, CARB adopted the *Climate Change Scoping Plan* (CCSP) in 2008, which outlines actions recommended to obtain that goal. The CCSP provides a range of GHG reduction actions that include direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, monetary and non-monetary incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms such as the cap-and-trade program, and an AB 32 implementation fee to fund the program. As shown in **Table 8-4, Project Consistency with Applicable CARB Scoping Plan Measures**, the proposed project is consistent with most of the strategies, while others are not applicable to the proposed project.

The 2017 CCSP Update identifies additional GHG reduction measures necessary to achieve the 2030 target. These measures build upon those identified in the first update to the CCSP in 2013. Although a number of these measures are currently established as policies and measures, some measures have not yet been formally proposed or adopted. It is expected that these actions to reduce GHG emissions will be adopted as required to achieve statewide GHG emissions targets. As such, impacts related to consistency with the Scoping Plan would be less than significant.

**Table 8-4**  
**Project Consistency with Applicable CARB Scoping Plan Measures**

Scoping Plan Sector	Scoping Plan Measure	Implementing Regulations	Project Consistency
Transportation	California Cap-and-Trade Program Linked to Western Climate Initiative	Regulation for the California Cap on Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Market-Based Compliance Mechanism October 20, 2015 (CCR 95800)	<b>Consistent.</b> The Cap-and-Trade Program applies to large industrial sources such as power plants, refineries, and cement manufacturers. However, the regulation indirectly affects people who use the products and services produced by these industrial sources when increased cost of products or services (such as electricity and fuel) are transferred to the consumers. The Cap-and-Trade Program covers the GHG emissions associated with electricity consumed in California, generated in-state or imported. Accordingly, GHG emissions associated with CEQA projects' electricity usage are covered by the Cap-and-
Transportation			Trade Program. The Cap-and-Trade Program also covers fuel suppliers (natural gas and propane fuel providers and transportation fuel providers) to address emissions from such fuels and combustion of other fossil fuels not directly covered at large sources in the Program's first compliance period.
	California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards	Pavley I 2005 Regulations to Control GHG Emissions from Motor Vehicles	<b>Consistent.</b> This measure applies to all new vehicles starting with model year 2012. The proposed Project would not conflict with its implementation as it would apply to all new passenger vehicles purchased in California. Passenger vehicles, model year 2012 and later, associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project would be required to comply with the Pavley emissions standards.
	California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards	2012 LEV III California GHG and Criteria Pollutant Exhaust and Evaporative Emission Standards	<b>Consistent.</b> The LEV III amendments provide reductions from new vehicles sold in California between 2017 and 2025. Passenger vehicles associated with the site would comply with LEV III standards.
	Low Carbon Fuel Standard	2009 readopted in 2015. Regulations to Achieve Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions Subarticle 7. Low Carbon Fuel Standard CCR 95480	<b>Consistent.</b> This measure applies to transportation fuels utilized by vehicles in California. The proposed Project would not conflict with implementation of this measure. Motor vehicles associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project would utilize low carbon transportation fuels as required under this measure.
	Regional Transportation-Related Greenhouse Gas Targets.	SB 375. Cal. Public Resources Code §§ 21155, 21155.1, 21155.2, 21159.28	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project would provide development in the region that is consistent with the growth projections in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).
	Goods Movement	Goods Movement Action Plan January 2007	<b>Not applicable.</b> The proposed Project does not propose any changes to maritime, rail, or intermodal facilities or forms of transportation.
	Medium/Heavy-Duty Vehicle	2010 Amendments to the Truck and Bus Regulation, the Drayage Truck Regulation and the Tractor-Trailer Greenhouse Gas	<b>Consistent.</b> This measure applies to medium and heavy-duty vehicles that operate in the state. The Proposed project would not conflict with implementation of this measure. Medium and heavy-duty vehicles associated with construction and operation of the proposed Project would be required to comply with the requirements of this regulation

**Table 8-4**  
**Project Consistency with Applicable CARB Scoping Plan Measures**

Scoping Plan Sector	Scoping Plan Measure	Implementing Regulations	Project Consistency
	High Speed Rail	Funded under SB 862	<b>Not applicable.</b> This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by a project applicant or Lead Agency.
Electricity and Natural Gas	Energy Efficiency	Title 20 Appliance Efficiency Regulation	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would not conflict with implementation of this measure. The proposed Project would comply with the latest energy efficiency standards.
		Title 24 Part 6 Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-Residential Building	
		Title 24 Part 11 California Green Building Code Standards	
	Renewable Portfolio Standard/Renewable Electricity Standard.	2010 Regulation to Implement the Renewable Electricity Standard (33% 2020)	<b>Consistent.</b> The Project would obtain electricity from the electric utility, Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE obtained 28 percent of its power supply from renewable sources in 2016. Therefore, the utility would provide power when needed on site that is composed of a greater percentage of renewable sources.
	Million Solar Roofs Program	SB 350 Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015 (50% 2030)	
	Million Solar Roofs Program	Tax Incentive Program	<b>Consistent.</b> This measure is to increase solar throughout California, which is being done by various electricity providers and existing solar programs. The program provides incentives that are in place at the time of construction.
Water	Water	Title 24 Part 11 California Green Building Code Standards	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would comply with the California Green Building Standards Code, which requires a 20 percent reduction in indoor water use. The proposed Project would also comply with the City's Water-Efficient Landscapes Regulations (Chapter 17.276 of the Wildomar Municipal Code).
		SBX 7-7—The Water Conservation Act of 2009	
		Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance	
Green Buildings	Green Building Strategy	Title 24 Part 11 California Green Building Code Standards	<b>Consistent.</b> The State is to increase the use of green building practices. The proposed Project would implement required green building strategies through existing regulation that requires the proposed Project to comply with various CalGreen requirements. The proposed Project includes sustainability design features that support the Green Building Strategy.
Industry	Industrial Emissions	2010 CARB Mandatory Reporting Regulation	<b>Not applicable.</b> The Mandatory Reporting Regulation requires facilities and entities with more than 10,000 MTCOe of combustion and process emissions, all facilities belonging to certain industries, and all electric power entities to submit an annual GHG emissions data report directly to CARB. As shown above, total Project GHG emissions would not exceed 10,000 MTCOe. Therefore, this regulation would not apply.

**Table 8-4**  
**Project Consistency with Applicable CARB Scoping Plan Measures**

Scoping Plan Sector	Scoping Plan Measure	Implementing Regulations	Project Consistency
Recycling and Waste Management	Recycling and Waste	Title 24 Part 11 California Green Building Code Standards	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed Project would not conflict with implementation of these measures. The proposed Project is required to achieve the recycling mandates via compliance with the CALGreen code. The City has consistently achieved its state recycling mandates.
		AB 341 Statewide 75 Percent Diversion Goal	
Forests	Sustainable Forests	Cap and Trade Offset Projects	<b>Not applicable.</b> The proposed Project site is in an area designated for urban uses. No forested lands exist on-site.
High Global Warming Potential	High Global Warming Potential Gases	CARB Refrigerant Management Program CCR 95380	<b>Not applicable.</b> The regulations are applicable to refrigerants used by large air conditioning systems and large commercial and industrial refrigerators and cold storage system. The proposed Project would not conflict with the refrigerant management regulations adopted by CARB.
Agriculture	Agriculture	Cap and Trade Offset Projects for Livestock and Rice Cultivation	<b>Not applicable.</b> The Project site is designated for urban development. No grazing, feedlot, or other agricultural activities that generate manure occur currently exist on-site or are proposed by the Project.
Source: California Air Resources Board, <i>California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan</i> , 2017 and CARB, <i>Climate Change Scoping Plan</i> , 2008.			

The Project is estimated to emit approximately 1,520 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e annually from on-site activities and indirectly from off-site motor vehicles, see **Table 8-2**. The GHG emissions caused by long-term operation of the proposed would be less than significant.

Regarding goals for 2050 under Executive Order S-3-05, at this time it is not possible to quantify the emissions savings from future regulatory measures, as they have not yet been developed. Nevertheless, it is anticipated that operation of the proposed project would comply with all applicable measures are enacted that state lawmakers decide would lead to an 80 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

None required.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

## 9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			✓	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			✓	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			✓	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?		✓		

### DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would involve construction activities that could result in the transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials such as gasoline fuels, asphalt, lubricants, toxic solvents, pesticides, and herbicides. The transport, use, storage, and disposal of these materials would comply with existing regulations established by several agencies including the Department of Toxic Substances Control, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the US Department of Transportation, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The proposed project would operate as a church, where project maintenance may require the use of cleaners, solvents, paints, and other custodial products that are potentially hazardous. These materials would be used in relatively small quantities, clearly labeled, and stored in compliance with state and federal requirements. With exercise of normal safety practices, the project would not create substantial hazards to the public or the environment.

The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations during project construction and operation. The Riverside County Department of Environmental Health is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for Riverside County and is responsible for consolidating, coordinating, and making consistent the administrative requirements, permits, inspections, and enforcement activities of state standards regarding the transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials in Riverside County, including Wildomar. Compliance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations would result in a less than significant impact.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction projects typically maintain supplies onsite for containing and cleaning small spills of hazardous materials. However, construction activities would not involve a significant amount of hazardous materials, and their use would be temporary. Furthermore, project construction workers would be trained on the proper use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials. The project site would operate as a church, which would not warrant the use of hazardous materials in quantities that could result in hazardous conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Donald Graham Elementary School is approximately 0.21-mile northwest of the project site, west of I-15. Operation of the proposed project would not generate hazardous emissions or require the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Project operations would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials (e.g. solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pesticides) typical of church and residential developments; when used correctly, these would not result in a significant hazard to residents or workers in the project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is not listed on EnviroStor or GeoTracker (DTSC 2018; SWRCB 2015). Construction activities would occur within the boundaries of the project site and would not disturb off-site properties. Two DTSC Clean-up Sites are identified at 35450 Frederick Street and La Estrella Road/George Porras Road; however, it was determined that no further action was required (SWRCB 2015). Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

e) **No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The closest public airport is the French Valley Airport, which is located approximately seven miles southeast of the project site. Given the distance of the project site to the French Valley Airport, no impact would occur.

f) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Site access would be provide by the two proposed driveway entrances at the northwest corner of the intersection of Depasquale and Glazebrook Roads and a driveway further east on Glazebrook Road. Construction would take place within the project site, and no roadway closures are anticipated. To ensure compliance with zoning, building, and fire codes, the project applicant is required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements would ensure that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans. Impacts would be less than significant.

g) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** California Government Code Chapter 6.8 directs the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire) to identify areas of very high fire hazard severity within Local Responsibility Areas (LRA). Mapping of the areas, referred to as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ), is based on data and models of potential fuels over a 30- to 50-year time horizon and their associated expected fire behavior and expected burn probabilities, which quantifies the likelihood and nature of vegetation fire exposure to buildings. LRA VHFHSZ maps were initially developed in the mid-1990s and are now being updated based on improved science, mapping techniques, and data. In 2008, the California Building Standards Commission adopted California Building Code Chapter 7A requiring new buildings in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones to use ignition-resistant construction methods and materials.



The eastern and western portions of the City of Wildomar, including the project site, have been designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Therefore, development on the project site would be subject to compliance with the 2016 California Building Code (or the most current version) and the 2016 edition of the California Fire Code (Part 9 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which includes Section 4905.2, Construction Methods and Requirements within Established Limits). Fire Code Chapter 49 cites specific requirements for wildland-urban interface areas that include, but are not limited to, providing defensible space and hazardous vegetation and fuel management. Wildomar is covered under the Riverside County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan (2006) and the Riverside County Operational Area Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2012). These plans provide guidance to effectively respond to any emergency, including wildfires. In addition, all proposed construction would be required to meet minimum standards for fire safety. Implementation of these plans and policies in conjunction with compliance with the Fire Code would minimize the risk of loss due to wildfires.

The project site, as with other portions of the City, is located within a VHFHZ, and therefore, development on the project site would be subject to compliance with California Building Code. Moreover, the City of Wildomar is under the Riverside County Operational Area Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, which provide guidance to effectively respond to and mitigate emergencies, including wildfires. In order to reduce impacts to wildfire hazards to a less than significant level, mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2**, which require conformance with the California Building Code and Fire Code, would be implemented. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. City of Wildomar Municipal Code Chapter 8.28, *Fire Code*, requires compliance with the 2016 California Building Code (or most current version) and the 2016 edition of the California Fire Code (Part 9 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations).
2. City of Wildomar Municipal Code Chapter 8.28, *Fire Code*, requires adherence to California Fire Code Chapter 49, which cites specific requirements for wildland-urban interface areas.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

**HAZ-1** Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Building Official and the Riverside County Fire Chief, compliance with the 2016 California Building Code (or the most recent edition) (Part 2 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations) and the 2016 California Fire Code (or the most recent edition) (Part 9 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations), including those regulations pertaining to materials and construction methods intended to mitigate wildfire exposure as described in the 2016 California Building Code and California Residential Code (or most recent edition); specifically California Building Code Chapter 7A; California Residential Code Section R327; California Residential Code Section R337; California Referenced Standards Code Chapter 12-7A; and California Fire Code Chapter 49.

*Timing/Implementation:* Prior to issuance of building permits

*Enforcement/Monitoring:* City of Wildomar Building Department and Riverside County Fire Department

**HAZ-2** Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City Building Official and the County Fire Chief, compliance with the vegetation management requirements prescribed in California Fire Code Section 4906, including California Government Code Section 51182.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Building Department and Riverside County Fire Department*

## 10. Hydrology and Water Quality

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			✓	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			✓	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			✓	
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			✓	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;			✓	
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			✓	
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			✓	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				✓
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				✓

The following analysis is based on a preliminary drainage study and Water Quality Management Plan prepared by FM Civil Engineers on October 29, 2018, and February 7, 2019, respectively, and are included as **Appendix 8.0** and **9.0**, respectively, to this Initial Study.

### DISCUSSION

#### a) Less Than Significant Impact.

##### Construction

As part of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the US Environmental Protection Agency has established regulations under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") program to control direct stormwater discharges. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, which

include construction activities. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (“SWRCB”) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements.

Wildomar Municipal Code Section 13.12.050 requires development to comply with a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. Section F.1 of the MS4 permit specifies requirements for new developments, and Section F.1.D details the requirements for standard stormwater mitigation plans (also known as water quality management plans). The MS4 permit imposes pollution prevention requirements on planned developments, construction sites, commercial and industrial businesses, municipal facilities and activities, and residential activities. Even though Wildomar is split by two watersheds (Santa Ana and Santa Margarita) that affect some of the properties in the city, the entire city is governed by the MS4 permit for the Santa Margarita region.

Requirements for waste discharges potentially affecting stormwater from construction sites of one acre or more are set forth in the SWRCB’s Construction General Permit, Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ, issued in 2012. The site is larger than one acre and would be subject to requirements of the Construction General Permit. Projects obtain coverage under the Construction General Permit by filing a Notice of Intent with the SWRCB prior to grading activities, and preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction. The primary objective of the SWPPP is to identify, construct, implement, and maintain best management practices (BMPs) to reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater discharges and authorized non-stormwater discharges from the construction site. BMPs categories include, but are not limited to, erosion control and wind erosion control, sediment control, and tracking control. Implementation and monitoring required under the SWPPP would control and reduce short-term intermittent impacts to water quality from construction activities to less than significant levels.

#### Operation

The primary constituents of concern during the project operational phase would be solids, oils, and greases from parking area and driveways that could be carried off-site. Project design features identified in the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) (see **Appendix 9.0**) would address the anticipated and expected pollutants of concern during the project’s operational phase. Onsite landscaping would assist in minimizing the amount of runoff from the site by providing permeable areas for water infiltration and decreasing runoff volume. Infiltration through landscaped areas would serve as a water treatment function. The proposed project would also include BMPs to properly manage stormwater flow and prevent stormwater pollution by reducing the potential for contamination at the source. The BMPs could include use of sandbags at drain inlets to create ponding and allow silt to fall out of the runoff, jute to line areas, slow the movement of water and direct flows away from drainages, covering stockpiles, binding soil to prevent erosion, and prohibition of construction during rain or wind weather events. The mix of BMPs have been determined as part of the WQMP.

In general projects must control pollutants, pollutant loads, and runoff volume from the project site by minimizing the impervious surface area and controlling runoff through infiltration, bioretention, or rainfall harvest and use. Projects must incorporate BMPs in accordance with the requirements of the municipal NPDES permit. The project would comply with water quality standards, and impacts would be less than significant.

**b) Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is in the area subject to the Elsinore Basin Groundwater Management Plan (EBGMP) area. The EBGMP addresses the hydrogeologic understanding of the Elsinore Basin, evaluates baseline conditions, identifies management issues and strategies, and

defines and evaluates alternatives. The primary sources of groundwater recharge in the basin are listed in the plan as:

- Recharge from precipitation – Rainfall directly to the basin.
- Surface water infiltration – Recharge from infiltration of surface waters such as streams. The San Jacinto River is the major surface water inflow. Inflow from Lake Elsinore is considered negligible.
- Infiltration from land use – Direct surface recharge from application of water for irrigation.
- Infiltration from septic tanks – Infiltration in areas serviced by septic systems in the basin.

Murrieta Creek is the closest stream to the proposed project site and would be considered a source of recharge for the basin. The proposed project would not affect the creek's recharge capability, as it is outside the project boundaries.

The project site is mostly permeable and construction of the proposed project would result in an increase in impervious surfaces. According to the Department of Water Resources Bulletin 118, the Elsinore Basin, which is the major source of potable groundwater supply for Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District (EVMWD), has not been identified to be in a state of overdraft (EVMWD 2016a). Furthermore, active groundwater management and conjunctive use programs have been implemented by EVMWD to ensure the balance of inflows and outflows of the Elsinore Basin (EVMWD 2016a). Therefore, the project would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin, and impacts would be less than significant.

c)

i, ii) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to issue b) in section VI.7, *Geology and Soils*, for further discussion of erosion. Surface water drainage would be controlled by building regulations, with the water directed toward existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains, and catch basins. The proposed drainage for the site would not channel runoff on exposed soils, would not direct flows over unvegetated soils, and would not otherwise increase the erosion or siltation potential of the site or any downstream areas. As discussed above, the proposed project is subject to NPDES requirements, including the countywide MS4 permit and compliance with the SWPPP. Additionally, the project applicant is required to submit a SWPPP to reduce erosion and sedimentation of downstream watercourses during project construction. Further, the applicant would be required to prepare and submit a detailed erosion control plan for City approval prior to obtaining a grading permit. Implementation of this plan is expected to address any erosion issues associated with proposed grading and site preparation. Although future development would create new impervious surfaces on the property, development associated with the proposed project would result in opportunities for landscaped areas to be utilized for stormwater retention.

Runoff from the project site flows offsite to Murrieta Creek. The proposed project would utilize a subsurface storm drain, drainage inlets, to convey peak flows and utilize two onsite infiltration basins to mitigate for water quality and hydromodification requirements (FM Civil Engineers 2018).

Furthermore, the required SWPPP for the project includes best management practices designed to prevent erosion during construction, such as preventing illicit discharges and implementing good practices for vehicle and equipment maintenance, cleaning, and fueling operations, such as using drip pans under vehicles. The project-specific water quality management plan provides best management practices for after construction, such as designed landscape areas to infiltrate runoff from impervious areas, direct roof runoff into landscaped areas, installation of infiltration basins, etc. Therefore, the

proposed project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Additionally, the proposed subsurface storm drains and onsite infiltration basins would reduce impacts from on- or offsite flooding. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

iii) **Less Than Significant.** The proposed project would be required to comply with Wildomar Municipal Code Section 13.12.050, which requires development to comply with a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. Two infiltration basins would be constructed at the project site to mitigate and address hydromodification requirements. The proposed project includes construction of a subsurface storm drain and drainage inlets to convey peak runoff flows from the project improvements (FM Civil Engineers 2018). All onsite surface storm flows would be directed to onsite drop curb and street inlets and conveyed via the storm drain pipe system where they will discharge to the two infiltration basins (FM Civil Engineers 2018). An emergency overflow would be utilized to bypass the 100-year storm flow where they would be collected and conveyed by street storm drain systems and ultimately by the existing culverts crossing below I-15 (FM Civil Engineers 2018). Therefore, increases in runoff as a result of the project would not exceed the capacity of the existing stormwater systems and impacts would be less than significant.

iv). **Less Than Significant.** The project site is designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) as Zone X, indicating minimal risk of flooding (FEMA 2008). Moreover, the project site is not within a 100-year or 500-year flood zone (Wildomar 2003). The proposed project would result in construction of impervious surfaces over an existing undeveloped site and would redirect runoff compared to existing conditions. Although the project would redirect flows onsite, the site is not in an area of flood risk, and the proposed subsurface storm drains and onsite infiltration basins would reduce impacts from on- or offsite flooding. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) **No Impact.** As provided in V.10.iv, the project site is not within a flood hazard zone. The project site is not in an area that is subject to seiches, mudflows, or tsunamis due to the absence of any nearby bodies of water and mud/debris channels. Additionally, the County of Riverside identifies dam inundation hazard areas throughout the county. A review of records maintained at the California Office of Emergency Services provided potential failure inundation maps for 23 dams affecting Riverside County; these maps were compiled into geographic information system (GIS) digital coverage of potential dam inundation zones. The County's dam inundation zones are identified in Figure S-10 of the Wildomar General Plan. According to Figure S-10, the project site is not in any dam inundation hazard zones (Wildomar 2003). In addition, the project is not in the vicinity of any levees. Therefore, the project would not provide additional source of polluted runoff due to project inundation, and no impact would occur.

e) **Less Than Significant.** As provided in section VI.10.b, above, the proposed project is in the area subject to the Elsinore Basin Groundwater Management Plan area and the improvements would not conflict or obstruct implementation the EBGMP. Additionally, the project site is within the Water Quality Improvement Plan for the Santa Margarita River Watershed Management Area. The proposed project would comply with water quality requirements set forth in the Statewide General Construction Permit, the NPDES, and the City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 13.12 (Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls Ordinance). Additionally, active groundwater management and conjunctive use programs have been implemented by EVMWD to ensure the balance of inflows and outflows of the Elsinore Basin (EVMWD 2016a). Therefore, the project would not impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin, and impacts would be less than significant.

## **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. Wildomar Municipal Code Section 13.12.060 requires that new construction and renovation control stormwater runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. The City shall identify the best management practices (BMPs) that may be implemented in addition to those provided in the WQMP to prevent such deterioration, as part of the building plan check review process prior to construction.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

## 11. Land Use and Planning

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?				✓
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			✓	

### DISCUSSION

a) **No Impact.** The project site is vacant and is surrounded by vacant and single family lots to the north, vacant land to the east, residences uses to the south, and the Interstate-15 (I-15) to the west, with residences further west of I-15. The residences to the north, south, and west of the I-15 have different densities, are not connected by roadway, and are not considered a separate community. Therefore, construction of the Faith Bible Church on vacant land would not physically divide an established community, and no impact would occur.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project will include a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use designations of Medium Density Residential and Commercial Office to Commercial Retail. The proposed General Plan Amendment would result in compatibility with the current zoning designation for the site, C-1/C-P (General Commercial). The C-1/C-P designation allows for churches, temples, and other places of worship, pursuant to Chapter 17.72 of the City of Wildomar Municipal Code. Therefore, approval of the GPA would result in a less than significant impacts to land use.

### STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

1. Section 3.42.090 of the Wildomar Municipal Code requires the payment of MSHCP fees at the time of issuance of a building permit.
2. Section 3.44.060 requires that the applicant pay appropriate development impact fees prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the development project.
3. As required by Section 3.43.070 of the Wildomar Municipal Code, the project applicant is required to submit fees to the City in accordance with the requirements of the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan Mitigation Fee Area.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.



## 12. Mineral Resources

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and 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?				✓

### DISCUSSION

a) **No Impact.** The City of Wildomar, including the proposed project site, is in an area designated as MRZ-3 in the Wildomar General Plan (Wildomar 2003). The MRZ-3 zone includes areas where the available geologic information indicates that while mineral deposits are likely to exist, the significance of the deposit is undetermined. The General Plan Open Space-Mineral Resources (OS-MIN) land use designation allows mineral extraction and processing facilities, based on the applicable Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA) classification. Those land areas held in reserve for future mining activities are also designated OS-MIN. No areas within the city boundaries are designated as OS-MIN. In addition to local regulations, all projects are required to comply with applicable state and federal regulations. As a result, no impacts would occur.

b) **No Impact.** There are no known locally important mineral resource recovery sites identified on the project site in the Wildomar General Plan or in a specific plan or other land use plan. As a result, no impacts would occur.

### STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

None required.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

### 13. Noise

Issues, would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		✓		
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✓	
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓

An Acoustical Assessment was prepared by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc (2019b) (see **Appendix 10.0**). The analysis was prepared to evaluate the potential for construction and operation of the project to contribute to noise impacts.

#### Regulatory Setting

The City of Wildomar adopted the County of Riverside General Plan (CRGP), dated October 2003. The CRGP Noise Element sets general community noise and land use compatibility guidelines (see **Appendix 10**). Sound levels up to 60 dBA CNEL are normally compatible for single-family residential.

#### Existing Conditions

##### Noise Measurements

To quantify existing ambient noise levels in the project area, two noise measurements were conducted on August 24, 2016 (see **Table 13-1, Noise Measurements**). The noise measurement sites were representative of typical existing noise exposure within and immediately adjacent to the project. Ten-minute measurements were taken at between 11:00 AM and 12:00 PM at each site. Short-term ( $L_{eq}$ ) measurements are considered representative of the noise levels in the project area.

**Table 13-1**  
**Noise Measurements**

Site #	Location	L(dBA)	L(dBA)	L(dBA)	Peak (dBA)	Time
1	Corner of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road	55.5	49.2	82.9	101.2	11:08 AM
2	Along Glazebrook Road and the southeast boundary of the project site	49.0	40.8	72.4	87.4	11:26 AM

Source: Noise measurements taken by Michael Baker International, August 24, 2016. See Appendix 10.0 for noise measurement results.

Meteorological conditions were clear skies, warm temperatures, with light wind speeds (0 to 5 miles per hour), and low humidity. Measured noise levels during the daytime measurements ranged from 49.0 to 55.5 dBA Leq. Noise monitoring equipment used for the ambient noise survey consisted of a Brüel & Kjær Hand-held Analyzer Type 2250 equipped with a Type 4189 pre-polarized microphone. The monitoring equipment complies with applicable requirements of the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for sound level meters.

Noise exposure standards and guidelines for various types of land uses reflect the varying noise sensitivities associated with each of these uses. Residences, hospitals, schools, guest lodging, libraries, and churches are treated as the most sensitive to noise intrusion and therefore have more stringent noise exposure targets than do other uses, such as manufacturing or agricultural uses that are not subject to impacts such as sleep disturbance. Sensitive receptors near the project are listed in **Table 13-2, Sensitive Receptors**.

**Table 13-2**  
**Sensitive Receptors**

Receptor Type/Description	Distance and Direction from the Project Site
Single-Family Residential Neighborhood	50 feet north
Single-Family Residential Neighborhood	50 feet south
Single-Family Residential Neighborhood	50 feet west
Single-Family Residential Neighborhood	650 feet east
Donald Graham Elementary	1,090 feet northwest
Ronald Reagan Elementary	1,410 feet northeast
Windsong Park	1,802 feet southeast
California Lutheran High School	4,440 feet northwest
Living Hope Lutheran Church	4,440 feet northwest
World Harvest Church	5,560 feet south

### Mobile Sources

To assess the potential for mobile source noise impacts, it is necessary to determine the noise currently generated by vehicles traveling through the project area. Most of the existing noise in the project area is generated from vehicle sources along Clinton Keith Road from the I-15 Northbound Ramps to Arya Road. As shown in **Table 13-3, Existing Traffic Noise Levels**, mobile noise sources near the project range from 55.5 to 64.0 dBA.

**Table 13-3**  
**Existing Traffic Noise Levels**

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions				
	ADT	dBA @ 100 feet from Roadway Centerline	Distance from Roadway Centerline (feet)		
			60 CNEL Noise Contour	65 CNEL Noise Contour	70 CNEL Noise Contour
Baxter Road					
I-15 NB Ramps to Monte Vista Drive	2,200	57.9	68	22	7
Porrás Road					
Baxter Road to La Estrella Street	2,100	56.5	49	16	5
George Avenue					
La Estrella Street to Depasquale Road	2,271	55.5	39	12	4
Depasquale Road to Clinton Keith Road	2,575	56.0	44	14	4
Clinton Keith Road					

**Table 13-3  
Existing Traffic Noise Levels**

Roadway Segment	Existing Conditions				
	ADT	dBA @ 100 feet from Roadway Centerline	Distance from Roadway Centerline (feet)		
			60 CNEL Noise Contour	65 CNEL Noise Contour	70 CNEL Noise Contour
Hidden Springs Road to I-5 SB Ramps	15,500	63.4	267	85	27
I-15 NB Ramps to Arya Road	17,904	64.0	309	98	31
George Road to Inland Valley Road	14,414	63.2	248	79	25
Notes: ADT = Average Daily Traffic; dBA = A-Weighted Decibels; CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level					
Source: Based on traffic data within the <i>Faith Bible Church Traffic Impact Analysis Report</i> , prepared by Michael Baker International, 2016. Refer to Appendix 10.0 for traffic noise modeling assumptions and results.					

Mobile source noise was modeled using the Federal Highway Administration's Highway Noise Prediction Model (FHWA RD-77-108) which incorporates several roadway and site parameters. The model does not account for ambient noise levels. Noise projections are based on modeled vehicular traffic as derived from the *Faith Bible Church Traffic Impact Analysis Report*, prepared by Michael Baker International on September 12, 2016. A 45-mile per hour average vehicle speed along Baxter Road, a 40-mile per hour average vehicle speed along Porras Road, and a 35-mile per hour average vehicle speed along George Avenue and Clinton Keith Road were assumed for existing conditions based on empirical observations and posted maximum speeds. Existing modeled traffic noise levels are shown in **Table 13-3**.

#### Stationary Sources

The project is located within an urbanized area. The primary sources of stationary noise in the project vicinity are urban-related activities (i.e., mechanical equipment, commercial areas, parking areas, and pedestrians). The noise associated with these sources may represent a single-event noise occurrence, short-term, or long-term/continuous noise.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

Construction noise estimates are based upon noise levels from the FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA-HEP-05-054) as well as the distance to nearby receptors. Reference noise levels from FHWA are used to estimate noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors based on a standard noise attenuation rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance (line-of-sight method of sound attenuation for point sources of noise). Construction noise level estimates do not account for the presence of intervening structures or topography, which may reduce noise levels at receptor locations. Therefore, the noise levels presented below represent a conservative, reasonable worst-case estimate of actual temporary construction noise.

This analysis of the existing and future noise environments is based on noise prediction modeling and empirical observations. Predicted construction noise levels were based on typical noise levels generated by construction equipment. The traffic noise levels in the project vicinity Street were calculated using the FHWA Highway Noise Prediction Model (FHWA-RD-77-108).

Groundborne vibration levels associated with construction-related activities for the project were evaluated utilizing typical groundborne vibration levels associated with construction equipment, obtained from the Caltrans guidelines set forth above. Potential groundborne vibration impacts related

to structural damage and human annoyance were evaluated, considering the distance from construction activities to nearby land uses and typically applied criteria for structural damage and human annoyance.

## DISCUSSION

### a) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

#### **Construction**

The City of Wildomar sets standards for allowable noise levels according to General Plan land use designations. These standards, contained in the Wildomar General Plan, are measured by equivalent continuous sound level ( $L_{eq}$ ).  $L_{eq}$  is a method of describing sound levels that vary over time, resulting in a single decibel value that takes into account the total sound energy over a period of time of interest. Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) is the weighted average of noise over time. Schools, libraries, and churches are “normally acceptable” up to 70 CNEL, as are office buildings and business, commercial, and professional uses. As provided in the CRGP Noise Element, sound levels up to 60 dBA CNEL are normally compatible for single-family residential, the allowable maximum exterior noise level exposure for single-family residential uses would be 65  $L_{eq}$  (10 minutes) from 7 AM to 10 PM and 45  $L_{eq}$  (10 minutes) from 10 PM to 7 AM; the maximum interior noise level at residential uses would be 55  $L_{eq}$  (10 minutes) from 7 AM to 10 PM and 40  $L_{eq}$  (10 minutes) from 10 PM to 7 AM. Although the proposed project includes a change in zoning designation, the project will be consistent with surrounding uses. Therefore, the proposed project does not represent any significant change to the potential long-term noise levels of the area.

#### Construction Noise

Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending on the nature or phase of construction (e.g., land clearing, grading, excavation, paving). Noise generated by construction equipment, including earth movers, material handlers, and portable generators, can reach high levels. During construction, exterior noise levels could affect the residential neighborhoods near the construction site. At the nearest, project construction would occur at 50 feet from existing single-family residences. However, it is acknowledged that construction activities would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated at the point closest to the sensitive receptors.

Construction activities would include site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating. Such activities would require graders, scrapers, and tractors during site preparation; graders, dozers, and tractors during grading; cranes, forklifts, generators, tractors, and welders during building construction; pavers, rollers, mixers, tractors, and paving equipment during paving; and air compressors during architectural coating. Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve 1 or 2 minutes of full power operation followed by 3 to 4 minutes at lower power settings. Other primary sources of acoustical disturbance would be random incidents, which would last less than one minute (such as dropping large pieces of equipment or the hydraulic movement of machinery lifts). Noise generated by construction equipment, including earth movers, material handlers, and portable generators, can reach high levels. Typical noise levels associated with individual construction equipment are listed in **Table 13-4, Typical Construction Noise Levels**.

**Table 13-4**  
**Typical Construction Noise Levels**

Equipment	Typical Noise Level (dBA) at 50 Feet from Source		Typical Noise Level (dBA) at 100 Feet from Source	
	L	L	L	L
Air Compressor	80	76	74	70
Backhoe/Front End Loader	80	76	74	70
Compactor (Ground)	80	73	74	67
Concrete Mixer	85	81	79	75
Concrete Mixer (Vibratory)	80	73	74	67
Concrete Pump Truck	82	75	76	69
Concrete Saw	90	83	84	77
Crane	85	77	79	71
Dozer/Grader/Excavator/Scraper	85	81	79	75
Drill Rig Truck	84	77	78	71
Generator	82	79	76	73
Gradall	85	81	79	75
Hydraulic Break Ram	90	80	84	74
Jackhammer	85	78	79	72
Mounted Impact Hammer	90	83	84	77
Pavement Scarifier/Roller	85	78	79	72
Paver	85	82	79	76
Pneumatic Tools	85	82	79	76
Pumps	77	74	71	68
Truck (Dump/Flat Bed)	84	80	78	74
Source: Federal Transit Administration, <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment</i> , 2018.				
Note:				
1. Calculated using the inverse square law formula for sound attenuation: $dBA = dBA + 20 \log(d/d)$				

As shown in **Table 13-4**, exterior noise levels could affect the nearest existing sensitive receptors in the vicinity. Pursuant to Municipal Code Section 9.48.020, construction activities and noise are exempt so long as they occur between the hours of 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM during the months of October through July. These permitted hours of construction are included in the code in recognition that construction activities undertaken during daytime hours are a typical part of living in an urban environment and do not cause a significant disruption. The potential for construction-related noise to affect nearby residential receptors would depend on the location and proximity of construction activities to these receptors. Construction would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated or confined in the area directly adjacent to sensitive receptors.

It should be noted that the noise levels depicted in **Table 13-4** are maximum noise levels, which would occur sporadically when construction equipment is operated in proximity to sensitive receptors. Given the sporadic and variable nature of project construction and the implementation of time limits specified in the Wildomar Municipal Code, noise impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, to further reduce the potential for noise impacts, **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** would be implemented to incorporate best management practices during construction. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** would further minimize impacts from construction noise as it requires construction equipment to be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices. Thus, a less than significant noise impact would result from construction activities with mitigation incorporated.

### Construction Truck Trips

Construction activities would also cause increased noise along access routes to and from the site due to movement of equipment and workers. Grading of the project site is expected to be balanced and result in minimal soil hauling trips (1,875 trips over the course of the approximately 6-month grading phase, or approximately 16 trips per day). It is anticipated that construction worker trips would be a maximum of 49 trips per day total. Approximately 12 vendor trips per day are anticipated during the building construction phase. Construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site for the proposed project would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the site. However, this source of noise would be temporary and would cease upon project completion. It is anticipated that hauling would occur along Depasquale Road and George Avenue, which is a residential corridor. There would be a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential at a maximum level of 55 decibels (dBA) with trucks passing at 50 feet. However, the projected construction traffic would be minimal when compared to the existing traffic volumes on I-15 and other affected streets; and the associated long-term noise level change would not be perceptible.

Additionally, construction activities would only take place within the allowable hours specified by Wildomar Municipal Code section 9.48.020. Therefore, short-term construction-related impacts associated with worker commute and equipment transport to the project would be less than significant.

### **Operation**

Implementation of the proposed project would create new sources of noise in the project vicinity. The major noise sources associated with the project that would potentially impact existing and future nearby residences include off-site traffic noise, on-site mobile noise, mechanical equipment, parking area noise, and athletic field noise.

### Off-Site Traffic Noise

Future development generated by the project would result in additional traffic on adjacent roadways, increasing vehicular noise near existing and proposed land uses. The project is projected to generate a total of approximately 677 average daily weekday trips, including 42 trips during the morning peak hour and 41 trips during the evening peak hour, and 2,057 average daily trips on Sunday, including 678 morning peak hour trips. The “Future Without Project” and “Future With Project” scenarios are compared in **Table 13-5, Future Traffic Noise Levels**. As depicted in **Table 13-5**, under the “Future Without Project” scenario, noise levels would range from approximately 59.4 dBA to 66.4 dBA, with the highest noise levels occurring along Clinton Keith Road (I-15 Northbound Ramps to Arya Road). The “Future With Project” scenario noise levels would range from approximately 59.7 dBA to 66.5 dBA, with the highest noise levels also occurring along Clinton Keith Road (I-15 Northbound Ramps to Arya Road).

**Table 13-5  
Future Traffic Noise Levels**

Roadway Segment	Future Without Project		Future Plus Project		Difference in dBA @ 100 feet from Roadway
	ADT	dBA CNEL at 100 feet from Roadway Centerline	ADT	dBA CNEL at 100 feet from Roadway Centerline	
Baxter Road					
I-15 NB Ramps to Monte Vista Drive	6,500	62.6	6,767	62.8	0.2
Porras Road					
Baxter Road to La Estrella Street	5,800	60.9	6,109	61.1	0.2
George Avenue					
La Estrella Street to Depasquale Road	5,613	59.4	6,024	59.7	0.3
Depasquale Road to Clinton Keith Road	5,662	59.5	7,040	60.4	0.9
Clinton Keith Road					
Hidden Springs Road to I-5 SB Ramps	24,600	65.4	24,847	65.4	0.0
I-15 NB Ramps to Arya Road	31,059	66.4	32,273	66.5	0.1
George Road to Inland Valley Road	23,883	65.4	24,294	65.5	0.1
ADT = Average Daily Trips; dBA = A-Weighted Decibels; CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level					
Source: Based on traffic data within the <i>Faith Bible Church Traffic Impact Analysis Report</i> , prepared by Michael Baker International, 2016. Refer to Appendix 10.0 for traffic noise modeling assumptions and results.					

**Table 13-6** also compares the “Future Without Project” scenario to the “Future With Project” scenario. The noise levels would result in a maximum increase of 0.9 dBA from the project. This increase in noise would occur along George Avenue (Depasquale Road to Clinton Keith Road). According to the City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 9.48.020, motor vehicle noise is exempt from the City of Wildomar noise standards. Additionally, increases of up to 3 dBA are not perceptible to the human ear (FHWA 2017). Therefore, an increase in 0.9 dBA would not significantly increase noise levels along the roadway segments analyzed, and a less than significant impact would occur.

#### On-Site Mobile Noise

The project includes three detached single-family residential units to house visiting missionaries and their families. Based on the noise measurements in the City of Wildomar General Plan and the County of Riverside’s noise standards for land use compatibility, the ambient noise along Glazebrook Road, 49.0 to 55.5 dBA, which is compatible for single-family residential uses (50-60 dBA). (City of Wildomar 2003). Further, the proposed housing is for visitors, it is not proposed as a permanent residence. Therefore, traffic noise impacts to on-site residences would be less than significant.

#### Mechanical Equipment

Typically, mechanical equipment noise is 55 dBA at 50 feet from the source. HVAC units would be included on the roof of the proposed building. The HVAC units would be shielded by a mechanical screen wall and the roof would include a parapet, which would further attenuate noise. If HVAC units would be ground mounted, they would be located as close as approximately 360 feet away from the closest receptors and would not be audible at this distance. As the project would not place mechanical equipment adjacent to residential uses, noise from the HVAC units would not be perceptible at the nearest residents (adjacent to the project site on all sides).

#### Parking Areas

Traffic associated with parking lots is typically not of sufficient volume to exceed community noise standards, which are based on a time-averaged scale such as the CNEL scale. The instantaneous



maximum sound levels generated by a car door slamming, engine starting up, and car pass-bys range from 60 to 63 dBA and may be an annoyance to adjacent noise-sensitive receptors. Conversations in parking areas may also be an annoyance to adjacent sensitive receptors. Sound levels of speech typically range from 33 dBA at 48 feet for normal speech to 50 dBA at 50 feet for very loud speech. Impacts associated with parking would be considered minimal since the majority of parking spaces would be adjacent to the I-15 freeway. Parking lot noise would also be partially masked by background noise from traffic along Glazebrook Road. Therefore, the proposed parking would not result in substantially greater noise levels than currently exist at the project site. Noise associated with parking lot activities is not anticipated to exceed the County's Noise Standards or the California Land Use Compatibility Standards during operation. Therefore, noise impacts from parking lots would be less than significant.

#### Athletic Field Noise

The project proposes an athletic field located in the southwestern section of the site that is expected to be a source of recreational noise. Current noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptor 250 feet southeast of the proposed ball field are 55.5 dBA. Playgrounds and sports fields can generate noise levels of approximately 66 dBA at 50 feet. At 250 feet away, athletic field noise levels would be reduced to 52 dBA, which is below the City's 65 dBA daytime noise standard. Given the distance from the proposed field to the sensitive receptors, noise impacts would be less than significant.

#### Amphitheater

The project proposes an amphitheater to be used for church-related events, such as weddings or baptisms, during Phase 5 of construction. The amphitheater would be constructed at the northeastern portion of the site, abutting the northern property boundary, and would face south and away from sensitive residential receptors to the north. Events at the amphitheater would be infrequent and would be required to comply with the City of Wildomar noise standards (Municipal Code Section 9.48), and would not operate sound-amplifying equipment or audio equipment between 10:00 PM and 8:00 AM, or would apply for a single-event exception with the Planning Director.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Once operational, the project would not be a source of groundborne vibration. Increases in groundborne vibration levels attributable to the proposed project would be primarily associated with short-term construction-related activities. Construction on the project site would have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary groundborne vibration, depending on the specific construction equipment used and the operations involved.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has published standard vibration velocities for construction equipment operations. In general, the FTA architectural damage criterion for continuous vibrations (i.e., 0.2 in/sec) appears to be conservative. The types of construction vibration impacts include human annoyance and building damage. Human annoyance occurs when construction vibration rises significantly above the threshold of human perception for extended periods of time. Building damage can be cosmetic or structural. Ordinary buildings that are not particularly fragile would not experience any cosmetic damage (e.g., plaster cracks) at distances beyond 30 feet. This distance can vary substantially depending on the soil composition and underground geological layer between vibration source and receiver. In addition, not all buildings respond similarly to vibration generated by construction equipment. For example, for a building that is constructed with reinforced concrete with no plaster, the FTA guidelines show that a vibration level of up to 0.20 in/sec is considered safe and would not result in any construction vibration damage.

**Table 13-6, Typical Construction Equipment Vibration Levels**, lists vibration levels at 25 feet for typical construction equipment. Groundborne vibration generated by construction equipment spreads through the ground and diminishes in magnitude with increases in distance. As indicated in **Table 13-6**, based on FTA data, vibration velocities from typical heavy construction equipment operations that would be used during project construction range from 0.003 to 0.210 in/sec PPV at 25 feet from the source of activity.

**Table 13-6**  
**Typical Construction Equipment Vibration Levels**

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity at 25 Feet (in/sec)	Peak Particle Velocity at 50
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.032
Caisson Drilling	0.089	0.032
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.027
Rock Breaker	0.059	0.021
Jackhammer	0.035	0.012
Small Bulldozer/Tractors	0.003	0.001
Vibratory Roller	0.210	0.074
Notes: Calculated using the following formula: $PPV = PPV_x (25/D)$ where: PPV= the peak particle velocity in in/sec of the equipment adjusted for the distance PPV= the reference vibration level in in/sec from Table 12-2 of the Federal Transit Administration, <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines</i> , 2006. D = the distance from the equipment to the receiver		
Source: Federal Transit Administration, <i>Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines</i> , 2018.		

The nearest sensitive receptors are the residential uses approximately 50 feet to the north and the nearest structures are approximately 80 feet or more from the active construction zone. Using the calculation shown in **Table 13-6**, at 50 feet the vibration velocities from construction equipment would not exceed 0.074 in/sec PPV, which is below the FTA's 0.20 PPV threshold. It is also acknowledged that construction activities would occur throughout the project site and would not be concentrated at the point closest to the nearest residential structure. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with the project would be less than significant.

c) **No Impact.** The project is not located within an airport land use plan. There is no public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip located within two miles of the project site. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. As required by City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 9.48.020, all construction and general maintenance activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM from (Monday – Saturday) October through May, and between 6:00 AM and 6:00 PM (Monday – Saturday) from June through September. No construction is permitted on Sundays and city-observed holidays unless approval is obtained from the City Building Official or City Engineer.

2. As required by City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 15.04.010, Hours of Construction, any construction located within one-fourth mile from occupied residences shall be permitted Monday through Saturday, 6:30 AM to 7:00 PM. No construction shall be permitted on Sundays or City-observed holidays unless approved by the City Building Official or City Engineer.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

**NOI-1** Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of Wildomar Planning Department that the project complies with the following:

- a) Construction contracts specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices.
- b) Property owners and occupants located within 200 feet of the project boundary shall be sent a notice, at least 15 days prior to commencement of construction of each phase, regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the project construction site. All notices and signs shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Wildomar Planning Director (or designee), prior to mailing or posting and shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints.
- c) The Contractor shall provide evidence that a construction staff member will be designated as a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and will be present on-site during construction activities. The Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall notify the City within 24-hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the Planning Director (or designee). All notices that are sent to residential units immediately surrounding the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall include the contact name and the telephone number for the Noise Disturbance Coordinator.
- d) Prior to issuance of any Grading or Building Permit, the project Applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Director (or designee) that construction noise reduction methods shall be used where feasible. These reduction methods include shutting off idling equipment, installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and electric air compressors and similar power tools.
- e) Construction haul routes shall be designed to avoid noise sensitive uses (e.g., residences, convalescent homes, etc.), to the extent feasible.
- f) During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.
- g) Construction activities shall not take place outside of the allowable hours specified by the City's Municipal Code Section 9.48.020, (6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM during the months of October through July).

<i>Timing/Implementation:</i>	<i>Prior to grading permit issuance and during construction phase or any ground-breaking activity</i>
<i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i>	<i>City of Wildomar Planning Department and Public Works Department</i>

#### 14. Population and Housing

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			✓	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

#### DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would construct a church building that would seat 1,030 people and include assembly areas; rooms for bible study, training, and worship; childcare during church services; parking area for 795 vehicles, maintenance/equipment building, athletic field, and three single-family dwelling units to be used by visiting missionaries. The dwelling units on the project site would be used on a temporary-basis and would not provide housing for permanent residents. The proposed project would not induce substantial population growth; the church and its facilities would be used by residents living within the project site vicinity. Therefore, impacts to population growth would be less than significant.

b) **No Impact.** Since the project site is currently vacant, no housing units or people would be displaced, and the construction of replacement housing is not required. Therefore, there would be no impact in regard to displacing housing or people.

#### STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

None required.

#### MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.

## 15. Public Services

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental 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:				
a) Fire protection?			✓	
b) Police protection?			✓	
c) Schools?			✓	
d) Parks?			✓	
e) Other public facilities?			✓	

### DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) provides fire protection and safety services to the City of Wildomar. RCFD Fire Station 61 is located at 32637 Gruwell Street, approximately 1.6-miles west of the project site and would respond to calls for service from the proposed project. In addition to Fire Station 61, several other Riverside County and Murrieta Fire Department fire stations in the surrounding area would be able to provide fire protection services to the project site if needed. A standard condition of approval for the proposed project includes compliance with the requirements of the Riverside County Fire Department and the payment of standard development impact fees, which include a fee for fire service impacts. The proposed project is not expected to result in activities that create unusual fire protection needs. Refer to section VI.20, *Wildfire*, for specific analysis related to fire hazards. As such, any impacts are considered less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Police protection services are provided in Wildomar by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department (RCSD). The nearest sheriff's station is located at 333 Limited Street in Lake Elsinore, approximately 6.3-miles northwest of the project site. Traffic enforcement is provided in this area of Riverside County by the California Highway Patrol, with additional support from local Riverside County Sheriff's Department personnel.

For the purpose of establishing acceptable levels of service, the Sheriff's Department strives to maintain a recommended servicing of 1.2 sworn law enforcement personnel for every 1,000 residents (City of Wildomar 2018a). As discussed in Issue a) in section VI.14, *Population and Housing*, the project is not anticipated to induce substantial population growth and therefore would not be expected to substantially increase the demand for police protection services. Furthermore, the project is not expected to result in activities that create unusual police protection needs. Regardless, as a standard condition of approval for the project, the project applicant would be required to pay standard development impact fees, which include a fee for police service impacts to offset potential demand associated with development. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is in the Lake Elsinore Unified School District (LEUSD) and is served by Reagan Elementary School, Brown Middle School, and Elsinore High School. As discussed in Issue a) in section VI.14, *Population and Housing*, the project would not substantially increase the City's population. Currently, the City provides a Notice of Impact Mitigation Requirement to an applicant for a building permit, who then works with the school district to determine the precise amount of the fee. Once the fee has been paid in full, the LEUSD prepares a certificate that is provided to the City demonstrating payment of the fee. Payment of fees in compliance with Government Code Section 65996 fully mitigates all impacts to school facilities. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Wildomar owns and manages three public parks with a combined acreage of 14.27 acres: Marna O'Brien Park, Regency Heritage Park, and Windsong Park. The City requires 3 acres of neighborhood and community parkland per 1,000 residents. The proposed project would not create housing for permanent residents. The proposed project would include three single-family dwelling units which would be used by visiting missionaries. Moreover, the proposed project would include an athletic field. Although the City has Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvement impact fees, these fees are only applicable to residential developments, and do not apply to commercial, office, or industrial/business park developments. Therefore, the project applicant would not have to pay these fees, and project impacts to parks would be less than significant.

e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of the project would result in a negligible increase in the demand for other public facilities. The proposed project would include facilities such as an assembly area; rooms for bible study, training, and worship; and childcare during church services. The church would serve current residents living within the project vicinity. As substantiated in issue a) in section VI.14, *Population and Housing*, the proposed project would not have significant impacts on population growth. The proposed project is not expected to result in activities that create unusual demands on other public facilities; impacts would be less than significant.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. The project applicant would be required to comply with the requirements of the Riverside County Fire Department and pay standard development impact fees for fire service impacts.
2. The project applicant would be required to pay standard development impact fees for police service impacts.
3. The project applicant would be required to work with the LEUSD to determine the precise amount for the Notice of Impact Mitigation Requirement.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

## 16. Recreation

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			✓	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			✓	

### DISCUSSION

a) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Wildomar owns and manages three public parks with a combined acreage of 14.27 acres: Marna O'Brien Park, Regency Heritage Park, and Windsong Park. The City uses a level of service standard to calculate park improvement impact fees, 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents – the same ratio specified in the Quimby Act for park land acquisition (Wildomar 2015). The proposed project includes construction of a church building and three single-family dwelling units used by visiting missionaries. As these missionaries would not be permanent residents, impacts to recreational facilities would be less than significant. Moreover, the proposed project would include an athletic field/facility. Although the City has Park Land Acquisition and Park Improvement impact fees, these fees are only applicable to residential developments, and do not apply to commercial, office, or industrial/business park developments. Thus, impacts to neighborhood and regional parks would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes the construction of an athletic field and tot lot/playground. The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of offsite recreational facilities, as the attendees of the church would be residents that live within the project site vicinity. Additionally, the project would result in a lot line adjustment that would leave 1.27 acres of APN 376-410-024 undeveloped and not proposed for development as part of this project (the parcel would retain current General Commercial zoning and, if developed in the future, would require separate CEQA review and discretionary approvals). Therefore, the proposed project would result in a net gain in open space, and a less than significant impact would occur.

### STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS

None required.

### MITIGATION MEASURES

None required.



## 17. Transportation

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?		✓		
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			✓	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✓
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			✓	

A traffic impact analysis (TIA) was conducted by Michael Baker International on October 22, 2018, and is included as **Appendix 11.0** to this Initial Study. The City's traffic engineer, TKE Engineering reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) dated October 22, 2018 and provided comments in a letter dated November 29, 2018. A technical memorandum was prepared to address the City comments for inclusion as an addendum to the TIA, and has been appended to the front of **Appendix 11.0** in this Initial Study. As the City of Wildomar does not have their own traffic study guidelines, the methodologies were prepared in accordance with the Riverside County Transportation Department Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guide (April 2008).

The City of Wildomar has adopted the County of Riverside's General Plan, which considers level of service (LOS) "D" or better to be an acceptable traffic operation during peak hour within intersections in the City of Wildomar. Therefore, project-related traffic that would result in roadway segments to operate at LOS "F" would result in a significant impact.

### Project Background

The TIA assumes the development of a 1,112-seat sanctuary (74,309) on a 25.58-acre site. At the time the traffic study was completed, the site plan changed slightly to include a lower seating capacity of 1,030 seats for the sanctuary. Rather than revise the TIA for the smaller number of seats, staff determined that the conclusions of the TIA are valid for the smaller project, and in fact would be more conservative.

### Project Trip Generation

**Table 17-1, ITE Trip Generation Rates**, shows the project AM and PM peak hour rates based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) 9th Edition trip generation rates.

**Table 17-1  
Proposed Project Trip Generation**

Land Use		Intensity	ADT	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
				Volume	In	Out	Volume	In	Out
Church	Weekday <sup>1</sup>	74,309 KSF	677	42	26	16	41	20	21
	Sunday	1,030 Seats <sup>3</sup>	2,057	678	339	339	NA <sup>2</sup>		

<sup>1</sup>ITE only provides weekday rates based on square footage, however trip generation based on seats is expected to be more accurate for this land use. Square footage based on assumed lot coverage of 7 percent of gross acreage.  
<sup>2</sup>Only one peak hour is anticipated to occur on a typical Sunday (in compliance with ITE). Therefore, no PM peak hour rates are applied.  
<sup>3</sup>TIA analyzed 1,112 seats, while only 1,030 are proposed.

Trip generation rates used to estimate project traffic and a summary of the project's trip generation are from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 9th edition (2012) and shown in **Table 17-1**. Because the three proposed residences would only be temporarily occupied, they are expected to generate a minor amount of traffic during the weekday and are included in weekday trip generation estimates. Furthermore, as shown in **Table 3-1** and **Table 3-2**, the proposed project would result in fewer trips compared to the estimated trip generation for the existing land use designations.

#### Project Trip Distribution and Assignment

Project trip distribution was developed based on the existing roadway network and surrounding land uses, existing traffic patterns and access to regional routes such as I-15 and I-215. The TIA assumes Westpark Street within the Westpark Promenade project is built and extended south which ultimately connects to the intersection of Clinton Keith Road and Arya Drive. This is assumed because the project has been approved and was slated to be completed by 2018, and is anticipated to be completed prior to operation of the proposed project. Based on this information and input from City staff, the analysis assumes approximately 15 percent of traffic from the proposed development would use Westpark Street to access Clinton Keith Road, as an alternative to using George Avenue. The 15 percent traffic estimate was determined based on existing traffic patterns for projects with similar land uses and street configurations in their vicinity.

#### Ambient Growth

Ambient growth refers to a growth rate applied to the existing volumes to account for other general traffic growth in and around the study area. For this analysis, the ambient growth rate is based on a 2 percent annual growth for three years to represent the 2019 traffic conditions. The total ambient growth is 6 percent (growth of 2 percent per year from 2016 to 2019). This ambient growth rate (approximately 6.21 percent) is added to existing traffic (daily and peak hour) volumes to account for general traffic growth not reflected by cumulative projects.

#### Study Area

The following 13 intersections were evaluated in the TIA and their LOS are included in **Table 17-3, Existing Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions**, below (see **Figure 9, Existing Travel Lanes and Intersections**). As shown in **Table 17-3**, the existing LOS conditions for the 13 study intersections range from LOS A-C:

**Table 17-3**  
**Existing Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions**

Study Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Conditions Midday
		Delay <sup>1</sup> - LOS
I-15 SB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	10.4 – B
I-15 NB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	10.3 – B
Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive	OWSC	7.4 – A
La Estrella Street / Porras Road – George Avenue	AWSC	7.2 – A
Depasquale Road / Poplar Crest Road	TWSC	9.1 – A
Depasquale Road / George Avenue	OWSC	9.2 – A
Clinton Keith Road / Hidden Springs Road	Signal	23.9 – C
I-15 SB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	19.9 – B
I-15 NB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	23.2 – C
Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road	Signal	22.5 – C
Clinton Keith Road / George Avenue	Signal	16.8 – B
Clinton Keith Road / Inland Valley Drive	Signal	13.0 – B
Glazebrook Road / Depasquale Road	OWSC	7.3 – A
<sup>1</sup> Average seconds of delay per vehicle. LOS = Level of Service; TWSC = Two-Way Stop Control; AWSC = All-Way Stop Control; OWSC = One-Way Stop Control		

#### Cumulative Traffic

To determine “cumulative” traffic in the project study area, forecast traffic associated with the City of Wildomar approved or pending projects were identified and evaluated. As presented in Table 6 of the TIA, there are 21 cumulative projects within the project area that are forecasted to generate approximately 44,252 average weekend daily trips, which includes approximately 4,741 weekend peak hour trips (2,399 inbound and 2,342 outbound) (see **Appendix 11.0**).

a) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Church services will be conducted on Sunday mornings from 8:30-10 AM and 10:30-12 PM with various events planned throughout the week. In order to anticipate the highest-traffic scenario, the TIA analyzes the road network based on a Sunday morning between 10:00 and 1:00 PM. Based on existing counts anticipated to capture the Sunday church services scheduled, the peak hour occurred from 12:00 (noon) to 1:00 PM which was used for this analysis.


The TIA assumes all trips entering and exiting the site use Depasquale Road towards George Avenue. Although some traffic may use Glazebrook Road and travel south on Susan Drive, the majority of traffic is expected to use Depasquale Road, which provides a direct path to George Avenue rather than travel on nearby residential streets such as Dulock Road, Doheny Circle, or Bovard Street to access George Avenue. Assuming that all trips entering and exiting use Depasquale Road provides the most conservative analysis because it would be speculative to determine the volumes of traffic that would use other less-direct access roads to the project site. During actual operation, it is likely that traffic would

disperse and use other streets; therefore, assuming all traffic uses one street would be worst-case scenario.

The project is forecast to generate approximately 677 average daily trips (ADT) during the weekdays, with approximately 42 AM and 41 PM peak hour trips. The project is forecast to generate approximately 2,057 trips on Sundays with 678 (339 inbound and 339 outbound) peak hour trips in the afternoon.

**Figure 10, *Project Only Daily Traffic***, shows the project-generated traffic distribution.


Figure 9 - Existing Travel Lanes and Intersection Geometries



*This page intentionally left blank.*



Figure 10 - Project Only Daily Traffic



*This page intentionally left blank.*



### Existing Plus Project Conditions

Existing Plus Project traffic volumes were determined by adding the estimated project trips to existing Sunday traffic volumes. **Table 17-5, Existing Plus Project Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions**, summarizes the existing plus project conditions compared to existing conditions.

**Table 17-5**  
**Existing Plus Project Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions**

Study Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Conditions	Existing Plus Project Conditions	Change in Delay (sec.)	Significant Impact <sup>3</sup>
		Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> – LOS	Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> – LOS		
1. I-15 SB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	10.4 – B	10.9 – B	0.5	No
2. 1-15 NB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	10.3 – B	11.1 – B	0.8	No
3. Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive	OWSC	7.4 – A	11.9 – B	4.5	No
4. La Estrella Street / Porras Road – George Avenue	AWSC	7.2 – A	7.8 – A	0.6	No
5. Depasquale Road / Poplar Crest Road	TWSC	9.1 – A	15.8 – C	6.7	No
6. Depasquale Road / George Avenue	OWSC	9.2 – A	10.5 – B	1.3	No
7. Clinton Keith Road / Hidden Springs Road	Signal	23.9 – C	24.0 – C	0.1	No
8. I-15 SB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	19.9 – B	21.5 – C	1.6	No
9. I-15 NB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	23.2 – C	24.0 – C	0.8	No
10. Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road	Signal	22.5 – C	28.3 – C	5.8	No
11. Clinton Keith Road / George Avenue	Signal	16.8 – B	24.8 – C	8.0	No
12. Clinton Keith Road / Inland Valley Drive	Signal	13.0 – B	13.6 – B	0.6	No
13. Glazebrook Road / Depasquale Road	OWSC <sup>2</sup>	7.3 – A	17.5 – C	10.2	No

<sup>1</sup> Seconds of delay per vehicle.

<sup>2</sup> Intersection control is modified to a two-way-stop-controlled intersection with the addition of the project.

<sup>3</sup> LOS D or better is an acceptable level of service and would be less than significant.

All the study intersections are forecasted to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better) with Existing Plus Project conditions; therefore, no significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are proposed.

#### Existing Plus Ambient Plus Project Conditions

In accordance with City staff direction, an annual average growth rate of two percent per year (total of 6 percent) was applied to existing traffic volumes (2018) to account for general background traffic growth (Ambient Growth) in accordance with City staff direction. Project-related traffic volumes were then added to the Existing Plus Ambient to obtain Existing Plus Ambient Plus Project Volumes that would occur by the projects assumed opening year in 2019. **Table 17-6**, below, shows the Existing Plus Ambient Plus Project traffic volumes.

**Table 17-6**  
**Existing Plus Project Plus Ambient Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions**

Study Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Conditions	Existing Plus Project Conditions	Change in Delay (sec.)	Significant Impact
		Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> – LOS	Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> - LOS		
1. I-15 SB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	10.4 – B	11.5 – B	1.1	No
2. 1-15 NB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	10.3 – B	11.7 – B	1.4	No
3. Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive	OWSC	7.4 – A	12.3 – B	4.9	No
4. La Estrella Street / Porras Road – George Avenue	AWSC	7.2 – A	7.9 – A	0.7	No
5. Depasquale Road / Poplar Crest Road	TWSC	9.1 – A	15.9 – C	6.8	No
6. Depasquale Road / George Avenue	OWSC	9.2 – A	10.7 – B	1.5	No
7. Clinton Keith Road / Hidden Springs Road	Signal	23.9 – C	25.2 – C	1.3	No
8. I-15 SB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	19.9 – B	21.8 – C	1.9	No
9. I-15 NB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	23.2 – C	24.4 – C	1.2	No
10. Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road	Signal	22.5 – C	29.8 – C	7.3	No
11. Clinton Keith Road / George Avenue	Signal	16.8 – B	24.9 – C	8.1	No
12. Clinton Keith Road / Inland Valley Drive	Signal	13.0 – B	14.1 – B	1.1	No

**Table 17-6**  
**Existing Plus Project Plus Ambient Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions**

Study Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Conditions	Existing Plus Project Conditions	Change in Delay (sec.)	Significant Impact
		Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> – LOS	Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> - LOS		
13. Glazebrook Road / Depasquale Road	OWSC <sup>2</sup>	7.3 – A	17.0 - C	9.7	No
<sup>1</sup> Seconds of delay per vehicle. <sup>2</sup> Intersection control is modified to a two-way-stop-controlled intersection with the addition of the project.					

All the study intersections are forecasted to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better) for Existing Plus Project Plus Ambient conditions; therefore, no significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are proposed.

Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Conditions

The Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative traffic volumes were calculated by adding trips associated with 21 cumulative projects to Existing Plus Ambient without project traffic volumes. Cumulative project traffic assumes to generate traffic into the study area by the projects opening year (2019), and are shown in **Table 17-7**, below.

**Table 17-7**  
**Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Mid-Day (Sunday) Peak Hour Intersection Conditions**

Study Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Conditions Midday
		Delay <sup>1</sup> - LOS
1. I-15 SB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	18.9 – C
2. 1-15 NB Ramps / Baxter Road	AWSC	19.9 – C
<b>3. Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive</b>	<b>OWSC</b>	<b>108.9 - F</b>
4. La Estrella Street / Porras Road – George Avenue	AWSC	9.7 – A
5. Depasquale Road / Poplar Crest Road	TWSC	11.7 – B
6. Depasquale Road / George Avenue	TWSC	10.9 – B
7. Clinton Keith Road / Hidden Springs Road	Signal	28.2 – C
8. I-15 SB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	26.0 – C
9. I-15 NB Ramps / Clinton Keith Road	Signal	26.5 – C
<b>10. Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road</b>	<b>Signal</b>	<b>95.8 – F</b>
11. Clinton Keith Road / George Avenue	Signal	31.8 – C
12. Clinton Keith Road / Inland Valley Drive	Signal	<b>15.8 – B</b>
13. Glazebrook Road / Depasquale Road	OWSC	7.3 – A
Note: Deficient intersection operation indicated in bold. <sup>1</sup> Seconds of delay per vehicle.		

All the study intersections are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better), except for two intersections, which would operate at a deficient LOS F – Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive and Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road. A traffic signal and roadway improvements at this intersection would improve the level of service to a less than significant level. Mitigation measure **TRAF-1** would be implemented to pay fair share contribution towards installation of improvements that would reduce LOS impacts to a less than significant level. This improvement is anticipated to be constructed by the City through its Capital Improvement Program (CIP), with the project paying its fair share. As noted in **TRAF-1**, if not constructed prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant will construct the improvement and be able to seek reimbursement of its costs beyond its fair share amount through a reimbursement agreement to be developed with the City. The timing of Mitigation Measure **TRAF-1** requires that the improvements be included in the City's program for construction, or that they be constructed, prior to occupancy.

#### Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Project Conditions

To calculate the Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Plus Project conditions, project-related traffic volumes were added to the Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative without project volumes. **Table 17-8** shows the LOS of each study intersection under these conditions, below.

**Table 17-8**  
**Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Plus Project Mid-Day (Sunday) Intersection Conditions**

Study Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative conditions	Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Plus Project Conditions	Change in Delay (sec.)	Significant Impact?
		Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> – LOS	Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> - LOS		
1. I-15 SB Ramps/Baxter Road	AWSC	18.6 – C	21.6 – C	3.0	No
2. I-15 NB Ramps/Baxter Road	AWSC	19.9 – C	26.2 – D	6.3	No
<b>3. Baxter Road/Monte Vista Drive</b>	<b>OWSC</b>	<b>108.9 – F</b>	<b>135.0 – F</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>YES</b>
With Proposed Improvements	Signal		33.8 – C		
4. La Estrella Street/Porras Road – George Avenue	AWSC	9.7 – A	11.4 – B	1.7	No
5. Depasquale Road/Poplar Crest Road	TWSC	11.7 – A	23.1 – C	11.4	No
<b>6. Depasquale Road/George Avenue</b>	<b>TWSC</b>	<b>10.9 – B</b>	<b>198.0 – F</b>	<b>187.1</b>	<b>YES</b>
With Proposed Improvements	AWSC		29.9 – D		No
7. Clinton Keith Road/Hidden Springs Road	Signal	28.2 – C	28.5 - C	0.3	No
8. I-15 SB Ramps/Clinton Keith Road	Signal	26.0 – C	29.1 – C	3.1	No
9. I-15 NB Ramps/Clinton Keith Road	Signal	26.5 – C	27.5 – C	1.0	No

**Table 17-8**  
**Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Plus Project Mid-Day (Sunday) Intersection Conditions**

Study Intersection	Traffic Control	Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative conditions	Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Plus Project Conditions	Change in Delay (sec.)	Significant Impact?
		Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> – LOS	Midday Delay <sup>1</sup> - LOS		
<b>10. Clinton Keith/Arya Road</b>	Signal	<b>95.8 – F</b>	<b>133.7 – F</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>YES</b>
With Proposed Improvements	Signal		78.9 – E		No
11. Clinton Keith Road/George Avenue	Signal	31.8 – C	47.2 - D	15.4	No
12. Clinton Keith Road/Inland Valley Drive	Signal	15.8 – B	18.5 - B	2.7	No
13. Glazebrook Road/Depasquale Road	OWSC <sup>2</sup>	7.3 – A	17.0 - C	9.7	No
Note: Deficient intersection operation indicated in bold. <sup>1</sup> Seconds of delay per vehicle. <sup>2</sup> Intersection control is modified to a two-way-stop-controlled intersection with the addition of the project.					

All the study intersections are forecasted to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better), except for the following three intersections, which would operate at deficient LOS F:

- Intersection 3 - Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive
- Intersection 6 - Depasquale Road / George Avenue
- Intersection 10 - Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road

Therefore, Existing Plus Ambient Plus Cumulative Plus Project conditions would result in a significant impact to three intersections. Mitigation measure **TRAF-1** would be implemented to pay fair share contribution towards installation of improvements or to construct improvements that would reduce LOS impacts to a less than significant level.

#### Queueing

Queueing was evaluated at the intersection of Glazebrook Road and Depasquale Road with the extension of Glazebrook Road to the west. With stop signs controlling the northbound and southbound approaches and traffic flowing free in the eastbound and westbound approaches, little to no queueing would occur on Glazebrook Road in either direction. In the northbound approach on Depasquale Road, the conflicting movements are the eastbound left, southbound through and westbound through. The conflicting traffic volumes are expected to be minor and would most likely result in little to no queueing in the northbound approach. The southbound approach has the potential for the most queueing due to the conflicting movements and volumes. However, this queueing would occur on the project site where there is adequate vehicular storage. Queueing is likely to occur in the southbound approach on Sundays

when services end and vehicles are leaving the site. However, the queue is expected to clear within a 15 to 20-minute period following the service.

Additionally, **Mitigation Measure TRAF-1** requires improvements to the intersections of Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive, Depasquale Road / George Avenue, and Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road, which will ensure that these intersections will to operate at an acceptable level of service. Therefore, with the required fair share contributions, which have been calculated in **Appendix 11.0**, and impacts are considered less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure **TRAF-1**.

### **Public Transit and Bicycle Plans**

The City's Draft Wildomar General Plan Circulation Element identifies several roadways as "proposed circulation changes" and includes extension of La Estrella Street to the west towards I-15, as well as Susan Drive and Bayless Road extending between Baxter Road and La Estrella Street. The project proposes to construct a private road as the west leg of the existing intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road, which would parallel the I-15 before turning north along the northern boundary, turning back on the eastern side of the church to the south toward the Depasquale and Glazebrook Roads intersection and terminating at the project boundary. The project would also reserve the right-of-way on the northern boundary of the site to allow for a potential future La Estrella extensions, although the City has not indicated an extension is planned due to topographical constraints. Therefore, the proposed project has been designed to fit within the existing land use parameters and goals and policies of the City of Wildomar General Plan. Other improvements would include roadway, sidewalk, landscaping, and parkway improvements, allowing for alternative forms of transportation and connectivity with the surrounding transportation network. As proposed the project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs related public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 subdivision (b), vehicle miles traveled (VMT) exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects that would decrease vehicle miles traveled compared to existing conditions should be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact. The project would result in the construction of a new church at the project site. Churches generate regional VMT when they are not in abundance or available in close proximity to its user-base. Construction of a new church would reduce the VMT for users that would normally travel greater distances to attend other churches that provide similar services. The proposed Faith Bible Church would be located within a residential community and would reduce VMT from those residences that would otherwise travel to a church located farther away. Also, the project has existing members that live in the area and currently travel further to attend services. As the project would reduce VMT for existing city residents, and shorten travel distances for existing Wildomar residents that must travel to other cities to attend services, the project would not conflict with Section 15064.3 subdivision (b) and a less than significant impact would occur.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Wildomar implements development standards designed to ensure standard engineering practices are used for all improvements. The proposed project would be checked for compliance with these standards as part of the City's review process. The project includes improvements to the transportation and circulation system surrounding the site, and all such improvements would be designed and constructed to local, regional, and federal standards. As such, they would not introduce any hazardous design features. Therefore, the proposed project would not introduce any hazardous or inadequate design features, and no impact would occur.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would provide two points of vehicular access; the primary access would be a full-access driveway at the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road and the secondary access would be a full-access driveway on Glazebrook Road approximately 230 feet east of Depasquale Road. The project would include modification of the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road to include a project driveway connection adding the north leg of the intersection and extending Glazebrook Road to the west then along the I-15 freeway right-of-way, up to the northern boundary of the project site (see **Appendix 11.0**).

TIA states that the following offsite recommendations are reflected in the project site plan, shown in Exhibit 2 of the TIA:

- Construct partial width improvements on the northerly side of Glazebrook Road at its ultimate cross-section as a Collector with a curb-to-curb width of 60 feet and 80-foot right-of-way adjacent to the project's property boundary line; and
- Modify the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road to include a project driveway connection forming the north and west legs of the intersection.

Access to the project site would be reviewed by the City and the CAL FIRE/Riverside County Fire Department to ensure there is sufficient emergency access provided at the site as required by the City of Wildomar Municipal Code 8.28, Fire Code, for compliance with the California Fire Code. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. Prior to issuance of any building permit on the project site, the project applicant shall pay all existing roadway network fees (e.g., in-lieu costs) and fair-share contributions for specified off-site improvements.
2. As required by Municipal Code section 8.28, Fire Code, review of the project design by the City and CAL FIRE/Riverside County Fire Department is required to ensure sufficient emergency access.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

**TRAF-1** If the following improvements are included in the City of Wildomar Capital Improvement and Development Impact Fee Programs, the proposed project shall pay the City fees necessary to meet their fair share of the improvements. If the following improvements are not constructed prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant will construct the improvement and be able to seek reimbursement of its costs beyond its fair share amount through a reimbursement agreement to be developed with the City:

- Installation of a traffic signal at Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive and provide a dedicated eastbound left-turn lane.
- Convert the two-way stop control to all-way stop control at Depasquale Road / George Avenue and provide striping in eastbound approach to include a through-shared-left turn lane and a dedicated right-turn lane.
- At Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road:
  - *Northbound* – Restripe to provide one dedicated left-turn lane, one through lane and one dedicated right-turn lane.
  - *Southbound* – Restripe to provide one dedicated left-turn lane and one through-shared right-turn lane.

<i>Timing/Implementation:</i>	<i>Prior to Occupancy</i>
<i>Enforcement/Monitoring:</i>	<i>City of Wildomar Planning Department and Public Works Department</i>



## 18. Tribal Cultural Resources

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or		✓		
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		✓		

### DISCUSSION

a i, ii) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site does not contain any structures and does not have resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1 (k) (see section VI.5, above).

In accordance with SB 18, the Native American Heritage Commission was contacted to obtain a list of tribes that may have cultural association with the project site and its local vicinity. The NAHC provided a list of twenty-seven tribes, which were provided project information and request for information in accordance with SB 18 by the City on October 5, 2018. The Pala Band of Mission Indians and Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians responded stating that the project site is not within boundaries of their tribal cultural influence; the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians determined that the project was within their tribal boundaries, and requested consultation in accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52.

Assembly Bill 52 established a formal consultation process for California tribes within the CEQA process. The Bill specifies that any project may affect or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource would require a lead agency to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditional and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Section 21074 of AB 52 also defines tribal cultural resources as sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and which are either listed on, or eligible for, the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register, or if the lead agency chooses to treat the resource as a tribal cultural resource.

The City notified tribes that requested to be alerted of new projects on October 25, 2018, which included the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians. The Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians requested consultation; that consultation process has been formally concluded for Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians.

During initial consultation, the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians provided confidential information to Wildomar Planning staff regarding the tribal cultural resources and tribal values ascribed to the proposed project area. Based on the consultation, the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians believe that the proposed project could result in significant impacts to tribal cultural resources. While the City discussed the proposed project and mitigation for potentially significant impacts to tribal cultural resources was verbally agreed upon with the Pechanga and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, formal written consultation conclusion has not been provided. These tribes were asked for formal consultation conclusion again via email on March 12, 2019, but no response has been received. These tribes will be notified again via certified mail during the public review period for this Initial Study; further comments from the tribes, if provided, will be addressed accordingly.

With the inclusion of mitigation measures **TRI-1** through **TRI-5** and **CUL-1**, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be mitigated to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

None Required.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

Also refer to mitigation measures **CUL-1** in section VI.5 of this document.

**TRI-1** To address the possibility that historical, archaeological, and/or tribal cultural resources (collectively referred to as “cultural resources” in these mitigation measures) may be encountered during grading or construction, a qualified professional archaeologist shall monitor all construction activities that could potentially impact cultural resources (e.g., grading, excavation, and/or trenching). The Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians may assign individuals to monitor all grading, excavation, and groundbreaking activities as well, and the tribal monitors shall be allowed on-site during any construction activities that could potentially impact cultural resources. However, monitoring may be discontinued as soon the qualified professional and the appropriate tribe(s) are satisfied that construction will not disturb cultural resources.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *During any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Planning Department and Building and Safety Department*

**TRI-2** At least 30 days but no more than 60 days prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation which will be determined in consultation with the tribe(s) that intend to assign tribal monitors pursuant to mitigation measure **CUL-1**. The archaeologist and the tribal monitor(s) will have the authority to temporarily halt and redirect grading activities in order to evaluate the significance of any cultural resources discovered on the project site.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *At least Thirty days but no more than Sixty days prior to any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department*

- TRI-3** At least 30 days but no more than 60 days prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project applicant shall contact the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians with notification of the proposed grading and shall enter into a Tribal Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement with the tribe(s). The agreements shall include, but not be limited to, outlining provisions and requirements for addressing the handling of tribal cultural resources; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for tribal monitors; treatment and final disposition of any tribal cultural resources, including but not limited to sacred sites, burial goods, and human remains, discovered on the site; and establishing on-site monitoring provisions and/or requirements for professional tribal monitors during all ground-disturbing activities. The terms of the agreements shall not conflict with any of these mitigation measures. A copy of the signed agreement shall be provided to the Planning Director and the Building Official prior to the issuance of the first grading permit.

*Timing/Implementation:*      *At least thirty days but no more than sixty days prior to any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department*

- TRI-4** If during grading or construction activities, cultural resources are discovered on the project site, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery and the resources shall be evaluated by the archaeologist and the tribal monitor(s). Any cultural resources that are discovered shall be evaluated and a final report prepared by the archaeologist. The report shall include a list of the resources discovered; documentation of each site/locality; interpretation of the resources identified; a determination of whether the resources are historical resources, unique or non-unique archeological resources, and/or tribal cultural resources; and the method of preservation and/or recovery for the identified resources. If the archaeologist, in consultation with the tribes, determines the cultural resources to be either historic resources or unique archaeological resources, avoidance and/or mitigation will be required pursuant to and consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the City, project applicant, project archaeologist, and consulting tribe(s) reach an agreement regarding the appropriate treatment of the cultural resources, which may include avoidance or appropriate mitigation. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b), avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological and cultural resources. Work may continue outside of the buffer area and will be monitored by additional tribal monitors, if needed as determined by the project archaeologist and the consulting tribe(s).

*Timing/Implementation:*      *During any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*      *City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department*

- TRI-5** In the event that cultural resources are discovered during the course of grading (inadvertent discoveries), the following shall be carried out for final disposition of the discoveries:

- a. The landowner(s) shall agree to relinquish ownership of all recovered tribal cultural resources to the consulting tribe(s), including sacred items and all artifacts, as part of the required treatment for impacts to cultural resources.
- b. One or more of the following treatment, in order of preference below, with (i) being the preferred treatment and (ii) being the secondary preferred treatment, shall be employed with the agreement of all parties. Evidence of such agreement shall be provided to the City:
  - i. Preservation in place of the cultural resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in place they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.
  - ii. On-site relocation to a preservation area shall be accomplished as requested by the consulting tribe(s). The preservation area location shall be governed by measures and provisions to protect the preservation area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Relocation shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed. No recordation of sacred items is permitted without the written consent of the consulting tribe(s).
  - iii. Only if (i) and (ii) above cannot be employed, curation shall be arranged with an appropriate qualified repository that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79. The cultural resources would be professionally curated and made available to other archeologists/researchers/tribal governments for further research and culturally appropriate use. The collections and associated records shall be transferred to a curation facility meeting the above federal standards to be accompanied by a curation agreement and payment of any fees necessary for permanent curation.

*Timing/Implementation:*                      *During any ground-disturbing construction activities*

*Enforcement/Monitoring:*                      *City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department*

## 19. Utilities and Service Systems

Issues, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			✓	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			✓	
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			✓	
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			✓	
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓	

### DISCUSSION

a, c) **Less Than Significant Impact.**

#### Wastewater Treatment

The EVMWD currently operates three wastewater treatment facilities: The Regional Water Reclamation Facility (WRF), the Horsethief Canyon Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), and the Railroad Canyon WWTP (EVMWD 2016a). In addition, flow in the southern part of the EVMWD's service area is treated at the Santa Rosa Water Reclamation Facility operated by the Rancho California Water District. The project site is within the Regional WRF wastewater collection area (EVMWD 2016a).

To determine future demand for wastewater facilities, the EVMWD relies on recommended generation factors specified in the 2016 Sewer System Master Plan. The recommended generation factors are determined according to land use designation. The wastewater generations rates in Table 4-8, Calibrated Wastewater Duty and Generation Factors, of the Sewer System Master Plan are 706 gallons per day(gpd)/acre for public institutions and 360 gpd/acre for very low-density residences (0.1-0.5 dwelling unit/acre) (EVMWD 2016b).

The proposed church is 27,489 square feet, the Children's Building is 16,486 square feet, and the gymnasium would be approximately 18,024 square feet. Although the size of the single family residences and storage and restroom have not been finalized at this time, based on the dimensions in

the proposed site plan (see **Figure 7**) and for a conservative estimate, it can be assumed that each residence would be 2,500 square feet each (7,500 square feet total for the three) and the storage/restroom would be 1,250 square feet. **Table 19-1, Project-Wastewater Generation**, shows the amount of wastewater generation based on the proposed improvements and wastewater generation factors.

**Table 19-1**  
**Project-Wastewater Generation**

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>Size (square feet)</b>	<b>Size (acre)</b>	<b>Wastewater Duty Factor (gpd/ac)</b>	<b>Total (gpd)</b>
Church	27,489	0.63	706	444.78
Children's Building	16,486	0.38	706	268.28
Gymnasium	18,024	0.41	706	289.46
Residences	7,500	0.17	360	61.2
Restroom/Storage	1,250	0.03	706	21.18
			<b>Total</b>	<b>1,084.9</b>
Source: MWH. 2016 Sewer System Master Plan Final Report. August 2016.				

According to Table 3-4 of the 2016 Sewer System Master Plan, there are 29 lift stations that serve the Regional WRF (EVMWD 2016b). Wastewater produced by the proposed project would be drawn by the B-2 Regional Lift Station, approximately 3.4-miles northwest of the project site, at 32741 Mission Trail. The B-2 Lift Station has three pumps and a capacity of 1,200 gallons per minute (gpm), or 1,728,000 gpd (EVMWD 2016b). The Regional WRF has an average daily intake of 5.46 million gallons per day (mgd) with a flow capacity of 8 mgd and a peak flow capacity of 17.6 mgd (EVMWD 2016b); therefore, the Regional WRF has an excess daily intake capacity of approximately 2 mgd. In addition, the RWRF also has a planned capacity expansion of 4 mgd, from 8 to 12 mgd, and by an addition 4 mgd by 2040 to a total treatment capacity of 16 mgd.

The proposed project would result in an increased generation of approximately 0.05 percent<sup>4</sup> of the average flow capacity of the Regional WRF, and would be even less with implementation of the future expansion. Therefore, based on wastewater generated by the project, the current capacity of the Regional WRF would be able to accommodate the wastewater flows generated from the proposed project. The proposed project impacts to wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

#### Water Treatment

Water treatment facilities filter and/or disinfect water before it is delivered to customers. The EVMWD supplies water to the surrounding area and would supply water to the project site. Water line improvements at the project site would be constructed in accordance with Title 13, Public Services, of the Wildomar Municipal Code.

---

<sup>4</sup> 1,084.9 gpd / 2,000,000 gpd = 0.00054 = 0.05 percent.

EVMWD purchases water from the Eastern Municipal Water District and Western Municipal Water District (WMWD). Purchased water from the Eastern District is treated at the Metropolitan Water District's Skinner Filtration Plant, which blends primarily Colorado River water and a small amount of State Water Project water. Purchased water from the Western District is conveyed from the Temescal Valley Pipeline and treated at the Mills Filtration Plant (EVMWD 2016). Surface water from Canyon Lake (Railroad Canyon reservoir) is treated at Canyon Lake Water Treatment Plant. The water treatment facilities, their capacities, and remaining available treatment capacities are shown in Table 19-2.

**Table 19-2**  
**EVMWD Water Treatment Facilities**

<b>Treatment Plant</b>	<b>Capacity (mgd)</b>	<b>Average Daily Intake<sup>1</sup> (mgd)</b>	<b>Remaining Treatment Capacity (mgd)</b>
Canyon Lake Water Treatment Plant	9	4.5	4.5
Skinner Filtration Plant <sup>1</sup>	630	220	410
Mills Filtration Plant <sup>1</sup>	220	90	130
Total:	859	314.5	<b>544.5</b>

Source: MWD 2017.

<sup>1</sup> Estimates based on average of Skinner and Mills daily effluent graphs.

As shown in **Table 18-1**, the EVMWD water treatment facilities have a remaining water treatment capacity of approximately 544.5 million gallons per day (mgd). Based on water generations rates in Table 4-8, Calibrated Wastewater Duty and Generation Factors, of the Sewer System Master Plan, the water duty factors for the site uses would be 1700 gallons per day(gpd)/acre for public institutions and 400 gpd/acre for very low-density residences (0.1-0.5 dwelling unit/acre) (EVMWD 2016b). **Table 19-3, Project-Wastewater Generation**, shows the amount of water demand based on the proposed improvements and water duty factors.

**Table 19-3**  
**Project-Wastewater Generation**

<b>Improvement</b>	<b>Size (square feet)</b>	<b>Size (acre)</b>	<b>Wastewater Duty Factor (gpd/ac)</b>	<b>Total (gpd)</b>
Church	27,489	0.63	1700	1,071
Children's Building	16,486	0.38	1700	646
Gymnasium	18,024	0.41	1700	697
Residences	7,500	0.17	400	68
Restroom/Storage	1,250	0.03	1700	51
<b>Total</b>				<b>2,533</b>

Source: MWH. 2016 Sewer System Master Plan Final Report. August 2016.

As provided in Table 19-3, above, the project would result in a water demand increase of 2,533 gpd. This would be less than 0.001 percent<sup>5</sup> of the remaining treatment capacity of the EVMWD water treatment facilities. Therefore, based on water demands of the project, the current capacity of the EVMWD treatment facilities would be able to accommodate the water demands generated from the proposed project. The proposed project impacts to water treatment would be less than significant.

#### Stormwater Drainage

Stormwater drainage impacts are addressed in section VI.10.c.iii, above. The proposed project would utilize a subsurface storm drain and drainage inlets, to convey peak flows, and two onsite infiltration basins to address water quality and hydromodification requirements. All onsite surface storm flows would be directed to onsite drop curb and street inlets, and conveyed via the storm drain pipe system where they would discharge to the two infiltration basins. An emergency overflow would be utilized to bypass the 100-year storm flow where they would be collected and conveyed by street storm drain system and ultimately by the existing culverts crowing below I-15. The BMP facilities implemented by the proposed project would improve water quality. Impacts would be less than significant. Stormwater drainage improvements would not exceed the capacity of storm drain systems in accordance with the City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 13.12.050 and the MS4 Permit from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.

#### Electricity and Natural Gas

The project site would require connection to utilities such as electricity and natural gas lines in the vicinity of the site in accordance with Municipal Code Section 16.40.010 Installation requirements for undergrounding utilities. The applicant would be responsible for payment of electricity and gas connections as well as use of the utility. As described in section VI.6, *Energy*, the project would not result in energy use such that new or expanded facilities would be required. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is within the service boundary for the EVMWD. The EVMWD utilizes both groundwater and imported water supplies to ensure adequate water is available for consumers. Imported water is utilized to ensure that significant overdraft of local groundwater supplies does not occur. Imported water is obtained from the Metropolitan Water District, local surface water from Canyon Lake, and local groundwater from the Elsinore Basin. EVMWD has a total of 13,128.2 acre-ft/year of groundwater rights and safe yield (EVMWD 2016a). The EVMWD has the ability to obtain a capacity of 26,296 acre-feet per year (23.4 mgd) during average year and wet years (EVMWD 2016a).

The proposed project is expected to be developed by 2021; according to 2015 Urban Water Management Plan the projected 2020 water demand of 36,205 acre-feet per year, with a projected supply of 44,052 acre-feet per year (EVMWD 2016a). Thus, the supply would exceed the demand by 7,847 acre-feet/year, indicating that there would be sufficient supplies to service the proposed project. This impact would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The main disposal site in the project vicinity is the El Sobrante Landfill in Corona. The landfill is projected to reach its full capacity of 184,930,000 tons in 2051 (CalRecycle 2018). The landfill covers approximately 1,322 acres and has a maximum permitted throughput of

---

<sup>5</sup> 2,533 gpd / 544,500,000 gpd = 0.000004 = 0.0004 percent.



approximately 16,054 tons/day (CalRecycle 2018). The El Sobrante Landfill has a remaining capacity of 145,540,000 tons (CalRecycle 2018).

The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery's (CalRecycle) sample solid waste generation rates for public/institutional is 0.007 lbs/square feet/day and 11.4 lb/dwelling unit/day (CalRecycle 2016). The proposed church development would generate approximately 193.403 lb/day (27,489 square feet x 0.007 lb/day) and the three residences would generate 34.2 lb/day (3 single-family units x 11.4 lb/day), totaling 227.603 lb/day of solid waste. This increase would be 0.00071 percent<sup>6</sup> of the landfill's daily maximum permitted throughput, and could be accommodated. Therefore, the project impacts on landfill capacity would be less than significant.

e) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Solid waste would be generated during construction and operation of the proposed project. Development of the proposed project would be subject to the Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991. The act requires that adequate areas be provided for collecting and loading recyclable materials such as paper, products, glass, and other recyclables. City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 8.104 regulates solid waste handling and mandates that sufficient receptacles be in place onsite to accommodate refuse and recycling. Compliance with state law and the City's Municipal Code would ensure the project would result in a less than significant impact.

#### **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

1. As required by City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 13.12.050, Regulatory Consistency, and the MS4 Permit from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, stormwater drainage improvements must be consistent and in accordance with these provisions.
2. As required by City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 16.40.10, Installation Requirements, the project would comply with the installation requirements for undergrounding utilities.
3. As required by City of Wildomar Municipal Code Section 8.104, Solid Waste Collection and Disposal, the generation, accumulation, handling, collection, transportation, conversion, and disposal of solid waste must be controlled and regulated through the provisions of this chapter.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

None required.

---

<sup>6</sup>  $227.63 \text{ lb/day} = 0.1138015 \text{ ton/day}$   
 $0.1138015 / 16,054 \text{ tons/day} \times 100 = 0.00070887 \text{ percent} = 0.00071$

## 20. Wildfire

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		✓		
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?		✓		
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			✓	
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			✓	

a) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** California Government Code Chapter 6.8 directs the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire) to identify areas of very high fire hazard severity within Local Responsibility Areas (LRA). Mapping of the areas, referred to as Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ), is based on data and models of potential fuels over a 30- to 50-year time horizon and their associated expected fire behavior and expected burn probabilities, which quantifies the likelihood and nature of vegetation fire exposure to buildings. LRA VHFHSZ maps were initially developed in the mid-1990s and are now being updated based on improved science, mapping techniques, and data. In 2008, the California Building Standards Commission adopted California Building Code Chapter 7A requiring new buildings in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones to use ignition-resistant construction methods and materials.

The eastern and western portions of the City of Wildomar, including the project site, have been designated Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Therefore, development on the project site would be subject to compliance with the 2016 California Building Code (or the most current version) and the 2016 edition of the California Fire Code (Part 9 of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, which includes Section 4905.2, Construction Methods and Requirements within Established Limits). Fire Code Chapter 49 cites specific requirements for wildland-urban interface areas that include, but are not limited to, providing defensible space and hazardous vegetation and fuel management. Wildomar is covered under the Riverside County Operational Area Emergency Operations Plan (2006) and the Riverside County Operation Area Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2012). These plans provide guidance to effectively respond to any emergency, including wildfires. In addition, all proposed construction would be required to meet minimum standards for fire safety. Implementation of these plans and policies in conjunction with compliance with the Fire Code would minimize the risk of loss due to wildfires.

The project site, as with other portions of the City, is located within a VHFHZ, and therefore, development on the project site would be subject to compliance with California Building Code. Moreover, the City of Wildomar is under the Riverside County Operational Area Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, which provide guidance to effectively respond to and mitigate emergencies, including wildfires. In order to reduce impacts to wildfire hazards to a less than significant level, mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2**, which require conformance with the California Building Code and Fire Code, would be implemented. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

b) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The project site is predominately undeveloped with topography varying from 1,328 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 1,368 feet amsl. The site has been subject to a variety of man-made disturbances which includes illegal off-road activities, weed abatement, and dirt trails for recreational uses. The City does not have high speed prevailing winds, with average wind speeds of approximately 5.6 miles per hour during the windier part of the year, from November to June (Weather Spark 2019).

Development of the site with the proposed improvements would reduce the amount of exposed vegetation that could be used as fuel on the site. Therefore, the project and site conditions would not contribute to an increase in exposure to wildfire risk. Additionally, because the project site as with other portions of the City are located within a VHFHZ, development on the project site would be subject to compliance with California Building Code. Moreover, the City of Wildomar is under the Riverside County Operational Area Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, which provide guidance to effectively respond to and mitigate emergencies, including wildfires. In order to reduce impacts to wildfire hazards to a less than significant level, mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2**, which require conformance with the California Building Code and Fire Code, would be implemented. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site would require connection to utilities such as electricity, water, and sewer, as well as connection to roadways including Depasquale and Glazebrook Roads. In addition to paying for connections and maintenance of onsite utility infrastructure, the project applicant will be required to participate in the funding of off-site improvements, including maintenance of roadways. Specifically, this will be accomplished through required fair share payments into the City of Wildomar DIF transportation improvement fee programs; churches and associated facilities are exempt from payment of the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (Municipal Code Chapter 3.40). Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.44, these fees are collected as part of a funding mechanism aimed at ensuring the maintenance of public infrastructure, services, and facilities as the demand for them grows in concurrence with cumulative growth in the city. The construction of infrastructure improvements for the project would not directly increase fire risk, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section VI.9 and VI.10 respectively, above, the project site is not within a flood plain or landslide hazard area. Construction activities related to the proposed project would be subject to compliance with the CBC and would include best management practices (BMPs). Best management practices may include but are not limited to covering of the soil, use of a dust-inhibiting material, landscaping, use of straw and jute, hydroseeding, and grading in a pattern than slows stormwater flow and reduces the potential for erosion, landslides, and downstream flooding. Operationally, drainage at the project site would be improved post-construction with a subsurface storm drain, drainage inlets, to convey peak flows and utilize two onsite infiltration basins to mitigate for water quality and hydromodification requirements. Therefore, with implementation of BMPs and the proposed drainage improvements, impacts would be less than significant.

## **STANDARD CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS**

None Required.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

Implementation of mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2** in section VI.9 of this document

## VII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Issues, does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		✓		
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		✓		
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		✓		

## DISCUSSION

The following are Mandatory Findings of Significance in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15065.

a) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** Based on the evaluations and discussion in this IS/MND, the proposed project has a very limited potential to incrementally degrade the quality of the environment because the site was previously disturbed. As discussed in section VI.4, *Biological Resources*, with implementation of mitigation measures **BIO-1** through **BIO-4**, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on biological resources and would not conflict with the MSHCP. Similarly, as discussed in section VI.5, *Cultural Resources*, with implementation of mitigation measures **CUL-1** and **TRI-1** through **TRI-5**, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on archaeological resources. As discussed in section VI.7, *Geology and Soils*, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on geological resources with implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** and **GEO-2**, which requires the project to incorporate recommendations of the fault hazard study and reduce impacts to paleontological resources. With implementation of **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2**, as discussed in section VI.8 *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to wildfire with conformance to building codes and City standards. As discussed in section VI.12, *Noise*, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with mitigation measure **NOI-1**, which would limit construction and operational noise levels. Furthermore, with implementation of **CUL-1** and **TRI-1** through **TRI-5**, the proposed project would

have a less than significant impact to tribal cultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly affect the environment with implementation of the mitigation measures contained in this IS/MND. Therefore, any impacts would be considered less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**b) Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.**

AESTHETICS

Implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative visual resource or aesthetic impacts. The project includes several design measures to minimize light pollution. This project and other projects in Wildomar are required to comply with the City's light pollution ordinance. The project is proposed in a developing region of the City and is consistent with the General Plan. While certain structures, such as the proposed church and Children's Building, may obscure views of surrounding ridgelines from proximate public vantage points, the project, in combination with other development in the vicinity would not significantly impact any scenic vistas. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact to aesthetics.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts to agricultural or forestry resources and would therefore not contribute to cumulative impacts to these resources.

AIR QUALITY

As previously stated, the SCAQMD's approach for assessing cumulative impacts is based on the Air Quality Management Plan forecasts of attainment of ambient air quality standards in accordance with the requirements of the federal and California Clean Air Acts. In other words, the SCAQMD considers projects that are consistent with the AQMP, which is intended to bring the basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants, to also have less than significant cumulative impacts. The discussion under Issue a) in section VI.3, *Air Quality*, describes the SCAQMD criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP and further demonstrates that the proposed project would be consistent with the plan. As such, the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on air quality.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The potential for the proposed project to result in direct biological impacts is addressed through the payment of mitigation fees required by the MSHCP and mitigation measures **BIO-1** through **BIO-4**. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on biological resources.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Development of the project site would contribute to a cumulative increase in potential impacts to cultural and archaeological resources. However, mitigation measures **CUL-1** and **TRI-1** through **TRI-5** would reduce the potential impacts associated with development on the project site. Thus, the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact.

ENERGY

Construction and operation of the improvements would result in an increase in energy. Construction energy would be temporary and normal of development in the region. Section VI.6, *Energy*, analyzed the project's cumulative contribution to energy in the region and determined the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable environmental impact to energy.

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Project-related impacts on geology and soils associated with development on the project site are site-specific, and project development would not contribute to seismic hazards or soil erosion. Implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** would result in decreased exposure to the risks associated with seismic activity, and **GEO-2** would reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts are expected to be less than cumulatively considerable.

## GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The greenhouse gas analysis in section VI.8, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, analyzed the proposed project's cumulative contribution to global climate change and determined that the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable environmental impact resulting from greenhouse gas emissions.

## HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The proposed project is not expected to utilize or contribute to hazards associated with the accidental release of hazardous materials. Implementation of mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2** would ensure that the proposed project complies with California Building Code, Fire Code, and City standards in regard to fire hazards. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that cumulative hazard conditions are less than cumulatively considerable.

## HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Water quality measures included in the proposed project and the WQMP and SWPPP prepared for the project would protect the quality of water discharged from the site during both construction and operational activities. The site is not located within a flood hazard zone. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact related to hydrology.

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

The proposed project is consistent with the existing C-1/C-P zoning designation of the General Plan. The proposed project requires approval of a General Plan Amendment to change the existing land use of Commercial Office (CO) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Commercial Retail (CR) to accommodate the project. With implementation of mitigation measures **BIO-1** through **BIO-4**, would be consistent with the MSHCP. Therefore, the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact related to land use and planning.

## MINERAL RESOURCES

The proposed project would have no impact related to mineral resources and would therefore not contribute to any cumulative impacts to such resources.

## NOISE

As discussed in section VI.13, *Noise*, the proposed project would comply with all applicable noise standards and would have less than significant direct impacts related to construction and operational noise. Project construction could result in some noise disturbance; however, these impacts would be temporary and would be restricted to daytime hours. In addition to adherence to the City of Wildomar's policies found in the General Plan Noise Element and the Municipal Code limiting the construction hours of operation, and implementation of mitigation measure **NOI-1** would reduce construction-associated noise by requiring best management practices to reduce construction-related noise. It is possible that other construction projects in the vicinity could overlap with activity on the proposed project site, but other such projects would be required to mitigate their construction noise impacts. Any combined impacts would be temporary, constituting intermittent annoyance perhaps, but not a significant

cumulative noise impact. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact related to noise.

#### POPULATION AND HOUSING

Since the project site is currently vacant, no housing units or people would be displaced, and the construction of replacement housing is not required. Therefore, the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact related to population and housing.

#### PUBLIC SERVICES

Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in the immediate area, may increase the demand for public services such as fire and police protection. However, as a standard condition of approval, the project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to fund the expansion of such services. Development of any future public facilities would be subject to CEQA review prior to approval that would identify and address any resulting impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on public services.

#### RECREATION

Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with other existing, planned, proposed, approved, and reasonably foreseeable development in the immediate area, may increase the demand for recreational space. The project would not remove recreational space and would provide new recreational space with a grass field and amphitheater. Additionally, as a standard condition of approval, the project applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to fund the expansion of such services. Development of any future public facilities would be subject to CEQA review prior to approval that would identify and address any resulting impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on public services.

#### TRANSPORTATION

The CEQA Guidelines require that other reasonably foreseeable development projects which are either approved or being processed concurrently in the study area also be included as part of a cumulative analysis scenario. The cumulative setting for the proposed project includes the nearby development for opening year traffic conditions provided by City of Wildomar Public Works and Engineering staff. Cumulative traffic impacts are created as a result of a combination of the proposed project and other future developments contributing to the overall traffic impacts and requiring additional improvements to maintain acceptable levels of service with or without the project. A project's contribution to a cumulatively significant impact can be reduced to less than significant if the project implements or funds its fair share of improvements designed to alleviate the potential cumulative impact. As enforced by the City adopted City Traffic Signal Development Impact Fee (Article I, Development Impact Fees, of Municipal Code Chapter 3.44), the project applicant will be required to participate in the funding of off-site improvements, including traffic signals that are needed to serve cumulative traffic conditions. Specifically, this will be accomplished through required fair share payments into the City of Wildomar DIF transportation improvement fee programs; churches and associated facilities are exempt from payment of the Western Riverside County Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (Municipal Code Chapter 3.40). Per Municipal Code Chapter 3.44, these fees are collected as part of a funding mechanism aimed at ensuring that regional highways and arterial expansions keep pace with projected population increases. Furthermore, implementation of mitigation measure **TRAF-1** stipulates that the applicant shall be responsible for payment of fair-share fees for installation of a traffic signal installed at Baxter Road/Monte Vista Drive, conversion of a two-way stop control to all-way stop control at Depasquale



Road/George Avenue, and restriping on Clinton Keith/Arya Road. The project's impacts to cumulative traffic conditions would be less than cumulatively considerable.

#### TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Development of the project site would contribute to a cumulative increase in potential impacts to cultural and archaeological resources. However, mitigation measures **CUL-1** and **TRI-1** through **TRI-5** would reduce the potential impacts to tribal cultural resources associated with development on the project site. Thus, the project would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact.

#### UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Implementation of the proposed project would increase demand for public utilities. However, project would not result in a significant increase in utility demand and would be accounted for in long-range plans for provision of such services, as provided in the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than cumulatively considerable impacts on utilities and service systems.

#### WILDFIRE

Development of the project site would not exacerbate wildfire risk for the region; the project would develop an undeveloped area and reduce wildfire risk at the site. Implementation of mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2** would ensure that the proposed project complies with California Building Code, Fire Code, and City standards in regard to fire hazards. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations would ensure that cumulative hazard conditions are less than cumulatively considerable.

c) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed project does not have the potential to significantly adversely affect humans, either directly or indirectly. While a number of impacts were identified as having a potential to significantly impact humans, with implementation of the identified mitigation measures and standard conditions and requirements, these impacts are expected to be less than significant. With implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed project is not expected to cause significant adverse impacts to humans. Mitigation measures **BIO-1** through **BIO-4** reduce impacts associated with biological resources; mitigation measures **CUL-1** and **TRI-1** through **TRI-5** reduce impacts associated with cultural, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources; mitigation measures **GEO-1** and **GEO-2** reduce impacts associated with earthquake fault, soils hazards, and paleontological resources; mitigation measures **HAZ-1** and **HAZ-2** reduce risk related to wildfires; mitigation measure **NOI-1** would reduce construction noise impacts; and mitigation measure **TRAF-1** would reduce traffic impacts. Therefore, the project does not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Furthermore, this document analyzes long term and short-term impacts, and all identified potential impacts have been mitigated to a less than significant level. Therefore, the proposed project would not achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals. Any impacts are considered **less than significant with mitigation incorporated.**

## VIII. REFERENCES

- Aragon Geotechnical Inc. 2017, February 17. *Fault Hazard Investigation Riverside County Reference GEO 02503 Proposed Church Complex. APN 376-410-002 and 376-410-024 City of Wildomar, California.*
- California Department of Conservation. Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP). 2016a. Accessed November 5, 2018. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/>
- \_\_\_\_\_. DLRP. 2016b. Accessed November 5, 2018. Riverside County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016, Sheet 1 of 3. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Riverside\\_w\\_15\\_16\\_WA.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/Riverside_w_15_16_WA.pdf)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2014. California Important Farmland Finder.
- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2016. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates>
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2018. Facility/Site Summary Details: El Sobrante Landfill (33-AA-0217). <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/swfacilities/Directory/33-AA-0217>
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). Envirostor 2018. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=glazebrook+road%2C+wildomar>
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2011, September 7. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16\\_livability/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/).
- California Gas and Electric Utilities. 2016 California Gas Report. <https://www.socalgas.com/regulatory/documents/cgr/2016-cgr.pdf>
- California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). GeoTracker. 2015. <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=glazebrook+road%2C+wildomar>
- County of Riverside. 2003. Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.
- EVMWD (Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District). 2005. *Elsinore Basin Groundwater Management Plan*
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016a. 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. <http://www.evmwd.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=31890>
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016b. 2016 Sewer System Master Plan. <http://www.evmwd.com/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=32037>
- FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2008. Flood Map Numbers 06065C2682G and 06065C2705G. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=glazebrook%2C%20wildomar#searchresultsanchor>
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2017, August 24. Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance. [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environMent/noise/regulations\\_and\\_guidance/polguide/polguide02.cfm](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environMent/noise/regulations_and_guidance/polguide/polguide02.cfm)
- Google Earth. 2018.
- Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD). 2016. Regional Urban Water Management Plan.

- 2017, February 13. *Review of Water Treatment Plant Operating Capacities*.  
<http://edmsidm.mwdh2o.com/idmweb/cache/MWD%20EDMS/003737313-1.pdf>.
- . 2016. Urban Water Management Plan
- RCFD (Riverside County Fire Department). 2016. *Annual Report 2016* (in cooperation with Cal Fire).
- Riverside, County of. 2003a. *General Plan Environmental Impact Report*.
- . 2003b. *Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP)*.
- SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments). 2016. 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.
- SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 2003. 2003 Air Quality Management Plan.
- . 2005. Rule 403 Dust Control Information.
- . 2008. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. Revised July 2008.
- . 2011. SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds. Revised March 2011.
- . 2016. Final 2012 Air Quality Management Plan.
- Southern California Edison (SCE). Edison International and Southern California Edison 2017 Annual Report. <https://www.edison.com/content/dam/eix/documents/investors/corporate-governance/2017-eix-sce-annual-report.pdf>.
- SWRCB (California State Water Resources Control Board). 2018. GeoTracker. Accessed June 2018.  
<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.
- United States Energy Information Administration (EIA). 2016, December. Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS).  
<https://www.eia.gov/consumption/commercial/data/2012/c&e/cfm/pba4.php>.
- 2018, May. Residential Energy Consumption Survey (RECS).  
<https://www.eia.gov/consumption/residential/data/2015/index.php?view=consumption#summary>
- U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC). 2016. Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) Research, Development, and Training. <https://www.erd.usace.army.mil/Media/Fact-Sheets/Fact-Sheet-Article-View/Article/486085/ordinary-high-water-mark-ohwm-research-development-and-training/>
- Weather Spark. Average Weather in Wildomar. Accessed on January 16, 2019.  
<https://weatherspark.com/y/1910/Average-Weather-in-Wildomar-California-United-States-Year-Round>
- Wildomar, City of. County of Riverside General Plan. 2003.  
[http://www.cityofwildomar.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server\\_9894739/File/Government/Departments/Planning/General%20Plan.pdf](http://www.cityofwildomar.org/UserFiles/Servers/Server_9894739/File/Government/Departments/Planning/General%20Plan.pdf)
- . 2015, April 23. City of Wildomar Impact Fee Study Update Report.
- . 2016. City of Wildomar Zoning Map.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2018a. Biennial Operating Budget Fiscal Years 2017-18 & 2018-19.

\_\_\_\_\_. 2019. Municipal Code.

June 2019 | Response to Comments  
State Clearinghouse No. 2019049175

# FAITH BIBLE CHURCH PROJECT

City of Wildomar

*Prepared for:*

**City of Wildomar**

Matthew Bassi, Planning Director  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, CA 92595  
951.677.7751

*Prepared by:*

**PlaceWorks**

Mark Teague, AICP, Associate Principal  
3910 Normal Street, Suite C  
San Diego, California 92103  
619.299.2700  
info@placeworks.com  
www.placeworks.com



Table of Contents

Section	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.2 DOCUMENT FORMAT .....	1
1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES .....	1
2. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS .....	3

APPENDICES

Appendix A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

## Table of Contents

*This page intentionally left blank.*



# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This document includes a compilation of the public comments received on the Faith Bible Church Project Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (collectively, “MND”; State Clearinghouse No. 2019049175) and the City of Wildomar’s (City) responses to the comments.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a lead agency is not required to prepare formal responses to comments on an MND. However, CEQA requires the City to have adequate information on the record explaining why the comments do not affect the conclusion of the MND that there are no potentially significant environmental effects. In the spirit of public disclosure and engagement, the City—as the lead agency—has responded to all written comments submitted on the MND during the 30-day public review period, which began May 1, 2019, and ended May 30, 2019.

## 1.2 DOCUMENT FORMAT

**Section 1, *Introduction*.** This section describes CEQA requirements and the content of this document.

**Section 2, *Response to Comments*.** This section provides a list of agencies and persons commenting on the MND, copies of comment letters received during the public review period, and individual responses to written comments. To facilitate review of the responses, each comment letter has been reproduced and assigned a letter. Individual comments for each letter have been numbered, and the letter is followed by responses with references to the corresponding comment number.

**Appendix A, *Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program*.** This document lists all the mitigation measures required for implementation of the project, the phase in which the measures would be implemented, and the enforcement agency responsible for compliance. The monitoring program provides 1) a mechanism for giving the lead agency staff and decision makers feedback on the effectiveness of their actions; 2) a learning opportunity for improved mitigation measures on future projects; and 3) a means of identifying corrective actions, if necessary, before irreversible environmental damage occurs.

## 1.3 CEQA REQUIREMENTS REGARDING COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (b) outlines parameters for submitting comments on negative declarations, and reminds persons and public agencies that the focus of review and comment of MNDs should be on the proposed findings that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment. If the commenter believes that the project may have a significant effect, they should: (1) Identify the specific effect, (2) Explain why they believe the effect would occur, and (3) Explain why they believe the effect would be significant.

## 1. Introduction

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 (c) further advises, “Reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.”

Section 15204 (d) also states, “Each responsible agency and trustee agency shall focus its comments on environmental information germane to that agency’s statutory responsibility.” Section 15204 (e) states, “This section shall not be used to restrict the ability of reviewers to comment on the general adequacy of a document or of the lead agency to reject comments not focused as recommended by this section.”

Finally, CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters. When responding to comments, lead agencies need only respond to potentially significant environmental issues and do not need to provide all information requested by reviewers, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the environmental document.

## 2. Responses to Comments

## 2. Response to Comments

This section provides all written comments received on the circulated MND and the City's response to each comment.

Comment letters and specific comments are given letters and numbers for reference purposes. Where sections of the MND are excerpted in this document, they are indented. The following is a list of all comment letters received on the circulated MND during the public review period.

Letter Reference	Commenting Person/Agency	Date of Comment	Page No.
A	Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Lacy Padilla	May 6, 2019	5
B	Kenneth Mays	May 28, 2019	9
C	Scott Morgan, Governor's Office of Planning and Research	June 10, 2019	13

## 2. Responses to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Responses to Comments

### LETTER A – Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Lacy Padilla. (1 page)

A-1

**From:** [Padilla, Lacy \(TRBL\)](#)

**To:** [Matthew Bassi](#)

**Subject:** IS/MND for Faith Bible Church Project (PA 17-0111)

**Date:** Monday, May 06, 2019 3:38:52 PM

Greetings,

A records check of the Tribal Historic preservation office’s cultural registry revealed that this project is not located within the Tribe’s Traditional Use Area. Therefore, we defer to the other tribes in the area. This letter shall conclude our consultation efforts.

Thank you,

**Lacy Padilla**  
Archaeological Technician  
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians  
5401 Dinah Shore Drive Palm Springs, CA 92264  
D: 760-699-6956 | C: 760-333-5222

The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer

## 2. Responses to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Responses to Comments

### A. **Response to Comments from Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Lacy Padilla, Archaeological Technician, dated May 6, 2019.**

A-1        The commenter states that the project site is not located within the Tribe's Traditional Use area and defer to other tribes in the area.

The comment does not impact the findings of the Initial Study. The comment does not raise an issue with the analysis or conclusions of the MND, no further response is necessary.

## 2. Responses to Comments

*This page intentionally blank.*



## 2. Responses to Comments

LETTER B – Kenneth Mayes. (1 page)

**From:** [Wildomar Connected](#)  
**To:** [Matthew Bassi](#)  
**Subject:** Faith Bible Church Project PA No. 17-0111  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 28, 2019 9:41:34 PM

The following comments are my thought on this project  
This property is currently zoned C1-CP General Commercial per the zoning map. The General Plan Map shows it as Commercial Office/Medium Density Residential.

B-1

Possible employment opportunities are as follows:  
Number of Employees per 1,000 sqft of building  
1 per for Religious Institution  
2.5 for Retail Space  
4.17 for Commercial Office  
4.30 for Medical Office

Existing zoning allows 220,849 square feet which could result in 921 jobs at an average of \$30,500. Or \$28,090,500 annually  
Current vacancy rate in wildomar is 4.1% with 289,580 sqft existing commercial space

B-2

Proposed Development would result in 74,309 square feet being built which will result in 74 potential jobs at \$43,000 ea for \$3,182,000

This is a loss of 847 ongoing local jobs

The zone change should not be approved as it detrimental to the financial health of the city.  
We need our commercial lands no another church.

Kenneth Mayes  
Resident and Voter in wildomar

## 2. Responses to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Responses to Comments

### **B. Response to Comments from Kenneth Mayes, dated May 28, 2019.**

B-1 The commenter states that the property is zoned C1/CP (General Commercial) and the land use designation is Commercial Office/Medium Density Residential. The commenter provides employment rates based on 1,000 square foot of building.

The commenter is correct in that the property has a zoning of C1/CP and a land use designation of Commercial Office and Medium Density Residential. The commenter does not provide source information for their assumptions for employees per 1,000 square foot of building based on land use type. Nonetheless, the proposed improvements would serve an existing need on a site that has always been vacant. Although the site has a General Plan land use designation of Commercial Office and Medium Density residential, based on the surrounding uses (I-15 Freeway, residences, and vacant land), it would not be a desirable location for those types of uses due to access constraints and existing residential development. Additionally, the comment does not address an environmental issue or the adequacy of the Initial Study as it relates to CEQA.

B-2 The commenter states that the existing zoning of the property would allow for 220,849 square feet of buildable area which could result in 921 jobs; assuming an average salary of \$30,500 this would result in \$28,090,500 annually from 921 jobs.



The comment does not address an environmental issue or the adequacy of the Initial Study as it relates to CEQA. The comment does not address an environmental issue or the adequacy of the Initial Study as it relates to CEQA.

## 2. Responses to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Responses to Comments

LETTER C – Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, Scott Morgan. (1 page)

 Gavin Newsom Governor	<p>STATE OF CALIFORNIA Governor’s Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit</p>	 Kate Gordon Director
---	---	--

RECEIVED  
JUN 10 2019  
CITY OF WILDOMAR

May 31, 2019

Matthew C Bassi  
Wildomar, City of  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
2019049175  
Wildomar, CA 92595


Subject: Faith Bible Church Project (Planning Application No 17-0111)  
SCH#: 2019049175

C-1 | Dear Matthew C Bassi

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named MND to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on 5/30/2019, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, <https://ceqanet.opr.ca.gov/2019049175/2>.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,



Scott Morgan  
Director, State Clearinghouse

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044  
TEL 1-916-445-0613 state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov www.opr.ca.gov

## 2. Responses to Comments

*This page intentionally left blank.*

## 2. Responses to Comments

### **C. Response to Comments from Scott Morgan, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, dated June 10, 2019.**

C-1 The commenter states that the State Clearinghouse submitted the MND to selected state agencies for review; no state agencies provided comments before the close of the comment period on May 30, 2019.

The comment does not impact the findings of the Initial Study. The comment does not raise an issue with the analysis or conclusions of the MND, no further response is necessary.

## 2. Responses to Comments

*This page intentionally blank.*



June 2019 | Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

# Faith Bible Church Project

City of Wildomar

*Prepared for:*

**City of Wildomar**

Matthew Bassi, Planning Director  
23873 Clinton Keith Road, Suite 201  
Wildomar, CA 92595  
951.677.7751

*Prepared by:*

**PlaceWorks**

Mark Teague, AICP, Associate Principal  
3910 Normal Street, Suite C  
San Diego, California 92103  
619.299.2700  
info@placeworks.com  
www.placeworks.com





## Table of Contents

Section	Page
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM.....	1
1.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS.....	1
1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	3
<b>2. MITIGATION MONITORING PROCESS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM ORGANIZATION.....	5
2.2 CITY OF WILDOMAR .....	5
2.3 MITIGATION MONITORING TEAM.....	5
2.4 ARBITRATION RESOLUTION .....	6
2.5 ENFORCEMENT.....	6
<b>3. MITIGATION MONITORING REQUIREMENTS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 PREMONITORING MEETING.....	7
3.2 CATEGORIZED MITIGATION MEASURES/TABLE.....	7
3.3 FIELD MONITORING .....	7
3.4 COORDINATION WITH CONTRACTORS.....	7
<b>4. MITIGATION MONITORING REPORTS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1 FIELD CHECK REPORT .....	23
4.2 IMPLEMENTATION COMPLIANCE REPORT .....	23
4.3 ARBITRATION/ENFORCEMENT REPORT.....	23
<b>5. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>6. REPORT PREPARATION .....</b>	<b>25</b>
6.1 LIST OF PREPARERS.....	25

Table of Contents

*List of Tables*

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
Table 3-1      Mitigation Monitoring Requirements .....	8

# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 PURPOSE OF MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The City of Wildomar (City) is the lead agency for the proposed Faith Bible Church project and has developed this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) as a vehicle for monitoring mitigation measures outlined in the Faith Bible Church Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), State Clearinghouse No. 2019049175. As the lead agency, the City is responsible for implementing the MMRP, which has been prepared in conformance with Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code:

- (a) When making findings required by paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 21081 or when adopting a mitigated negative declaration pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 21080, the following requirements shall apply:
  - (1) The public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required or incorporated into the project at the request of a responsible agency or a public agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, that agency shall, if so requested by the lead or responsible agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.
  - (2) The lead agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material which constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based.

The MMRP consists of mitigation measures that avoid, reduce, and/or fully mitigate potential environmental impacts. The mitigation measures have been identified and recommended through preparation of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and drafted to meet the requirements of Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6.

## 1.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

### 1.2.1 Project Location

The project site encompasses APN: 376-410-024 and 376-410-002 and is in an undeveloped area of Wildomar on the eastern side of the Interstate-15 (I-15) freeway. Access to the site is provided by Depasquale and Glazebrook Roads to the south and southeast.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.2.2 Proposed Improvements

The proposed development includes construction of a 27,489 square -foot worship building with ultimate capacity for 1,030 seats and includes assembly areas, rooms for bible study/religious education, and training and worship rooms. The project also includes construction of a 16,486 square-foot children's ministry/child care building (to be used during worship services only), an 18,024 square-foot gymnasium, three (3) residential dwellings (to be used for visiting missionaries), amphitheater, and 795 parking spaces. Additionally, the project includes a lot line adjustment of APNs 376-410-024 and -002, expanding APN 376-410-002 to 24.31 acres and reducing APN 376-410-024 to 1.27 acres. All physical improvements would be constructed on APN 376-410-002; APN 376-410-024 would be left undeveloped for a potential new use in the future, which would be evaluated under separate CEQA review.

#### Construction Phasing

The proposed project would be constructed in seven (7) phases. Although it is unlikely, it is possible that some phases may be built simultaneously, or that more than seven phases would be needed for construction. Construction is anticipated to begin at the end of 2019 and be completed by 2021.

**Phase 1** includes rough grading of the entire site and construction of water quality basins and major drainage structures. For Phase 1 the worship building would be approximately 8,279 square feet with a seating capacity of 584 seats. Two parking lots would be constructed south and southwest of the proposed worship building and would have 205 and 117 parking spaces (399 total), respectively. A roadway with the entrance from the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road would bisect the two lots and connect to a roundabout near the north-central portion of the site.

**Phase 2** would include the expansion of the worship building to approximately 27,489 square feet with a total capacity of 1,030 seats. The church building would consist of the worship area with a stage, sound booth, three storage areas, lobby area, meeting room, nursery, two classrooms, group room, counseling room, work room, study area, kitchen/café, and restrooms. Phase 2 would also include construction of the Children's Building. The Children's Building would be approximately 16,486 square feet, and would include a group room, nine classrooms, volunteer room, café/lounge, storage, and restrooms. The main courtyard area would be constructed between and to the south of the Children's Building and the Faith Bible Church with stairway and ADA ramp that leads to the parking lot to the south. A tot-lot/playground would also be constructed on the west side of the Children's Building and would be surrounded by a security fence. The tot playground would be equipped with a playhouse, shade structure, swings, seat walls and benches with backs.

**Phase 3** includes construction of an 18,024 square-foot gymnasium and a restroom, equipment room, and a pad for construction of a future outdoor room to the east of the Faith Bible Church.

**Phase 4** includes construction of a future athletic field which would also serve as overflow parking, with space for 172 parking stalls.

**Phase 5** includes construction of an amphitheater and pavilion at the northeastern portion of the project site. Phase 5 also includes construction of an additional overflow parking area with 64 stalls at the southern corner

## 1. Introduction

of the intersection of Depasquale Road and Glazebrook Road. Glazebrook Road would be extended westward between the Phase 4 and Phase 5 parking lots and would run parallel to the Interstate 15 freeway.

**Phase 6** includes construction of an additional overflow parking area with space for 160 parking stalls near the northwestern portion of the site. The parking lot would be accessed by the extended Glazebrook Road or the roundabout constructed in Phase 1.

**Phase 7** includes construction of three detached single-family units, which would be accessory uses to the church and not available for resale. These three units are proposed near the southeast portion of the site. These residences will be used to house church guests such as visiting missionaries and their families.

### Entitlements

The project would require the following entitlement approvals by the City of Wildomar: change of zone, parcel merger, conditional use permit, variance, and additional permitting.

- General Plan Amendment (GPA): The project would require approval of a General Plan Amendment to convert the existing land uses of Commercial Office (CO) and Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Commercial Retail (CR) on two parcels (APN: 376-410-002 & 376-410-024).
- Lot Line Adjustment: The proposed project will require a lot line adjustment prior to project approval to move the line adjoining the existing parcels (APN: 376-410-002 & 376-410-024) westward. The project site is 25.58 acres total. The lot line adjustment would expand APN 376-410-002 to 24.31 acres and reduce APN 376-410-024 to 1.27 acres. All physical improvements would occur within APN 376-410-002 (24.31 acres). APN 376-410-024 (1.27 acres) would remain undeveloped and is not proposed for development under this project; any future proposed development would require separate CEQA review and discretionary approvals.
- Plot Plan (PP): The project requires approval of a plot plan for the Faith Bible Church development including related on-/off-site improvements. The worship area, children's ministry building, and the gymnasium would be approximately 27,489 square feet, 16,486 square feet, and 18,024 square feet, respectively. The proposed project would result in a total of 795 parking spaces upon completion of all construction phases.

## 1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

### 1.3.1 Impacts Considered Less Than Significant

The MND and supporting Initial Study identified various thresholds from the CEQA Guidelines in a number of environmental categories that would not be significantly impacted by the proposed project and therefore did not require mitigation. Impacts to the following environmental resources were found to be less than significant:

## 1. Introduction

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Energy
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems

### 1.3.2 Potentially Significant Adverse Impacts That Can Be Mitigated, Avoided, or Substantially Lessened

Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geological Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Wildfire were identified as having potentially significant impacts that could be reduced, avoided, or substantially lessened through implementation of mitigation measures. No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified.



## 2. Mitigation Monitoring Process

---

### 2.1 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Overall MMRP management is the responsibility of the City. The City's technical consultants (CEQA consultant, archaeologist, paleontologist, etc.) may perform related monitoring tasks under the direction of the environmental monitor (if they are contracted by the City).

### 2.2 CITY OF WILDOMAR

The City is the designated lead agency for the MMRP and has the overall responsibility for the review of all monitoring reports, enforcement actions, and document disposition. The City will rely on information provided by individual monitors (e.g., CEQA consultant, archaeologist, paleontologist), presuming it to be accurate and up to date, and will field check mitigation measure status, as required.

### 2.3 MITIGATION MONITORING TEAM

The mitigation monitoring team, including the construction manager and technical advisors, is responsible for monitoring implementation/compliance with all adopted mitigation measures and conditions of approval. A major portion of the team's work is field monitoring and compliance report preparation. Implementation disputes are brought to the City Planning Director and/or his designee.

#### 2.3.1 Monitoring Team

The following summarizes key positions in the MMRP and their functions:

- **Construction Manager:** Responsible for coordination of mitigation monitoring team; technical consultants; report preparation; and implementing the monitoring program, including overall program administration, document/report clearinghouse, and first phase of dispute resolution.
- **Technical Advisors:** Responsible for monitoring in their areas of expertise (CEQA, archaeology, paleontology). Report directly to the monitoring program manager.

#### 2.3.2 Recognized Experts

Recognized experts are required on the monitoring team to ensure compliance with scientific and engineering mitigation measures. The mitigation monitoring team's recognized experts will assess compliance with required mitigation measures, and recognized experts from responsible agencies will consult with the construction manager regarding disputes.

## 2. Mitigation Monitoring Process

### 2.4 ARBITRATION RESOLUTION

If a mitigation monitor is of the opinion that a mitigation measure has not been implemented or has not been implemented correctly, the problem will be brought before the construction manager for resolution. The decision of the construction manager is final unless appealed to the City Planning Director and/or his designee. The construction manager will have the authority to issue stop work orders until the dispute is resolved.

### 2.5 ENFORCEMENT

Agencies may enforce conditions of approval through their existing police power using stop work orders; fines; infraction citations; or in some cases, notice of violation for tax purposes.

## 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

---

### 3.1 PREMONITORING MEETING

A pre-monitoring meeting will be scheduled to review mitigation measures, implementation requirements, schedule conformance, and monitoring team responsibilities. Team rules will be established, the entire mitigation monitoring program presented, and any misunderstandings resolved.

### 3.2 CATEGORIZED MITIGATION MEASURES/TABLE

Project-specific mitigation measures have been categorized in Table 3-1, *Mitigation Monitoring Requirements*. The table identifies the environmental impact, specific mitigation measures, schedule, and responsible monitor. The mitigation table will serve as the basis for scheduling the implementation of and compliance with all mitigation measures.

### 3.3 FIELD MONITORING

Project monitors and technical subconsultants shall exercise caution and professional practices at all times when monitoring implementation of mitigation measures. Protective wear (e.g., hard hat, glasses) shall be worn at all times in construction areas. Injuries shall be immediately reported to the mitigation monitoring team.

### 3.4 COORDINATION WITH CONTRACTORS

The construction manager is responsible for coordination of contractors and for contractor completion of required mitigation measures.

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure		Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>					
<b>BIO-1</b>	<p>Due to the presence of potentially suitable habitat on the project site and in adjacent off-site areas, a 30-day preconstruction survey for burrowing owl is required pursuant to the MSHCP. If burrowing owls are determined present during this survey, occupied burrows shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible, following the guidelines in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation published by Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW 2012), including but not limited to, conducting additional preconstruction surveys, avoiding occupied burrows during the nesting and nonbreeding seasons, implementing a worker awareness program, biological monitoring, establishing avoidance buffers, and flagging burrows for avoidance with visible markers. If occupied burrows cannot be avoided, acceptable methods may be used to exclude burrowing owl either temporarily or permanently, pursuant to a Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan that shall be prepared and approved by the County of Riverside Environmental Programs Department (EPD), in coordination with the CDFW. The Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan shall be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation and the MSHCP.</p> <p>In accordance with the MSHCP, take of active nests will be avoided. Passive relocation (i.e., the scoping of the burrows by a burrowing owl biologist and collapsing burrows free of young) will occur when owls are present outside the nesting season. The EPD may require translocation sites for the burrowing owl to be created in the MSHCP reserve for the establishment of new</p>	Project applicant and City of Wildomar Planning Department	No more than 30 days prior to/during any vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities	City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager, project applicant	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
colonies, pursuant to MSHCP objectives for the species. Translocation sites, if required, will be identified in consultation with EPD and/or CDFW, taking into consideration unoccupied habitat areas, presence of burrowing mammals, existing colonies, and effects to other MSHCP-covered species.				
<b>BIO-2</b> To offset direct impacts to 0.17-acre of riparian/riverine habitat, the applicant would create a mitigation site to enhance habitat within Drainage C totaling 0.30-acre of riparian/riverine habitat and 1.71-acre of Riversidean sage scrub (RSS) habitat on-site. Habitat "enhancement" activities shall include the removal of all non-native plant species from the entire mitigation site and non-riparian/wetland plant species (establishment only) from within the streambed, the removal of trash and debris; the installation of temporary irrigation; and the installation of appropriate container stock and seed mixes. Native plant materials (including seeds) that are proposed for removal during project activities will be used for restoration purposes, as will native riparian vegetation that is not proposed for removal but is already located within the mitigation site. Refer to Exhibit 10, Proposed Mitigation Site, of Appendix 3.0 of the Initial Study, for a depiction of the proposed mitigation site. The enhancement of 0.30-acre of riparian/riverine habitat and restoration/enhancement of 1.71-acre of RSS habitat that is biologically superior habitat to the riparian/riverine habitat within Drainage C and surrounding habitat that currently exists onsite, including that which will be directly impacted by site development.	Project applicant and City of Wildomar Planning Department	During construction.	City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager, project applicant	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<b>BIO-3</b> All plant species installed within the mitigation site shall include only local California native container plants and cuttings and shall be typical of the existing native plant species present in the existing riparian/riverine areas within and adjacent to the project site. The streambed bottom is proposed to be revegetated with native riparian vegetation, and the streambanks are proposed to be revegetated/enhanced with native RSS plant species. Drainages A and B shall be pipelined underground across the project site and discharged into the mitigation site to provide increased water flows for the riparian vegetation during rain events. Plant material should be installed between October 1 and April 30 to maximize the benefits of the winter rainy season. The planted area would have a conservation easement placed over it and would be maintained by a third party approved by the regulatory agencies that would provide for the long-term management and maintenance in perpetuity.	Project applicant and City of Wildomar Planning Department	Prior to any vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities	City of Wildomar Planning Department, construction manager, project applicant	
<b>BIO-4</b> The applicant will be responsible for implementing the requirements of the Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) and initial establishment. The HMMP will describe the methods used for invasive species, trash removal, fencing and signage replacement, will identify success criteria and reporting requirements, and will define responsibilities, adaptive management, and expected maintenance. The long-term management and maintenance costs would transfer to a third party as approved by the regulatory agencies. The mitigation site would be off-limits to the public and residents. Furthermore, signage and homeowner education materials would be provided to local residents, as well as	Project applicant and City of Wildomar Planning Department	During occupancy.	Project applicant.	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
the staff and members of the Faith Bible Church, regarding these restrictions.				
<b>BIO-5</b> To reduce impacts to the portions of Drainages A and C, and riparian/riverine habitat, the following minimization measures to reduce direct and indirect impacts, outlined in Appendix 3.0, shall be implemented: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Temporarily blocking off portions of Drainages A and C with silt fencing or another permeable material that would prevent construction from depositing sediment into areas outside the project site while still allowing water to flow through the site should there be a rain event;</li> <li>- Minimizing measures to reduce impacts caused by fugitive dust would include watering soil or applying chemical stabilizer to construction egress/ingress points; covering stockpiles or spraying stockpiles with chemical stabilizer; minimizing the amount of area disturbed by clearing, grading, and other earthmoving activities;</li> <li>- Preventing toxic runoff by implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP) which shall identify BMPs; BMPs shall be monitored and repaired as appropriate;</li> <li>- Minimizing impacts as a result of accidental encroachment during construction by training construction workers by a qualified biologist during pre-construction meeting, incorporating exclusionary fencing and signs near the top of slopes adjacent to conserved riparian/riverine</li> </ul>	Project applicant and City of Wildomar Planning Department	During any construction activities	Project applicant.	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<p>habitat, and ensuring that a qualified biologist be onsite during initial clearing/grubbing and o/or construction activities within the riparian/riverine habitat within Drainages A and B; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reducing post-construction human disturbances by incorporating special edge treatments designed to minimize edge effects by providing a safe transition between developed areas and conserved riparian/riverine habitat.</li> </ul>				
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
<p><b>CUL-1</b> If human remains are encountered, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Riverside County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be contacted within 24 hours. Subsequently, the Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the most likely descendant and notify them of discovery. The most likely descendant shall then make recommendations and engage in consultations concerning the treatment of the remains as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.</p>	City of Wildomar Engineering and Planning Departments	During any ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Engineering and Planning Departments	



### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure		Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>					
<b>GEO-1</b>	The project applicant shall incorporate the recommendations of the Fault Report prepared by Aragon Geotechnical, Inc. (2017; Appendix 6.0) into project plans related to the proposed project. The project's building plans shall demonstrate that they incorporate all applicable recommendations of the design-level Fault Report and comply with all applicable requirements of the latest adopted version of the California Building Code. A licensed professional engineer shall prepare the plans, including those that pertain to soil engineering, structural foundations, pipeline excavation, and installation. All plans will be subject to the approval of the City Engineer.	Project applicant and City of Wildomar Engineering and Planning Departments	Prior to any ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Engineering and Planning Departments	
<b>GEO-2</b>	Construction personnel involved in excavation and grading activities shall be informed of the possibility of discovering fossils at any location and the protocol to be followed if fossils are found. A professional meeting the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's standards shall provide the preconstruction training. The City shall ensure the grading plan notes include specific reference to the potential discovery of fossils. If potentially unique paleontological resources (fossils) are inadvertently discovered during project construction, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City shall be notified, and a professional paleontologist shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. The paleontologist shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance throughout project construction and shall establish, in cooperation	Project applicant and City of Wildomar Engineering and Planning Departments	During any ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
with the project applicant, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of fossils. Excavated finds shall be offered to a State-designated repository such as the Museum of Paleontology at the University of California, Berkeley, or the California Academy of Sciences.				
<b>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>				
<b>HAZ-1</b> Prior to issuance of a building permit, the owner or applicant shall submit plans detailing building materials and construction methods, and the Riverside County Fire Department shall verify and give the owner or applicant a certificate that says the buildings as proposed comply with all applicable state and local building standards, including for materials and construction methods intended to mitigate wildfire exposure, as described in the 2016 or most recent editions of the California Building Code Chapter 7A, California Residential Code Section R327, California Referenced Standards Code Chapter 12-7A, and California Fire Code Chapter 49.	Riverside County Fire Department	Prior to issuance of a building permit	Riverside County Fire Department	
<b>HAZ-2</b> Prior to issuance of the certificate of occupancy, the project shall show compliance with the vegetation management requirements prescribed in California Fire Code, Section 4906, including California Government Code Section 51182. Compliance shall be verified by an official letter from the Riverside County Fire Department.	Riverside County Fire Department	Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy	Riverside County Fire Department	
<b>NOISE</b>				
<b>NOI-1</b> Prior to Grading Permit issuance, the project applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the City of	Project applicant and City of Wildomar	Prior to grading permit issuance and during construction phase or	City of Wildomar Planning Department	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<p>Wildomar Planning Department that the project complies with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction contracts specify that all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers and other state required noise attenuation devices.</li> <li>• Property owners and occupants located within 200 feet of the project boundary shall be sent a notice, at least 15 days prior to commencement of construction of each phase, regarding the construction schedule of the proposed project. A sign, legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the project construction site. All notices and signs shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Wildomar Community Development Director (or designee), prior to mailing or posting and shall indicate the dates and duration of construction activities, as well as provide a contact name and a telephone number where residents can inquire about the construction process and register complaints.</li> <li>• The Contractor shall provide evidence that a construction staff member will be designated as a Noise Disturbance Coordinator and will be present on-site during construction activities. The Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. When a complaint is received, the Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall notify the City within 24-hours of the complaint and determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall implement reasonable measures to resolve the complaint, as deemed acceptable by the Community Development</li> </ul>	Engineering and Planning Departments	any ground-breaking activity	and Public Works Department	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<p>Director (or designee). All notices that are sent to residential units immediately surrounding the construction site and all signs posted at the construction site shall include the contact name and the telephone number for the Noise Disturbance Coordinator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prior to issuance of any Grading or Building Permit, the project Applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director (or designee) that construction noise reduction methods shall be used where feasible. These reduction methods include shutting off idling equipment, installing temporary acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and electric air compressors and similar power tools.</li><li>• Construction haul routes shall be designed to avoid noise sensitive uses (e.g., residences, convalescent homes, etc.), to the extent feasible.</li><li>• During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receivers.</li><li>• Construction activities shall not take place outside of the allowable hours specified by the City's Municipal Code Section 9.48.020, (6:00 AM and 6:00 PM during the months of June through September and 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM during the months of October through July).</li></ul>				
TRANSPORTATION				
TRAF-1	TRAF-1 If the following improvements are included in the City of Wildomar Capital Improvement and Development Impact Fee Programs, the proposed	Project applicant and City of Wildomar	Prior to occupancy	City of Wildomar Planning Department

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<p>project shall pay the City fees necessary to meet their fair share of the improvements. If the following improvements are not constructed prior to the issuance of <i>occupancy building permits</i> the applicant will construct the improvement and be able to seek reimbursement of its costs beyond its fair share amount through a reimbursement agreement to be developed with the City:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Restriping the installation of a traffic signal at Baxter Road / Monte Vista Drive intersection to provide two (2) southbound lanes (a right-turn and a left-turn lane), and provide a dedicated eastbound left turn lane.</i></li> <li>• <i>Within one (1) year of occupying the Phase 1 worship center building, the applicant shall prepare, for City staff review and approval, a Focused Traffic Study consisting of updated traffic counts and a MUTCD Signal Warrant Analysis. The Project will pay its fair share for the new traffic signal at the time the signal is warranted or upon buildout of the worship center building, whichever occurs first.</i></li> <li>• Convert the two-way stop control to all-way stop control at Depasqualle Road / George Avenue and provide striping in eastbound approach to include a through-shared-left turn lane and a dedicated right-turn lane.</li> <li>• At Clinton Keith Road / Arya Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Northbound – Restripe to provide one dedicated left-turn lane, one through lane and one dedicated right-turn lane.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Engineering and Planning Departments		and Public Works Department	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure		Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <i>Southbound</i> – Restripe to provide one dedicated left-turn lane and one through-shared right-turn lane.</li> </ul> <p><i>(this condition was amended by the City Council on 7/10/19)</i></p>				
<b>TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>					
TRI-1	To address the possibility that historical, archaeological, and/or tribal cultural resources (collectively referred to as “cultural resources” in these mitigation measures) may be encountered during grading or construction, a qualified professional archaeologist shall monitor all construction activities that could potentially impact cultural resources (e.g., grading, excavation, and/or trenching). The Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians may assign individuals to monitor all grading, excavation, and groundbreaking activities as well, and the tribal monitors shall be allowed on-site during any construction activities that could potentially impact cultural resources. However, monitoring may be discontinued as soon the qualified professional and the appropriate tribe(s) are satisfied that construction will not disturb cultural resources.	City of Wildomar Building and Planning Departments	During any ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Planning Department and Building and Safety Department	
TRI-2	At least 30 days but no more than 60 days prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project archaeologist shall file a pre-grading report with the City to document the proposed methodology for grading activity observation which will be determined in consultation with the tribe(s) that intend to assign tribal monitors pursuant	City of Wildomar Building and Planning Departments	Thirty days prior to any ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
to mitigation measure CUL 1. The archaeologist and the tribal monitor(s) will have the authority to temporarily halt and redirect grading activities in order to evaluate the significance of any cultural resources discovered on the project site.				
<b>TRI-3</b> At least 30 days but no more than 60 days prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the project applicant shall contact the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, and Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians with notification of the proposed grading and shall enter into a Tribal Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement with the tribe(s). The agreements shall include, but not be limited to, outlining provisions and requirements for addressing the handling of tribal cultural resources; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for tribal monitors; treatment and final disposition of any tribal cultural resources, including but not limited to sacred sites, burial goods, and human remains, discovered on the site; and establishing on-site monitoring provisions and/or requirements for professional tribal monitors during all ground-disturbing activities. The terms of the agreements shall not conflict with any of these mitigation measures. A copy of the signed agreement shall be provided to the Planning Director and the Building Official prior to the issuance of the first grading permit.	City of Wildomar Building and Planning Departments	At least thirty days but no more than sixty days prior to ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department	
<b>TRI-4</b> If during grading or construction activities, cultural resources are discovered on the project site, work shall be halted immediately within 50 feet of the discovery and the resources shall be evaluated by the archaeologist	City of Wildomar Building and Planning Departments	During any ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Engineering	

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
and the tribal monitor(s). Any cultural resources that are discovered shall be evaluated and a final report prepared by the archaeologist. The report shall include a list of the resources discovered; documentation of each site/locality; interpretation of the resources identified; a determination of whether the resources are historical resources, unique or non-unique archeological resources, and/or tribal cultural resources; and the method of preservation and/or recovery for the identified resources. If the archaeologist, in consultation with the tribes, determines the cultural resources to be either historic resources or unique archaeological resources, avoidance and/or mitigation will be required pursuant to and consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(c) and Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until the City, project applicant, project archaeologist, and consulting tribe(s) reach an agreement regarding the appropriate treatment of the cultural resources, which may include avoidance or appropriate mitigation. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b), avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological and cultural resources. Work may continue outside of the buffer area and will be monitored by additional tribal monitors, if needed as determined by the project archaeologist and the consulting tribe(s).			Department and Planning Department	
<b>TRI-5</b> In the event that cultural resources are discovered during the course of grading (inadvertent discoveries), the following shall be carried out for final disposition of the discoveries:	City of Wildomar Building and Planning Departments	During any ground-disturbing construction activities	City of Wildomar Engineering Department and Planning Department	



### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
<p>a. The landowner(s) shall agree to relinquish ownership of all recovered tribal cultural resources to the consulting tribe(s), including sacred items and all artifacts, as part of the required treatment for impacts to cultural resources.</p> <p>b. One or more of the following treatment, in order of preference below, with (i) being the preferred treatment and (ii) being the secondary preferred treatment, shall be employed with the agreement of all parties. Evidence of such agreement shall be provided to the City:</p> <p>i. Preservation in place of the cultural resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in place they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.</p> <p>ii. On-site relocation to a preservation area shall be accomplished as requested by the consulting tribe(s). The preservation area location shall be governed by measures and provisions to protect the preservation area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Relocation shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed. No recordation of sacred items is permitted without the written consent of the consulting tribe(s).</p> <p>iii. Only if (i) and (ii) above cannot be employed, curation shall be arranged with an appropriate qualified repository that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79. The cultural resources would be professionally curated and made available to other archeologists/researchers/tribal governments for</p>				

### 3. Mitigation Monitoring Requirements

**Table 3-1 Mitigation Monitoring Requirements**

Mitigation Measure	Responsibility for Implementation	Timing	Responsibility for Monitoring	Monitor (Signature Required) (Date of Compliance)
further research and culturally appropriate use. The collections and associated records shall be transferred to a curation facility meeting the above federal standards to be accompanied by a curation agreement and payment of any fees necessary for permanent curation.				

## 4. Mitigation Monitoring Reports

---

Mitigation monitoring reports are required to document compliance with the Mitigation Monitoring Program and to dispute arbitration enforcement resolution. Specific reports include:

- Field Check Report
- Implementation Compliance Report
- Arbitration/Enforcement Report

### 4.1 FIELD CHECK REPORT

Field check reports are required to record in-field compliance and conditions.

### 4.2 IMPLEMENTATION COMPLIANCE REPORT

The Implementation Compliance Report is prepared to document the implementation of mitigation measures, based on the information in Table 3-1. The report summarizes implementation compliance, including mitigation measures, date completed, and monitor's signature.

### 4.3 ARBITRATION/ENFORCEMENT REPORT

The Arbitration/Enforcement Report is prepared to document the outcome of arbitration review and becomes a portion of the ICR.

## 5. Community Involvement

---

Monitoring reports are public documents and are available for review by the general public. Discrepancies in monitoring reports can be taken to the City Planning Manager and/or his designee by the general public.

## 6. Report Preparation

---

### 6.1 LIST OF PREPARERS

#### **PlaceWorks**

Mark Teague, Associate Principal

Michael Paul, Project Planner

#### **City of Wildomar**

Matthew Bassi, Planning Director

Erica Vega, Assistant City attorney

## Report Preparation

*This page intentionally left blank*