



CITY OF MORENO VALLEY

INITIAL STUDY FOR Village at Moreno Valley



November 2023

Lead Agency
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY
14177 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92552

Prepared By
SALEM Engineering Group, Inc.
Mr. John Thomason
8711 Monroe Court, Suite A
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	2
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:	7
DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency):	7
ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	8
I. AESTHETICS	8
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	10
III. AIR QUALITY	11
VI. ENERGY	27
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.....	28
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	34
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	38
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:	41
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING	46
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:	47
XIII. NOISE	47
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING.....	54
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES	55
XVI. RECREATION.....	57
XVII. TRANSPORTATION	58
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	61
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	66
XX. WILDFIRE	71
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	72

APPENDICES (Separate Documents)

- A. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study
- B. Biological Resources Assessment & MSHCP Consistency Analysis/DBESP
- C. Cultural, Archaeological and Paleontological Assessment Report
- D. Geotechnical Engineering Investigation
- E. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
- F. Noise Impact Study
- G. Traffic Impact Analysis
- H. Water Quality Management Plan



INITIAL STUDY (IS) FOR Village at Moreno Valley

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

1. **Project Case Number(s):** PEN21-0074
2. **Project Title:** Village at Moreno Valley
3. **Public Comment Period:** November 20, 2023 – December 20, 2023, 30 Day Review Period
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Moreno Valley
Danielle Harper-Scott, Planning Department
14177 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92552
(951) 413-3215
danielleh@Moval.org
5. **Documents Posted At:** <https://moval.gov/cdd/documents/about-projects.html>
6. **Prepared By:** Mr. John Thomason, Project Planner
SALEM Engineering Group, Inc.
8711 Monroe Court, Suite A
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730
7. **Project Sponsor:**

Applicant/Developer
Mr. Oscar Etemadian / Mr. Ash Etemadian
Village at Moreno Valley, LLC
10995 Indiana Avenue
Riverside, CA 92503
8. **Project Location:** The Project site is located on the northwest corner of Nason Street and Fir Avenue in the City of Moreno Valley in Riverside County, California as shown in Figure 1 – Aerial Photograph following this report. The Project site is located in Section 4 of Township 3 South, Range 3 West, Sunnymead, 2012, 7.5-minute Quadrangle US Geological Survey (USGS), San Bernardino Base and Meridian (SBBM). The Project site is approximately 9.3 acres, identified as Riverside County Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 487-250-005, -06, -07, -10, and -13 and is covered with natural low-lying vegetation and one vacant single-family residence (26930 Fir Avenue).

9. **General Plan Designation:** Commercial

According to the City of Moreno Valley General Plan, the Project site is designated Commercial.

10. **Specific Plan Name and Designation:** N/A

11. **Existing Zoning:** Community Commercial (CC)

Community Commercial District (CC). The primary purpose of the community commercial (CC) district is to provide for the general shopping needs of area residents and workers with a variety of business, retail, personal and related or similar services. (Ord. 590 § 2, 2001; Ord. 359, 1992)

The project is commercial in nature and therefore compatible with both the General Plan Land Use Designation and Zoning.

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

	Land Use	General Plan	Zoning
Project Site	Commercial (C)	Commercial (C)	Community Commercial (CC)
North	Commercial (C)	Commercial (C)	Community Commercial (CC)
South	Residential	R5	Residential 5 District (R5)
East	Commercial (C)	C	Community Commercial (CC)
West	Residential	R5	Residential 5 District (R5)

13. **Description of the Site and Project:**

Environmental Setting

The project site is a vacant lot covered with native vegetation that comprises five contiguous parcels. The site has been altered by required weed abatement activities to reduce fire risk. Vegetation on-site is limited to scattered common invasive grasses and forbs.

Surrounding land uses include State Route 60 (SR-60) eastbound off-ramp onto Nason Street to the north, Fir Avenue to the south, and Nason Street to the east. Residential development is located adjacent to the west and across the roadway to the south and southeast. Commercial development is located to the east across Nason Street.

Project Description

The Project is a commercial development on an approximately 9.3-acre site located on the northwest corner of Nason Street and Fir Avenue in the City of Moreno Valley in Riverside County, California. The commercial development includes the following uses totaling 74,206 square feet (sf), single-story unless otherwise noted.

- Retail A – 3,000 sf
- Retail B – 3,500 sf
- Retail C – 4,500 sf
- Food A – 3,000 sf
- Food B – 3,000 sf
- Food C – 1,500 sf

- Food D – 2,500 sf
- Retail Anchor A – 16,000 sf
- Retail Anchor B – 6,000 sf
- Fast Food – 4,456 sf
- Restaurant – 4,500 sf
- Convenience Store – 5,450 sf
 - With 18 fuel pumps
- Car Wash – 1,600 sf

The applicant is requesting the following entitlements:

- PEN20-0045 Tentative Parcel Map 37896
- PEN21-0074 Master Plot Plan for Village at Moreno Valley retail center
- PEN20-0047 Plot Plan for retail anchors
- PEN20-0049 Conditional Use Permit for the development of a fast food restaurant with drive thru
- PEN20-0050 Conditional Use Permit for the development of a fast food restaurant with drive thru
- PEN 20-0051 Conditional Use Permit for the development of a gas station with convenience store and carwash
- PEN 20-0053 Conditional permit for the development of a retail building and a fast food restaurant with drive thru

The project also proposes a total of 422 parking spaces, utility installation and connections, and landscaping. Access to the project site would be provided via three driveways: one on Nason Street on the site's eastern border and two on Fir Avenue on the site's southern border.

It is our understanding that the planned construction of the site is expected to be 16-18 months from permit issuance. Phase I of the project includes mass grading and underground utilities of the entire site. Phase II of the project includes the vertical construction of the carwash and fueling station pad. The remainder of the site will be pad-ready, and construction of each pad will vary over the course of the remainder of the 16-18 months schedule.

14. **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.?**

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Consultation under Assembly Bill (AB) 52 commenced on February 22, 2022. The 30-day response period ended on March 24, 2022. Notices were sent to the following tribes: Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Rincon Bank of Luiseño Indians, San

Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians. Responses were received from the following Tribes: Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, and Pechanga Band of Indians. However, the Project will impact no known cultural and/or tribal resources, and the standard mitigation measures have been applied to the Project pursuant to consultation.

15. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**
 - a. Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) approval and water discharge requirements (WDR).
 - b. Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) – Water and wastewater connection permits.
 - c. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
 - d. California Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - e. United States Fish and Wildlife Service

16. Other Technical Studies Referenced in this Initial Study (Provided as Appendices):

- a. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Study
- b. Biological Assessment and DBESP
- c. Cultural/Archaeological/Paleontological
- d. Noise Impact Study
- e. Traffic Impact Analysis

17. Acronyms:

ADA -	American with Disabilities Act
ALUC -	Airport Land Use Commission
ALUCP -	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
AQMP -	Air Quality Management Plan
CEQA -	California Environmental Quality Act
CIWMD -	California Integrated Waste Management District
CMP -	Congestion Management Plan
DTSC -	Department of Toxic Substance Control
DWR -	Department of Water Resources
EIR -	Environmental Impact Report
EMWD -	Eastern Municipal Water District
EOP -	Emergency Operations Plan
FEMA -	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMMP -	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
GIS -	Geographic Information System
GHG -	Greenhouse Gas
GP -	General Plan
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HOA -	Homeowners' Association
IS -	Initial Study
LHMP -	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
LOS -	Level of Service
LST -	Localized Significance Threshold
MARB -	March Air Reserve Base
MARB/IPA-	March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport
MSHCP -	Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MVFP -	Moreno Valley Fire Department
MVPD -	Moreno Valley Police Department
MVUSD -	Moreno Valley Unified School District
MWD -	Metropolitan Water District
NCCP -	Natural Communities Conservation Plan
NPDES -	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OEM -	Office of Emergency Services
OPR -	Office of Planning & Research, State
PEIR -	Program Environmental Impact Report
PW -	Public Works
RCEH -	Riverside County Environmental Health
RCFCWCD -	Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District
RCP -	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RCTC -	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RCWMD -	Riverside County Waste Management District
RTA -	Riverside Transit Agency
RTIP -	Regional Transportation Improvement Plan
RTP -	Regional Transportation Plan

SAWPA - Santa Ana Watershed Project Authority
SCAG - Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCE - Southern California Edison
SCH - State Clearinghouse
SKRHCP - Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan
SWPPP - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB - State Water Resources Control Board
USFWS - United States Fish and Wildlife
USGS - United States Geologic Survey
VMT - Vehicle Miles Traveled
VVUSD - Valley Verde Unified School District
WQMP - Water Quality Management Plan
WRCOG - Western Riverside Council of Government

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:


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

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> | Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Energy |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Geology & Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazards & Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology & Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mineral Resources |
| <input 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 & Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> | Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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


 Signature
 Danielle Harper-Scott
 Printed Name

11/14/23
 Date
 City of Moreno Valley
 For

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS – Except as provided in Public Resources Code §21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit-Oriented Infill Projects – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Viewpoints that provide expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public are considered to be scenic vistas. Scenic vistas may be informally recognized, or officially designated by a public agency.</p> <p>The project site is a series of connected vacant lots at the northwest corner of Nason Street and Fir Avenue. The City of Moreno Valley General Plan does not identify specifically designated scenic vistas. However, the General Plan notes that the major aesthetic resources in the City include views of the Box Springs Mountains to the north and an area known as the “Badlands,” characterized by steep hillsides and open space, which forms the eastern boundary of the City. Both the Box Springs Mountains and the Badlands are visible from State Route 60 (SR 60), which is designated by the General Plan as a local scenic road. SR 60 runs east-west, adjacent to the project site to the north.</p> <p>The project would develop the site with various commercial structures of a similar nature found elsewhere along the SR-60 corridor in the northern portion of the City. While the scenic views to the east and north would be interrupted by the project’s development, development already exists in these directions, including a Target department store to the east and residential development on the north side of SR 60. The project would be similar in scale to other commercial developments in the area. Further, the Project would be required to comply with City General Plan Policy 7.7.5, which requires development along scenic roadways to be visually attractive and to allow for scenic views of the surrounding mountains. Therefore, impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant.</p>				
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) California Scenic Highway Mapping System, the project site is not located on or near a designated state scenic highway. The nearest state scenic highway is State Route 243, approximately 18 miles to the east. State Route 74, ten miles south, is eligible for scenic highway listing but is not yet designated (Caltrans 2011).</p> <p>The City of Moreno Valley General Plan designates Gilman Springs Road, Moreno Beach Drive, and SR 60 as local scenic roads (City of Moreno Valley 2006). Moreno Beach Drive is approximately one mile southeast of the project site, and Gilman Springs Road is approximately 3.75 miles east. However, the project site is not visible from either road. In addition, the project site does not contain any scenic resources, such as natural habitats or rock outcroppings, and is not located in proximity to any such resources. The project site is not on or near any National Register of Historic Places, California State Historical Landmarks, or California Historical Resources or Points of Interest (California State Parks 2019).</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The project would have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway because there are no state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site.				
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The project site is currently vacant. The surrounding area is urbanized, with commercial development to the east, and residential development to the north, west, and south. Vegetation lines the site along Nason Street and Fir Avenue, consisting of short, invasive grasses and forbs. The majority of the site is exposed soil with little vegetation. The area surrounding the site is mostly developed, with commercial development on the east side of Nason Street, residential development adjacent to the site to the west, residential development to the north across SR 60, and residential development across Fir Avenue to the south.</p> <p>Section 9.16.120 of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code (MVMC) lists general design guidelines, including guidelines related to aesthetic value, for all projects in the City. These include architectural compatibility with surrounding architecture, use of the natural (unpainted) color of bricks, avoidance of bright/fluorescent colors, and concealment of roof-mounted equipment from public view. The project would comply with the MVMC and would be visually similar to the surrounding commercial buildings. Specifically, the project would be similar in nature to existing development to the east across Nason Street. The project does not include aesthetically disruptive design elements such as fluorescent colors that would violate the design guidelines of the MVMC. Although the visual character of the site would be substantially altered from its current condition as a vacant lot, project components would be similar to the area's mix of residential and commercial development. The existing visual character of the site and its surroundings would not be degraded. Therefore, impacts to visual character would be less than significant.</p>				
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: As a vacant lot, the project site does not currently create any light or glare. Substantial sources of light and glare currently exist adjacent to the site in all directions, from commercial and residential development, and vehicular traffic on SR 60, Nason Street, and Fir Avenue.</p> <p>The project would include lighting that would add to light and glare in the surrounding area. However, the Project would be required to comply with applicable lighting requirements, including Section 9.10.110 of the MVMC, which prohibits lighting fixtures that create illumination which exceeds 0.5 foot-candles on an adjacent property, whether the illumination is direct or indirect light from the source, and requires lighting to project downward and not create glare on adjacent properties.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The following height requirements for commercial lighting would apply, pursuant to Section 9.08.100 of the MVMC: lighting shall be mounted on a post, fully shielded, and not exceed a maximum of thirty feet, except within one hundred feet of a residential use, where the post shall not exceed a maximum height of 20 feet; lighting fixtures shall be in scale with the proposed building height; lighting attached to a building shall not exceed the height of the roof eave or twenty feet, whichever is less.

The City of Moreno Valley requires submission of a lighting plan for approval of nonresidential nonexempt light fixtures. Lighting plans must include evidence of compliance with the City’s lighting regulations. Compliance with City regulations would reduce impacts of light and glare to a less-than-significant level.

Sources:

1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
 - Chapter 2 – Community Development Element – Section 2.3 – Community Design
 - Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.8 – Scenic Resources
 - Figure 7-2 – Major Scenic Resources
2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
 - Section 5.11 – Aesthetics
 - Figure 5.11-1 – Major Scenic Resources
3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code
 - Section 9.10.110 – Light and Glare of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code.
 - Chapter 9.16 – Design Guidelines
 - Section 9.17.030 G – Heritage Trees

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Response:

The Project site is primarily an undeveloped, vacant lot. The site’s surface area consists mostly of exposed dirt, with invasive grasses, shrubs, and forbs, as well as eucalyptus trees. The site is designated Commercial in the City of Moreno General Plan and is zoned Community Commercial. The site is not zoned for agricultural use or designated by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) as Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (DOC 2016). The project site does not contain any land zoned as forest land or trees with commercial timber value. The project would not involve any development that would convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use, conflict with existing zoning of forest land or timberland, result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses, interrupt ongoing agricultural activity, or conflict with a

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would have no impact on agricultural, forest land, or timberland resources.				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Response: See discussion for (a) above.				
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Response: See discussion for (a) above.				
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Response: See discussion for (a) above.				
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Response: See discussion for (a) above.				
Sources: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.7 – Agricultural Resources 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.8 – Agricultural Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.8-1 – Important Farmlands 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 				
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response: Salem Engineering Group, Inc. (Salem) prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment for the project in 2022. The analysis in this section is based on the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment, which is included as Appendix A. <i>Air Quality Standards and Attainment</i> The project site lies within the South Coast Air Basin (the Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). As the local air quality management agency, SCAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that state and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Depending on whether or not the standards are met or exceeded, the Basin is classified as being in “attainment” or “nonattainment.”				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

The health effects associated with criteria pollutants upon which attainment of state and federal air quality standards is measured are described in Table 1.

Table 1 Health Effects Associated with Criteria Pollutants

Pollutant	Adverse Effects
Ozone	(1) Short-term exposures: pulmonary function decrements and localized lung edema in humans and animals, risk to public health implied by alterations in pulmonary morphology and host defense in animals; (2) long-term exposures: risk to public health implied by altered connective tissue metabolism and altered pulmonary morphology in animals after long-term exposures and pulmonary function decrements in chronically exposed humans; (3) vegetation damage; and (4) property damage.
Carbon monoxide (CO)	Reduces oxygen delivery leading to: (1) aggravation of chest pain (angina pectoris) and other aspects of coronary heart disease; (2) decreased exercise tolerance in persons with peripheral vascular disease and lung disease; (3) impairment of central nervous system functions; and (4) possible increased risk to fetuses.
Nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂)	(1) Potential to aggravate chronic respiratory disease and respiratory symptoms in sensitive groups; (2) risk to public health implied by pulmonary and extra-pulmonary biochemical and cellular changes and pulmonary structural changes; and (3) contribution to atmospheric discoloration.
Sulfur dioxide (SO ₂)	(1) Bronchoconstriction accompanied by symptoms that may include wheezing, shortness of breath, and chest tightness during exercise or physical activity in persons with asthma.
Suspended particulate matter (PM ₁₀)	(1) Excess deaths from short-term and long-term exposures; (2) excess seasonal declines in pulmonary function, especially in children; (3) asthma exacerbation and possibly induction; (4) adverse birth outcomes including low birth weight; (5) increased infant mortality; (6) increased respiratory symptoms in children such as cough and bronchitis; and (7) increased hospitalization for both cardiovascular and respiratory disease (including asthma). ^a
Suspended particulate matter (PM _{2.5})	(1) Excess deaths from short- and long-term exposures; (2) excess seasonal declines in pulmonary function, especially in children; (3) asthma exacerbation and possibly induction; (4) adverse birth outcomes, including low birth weight; (5) increased infant mortality; (6) increased respiratory symptoms in children, such as cough and bronchitis; and (7) increased hospitalization for both cardiovascular and respiratory disease, including asthma. ¹
<p>¹ More detailed discussions on the health effects associated with exposure to suspended particulate matter can be found in the following documents: Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Particulate Matter Health Effects and Standard Recommendations, www.oehha.ca.gov/air/toxic_contaminants/PM10notice.html#may, May 9, 2002; and EPA, Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter, October 2004.</p> <p>Source: USEPA 2018a</p>	

The Basin is designated nonattainment for the state ozone (O₃), PM_{2.5}, and PM₁₀ standards, and the federal O₃, PM_{2.5}, and lead standards (California Air Resources Board [CARB] 2017a, United States Environmental Protection Agency [USEPA]

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

2018b). The Los Angeles County portion of the Basin is designated as nonattainment for the federal standard for lead. The Basin is in attainment of all other federal and state standards. Because the Basin currently exceeds several state and federal ambient air quality standards, SCAQMD is required to implement strategies to reduce pollutant levels to recognized acceptable standards. This nonattainment status is a result of several factors, the primary ones being the naturally adverse meteorological conditions that limit the dispersion and diffusion of pollutants, the limited capacity of the local airshed to eliminate air pollutants, and the number, type, and density of emission sources within the Basin.

SCAQMD monitors air pollutant concentrations throughout the Basin at various monitoring stations. The monitoring station located closest to the project site is the Perris monitoring station, located at 237 ½ North D Street in the City of Perris, approximately 10.5 miles west of the project site. The second closest monitoring station is the Riverside-Rubidoux monitoring station, located at 5888 Mission Boulevard in the City of Rubidoux, approximately 13.5 miles northwest of the project site.

Table 2 indicates the number of days that each of the standards has been exceeded at the nearest monitoring station in each of the last three years for which data is available.

Table 2 Ambient Air Quality Data

Pollutant	2015	2016	2017
8 Hour Ozone (ppm), 8-Hr Maximum	0.102	0.098	0.105
Number of Days of State exceedances (>0.070)	49	55	80
Number of days of Federal exceedances (>0.070)	49	55	80
Ozone (ppm), Worst Hour	0.124	0.131	0.120
Number of days of State exceedances (>0.09 ppm)	25	23	33
Number of days of Federal exceedances (>0.112 ppm)	0	1	0
Nitrogen Dioxide (ppm) - Worst Hour*	0.057	0.073	0.063
Number of days of State exceedances (>0.18 ppm)*	0	0	0
Number of days of Federal exceedances (0.10 ppm)*	0	0	0
Particulate Matter 10 microns, mg/m ³ , Worst 24 Hours	188.0	76.0	75.4
Number of days above Federal standard (>150 mg/m ³)	1	0	0
Particulate Matter <2.5 microns, mg/m ³ , Worst 24 Hours*	54.7	51.5	50.3
Number of days above Federal standard (>35 mg/m ³) *	9	5	7

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Note: This table summarizes ambient air quality measurements at the nearest monitoring station with available data. The monitoring station located closest to the project site is the Perris monitoring station. Asterisks (*) denote air quality data taken from the Riverside-Rubidoux monitoring station.

Source: CARB 2018

As shown in Table 2, the O₃ concentration exceeded state and federal eight-hour and one-hour standards every year from 2015 through 2017. The PM₁₀ concentration exceeded federal standards one day in 2015. The PM_{2.5} concentration exceeded federal standards every year from 2015 to 2017. No exceedances of either state or federal standards for NO₂ have occurred at the designated monitoring stations in the last three years.

Air Quality Management

Under State law, SCAQMD is required to prepare a plan for air quality improvement for pollutants for which the District is in non-compliance. SCAQMD has adopted an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) that provides a strategy for the attainment of state and federal air quality standards. SCAQMD updates the AQMP every three years. Each iteration of the AQMP is an update of the previous plan and has a 20-year horizon. The latest AQMP, the 2016 AQMP, was adopted on March 3, 2017. The 2016 AQMP incorporates new scientific data and notable regulatory actions that have occurred since adoption of the 2012 AQMP, including the approval of the new federal 8-hour ozone standard of 0.070 ppm that was finalized in 2015.

The 2016 AQMP addresses several state and federal planning requirements and incorporates new scientific information, primarily in the form of updated emissions inventories, ambient measurements, and updated meteorological air quality models (SCAQMD 2017). The 2016 AQMP builds upon the approaches taken in the 2012 AQMP for the attainment of federal PM and O₃ standards and highlights the significant amount of reductions to be achieved. It emphasizes the need for interagency planning to identify additional strategies to achieve reductions within the timeframes allowed under the federal Clean Air Act, especially in the area of mobile sources. The 2016 AQMP also includes a discussion of emerging issues and opportunities, such as fugitive toxic particulate emissions, zero-emission mobile source control strategies, and the interacting dynamics among climate, energy, and air pollution. The 2016 AQMP also includes attainment demonstrations of the new federal 8-hour O₃ standard and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) emissions offsets, as per recent USEPA requirements.

Air Pollutant Emission Thresholds

The 2016 AQMP provides a strategy for the attainment of state and federal air quality standards. SCAQMD recommends the use of quantitative thresholds to determine the significance of temporary construction-related pollutant emissions and emissions from project operations. These thresholds are designed such that a project consistent with the thresholds would not have an individually or cumulatively significant impact to the Basin’s air quality. These thresholds are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Pollutant	Mass Daily Thresholds (lbs./day)	
	Construction	Operation
NO _x	100	55
VOC	75	55
PM ₁₀	150	150
PM _{2.5}	55	55
SO _x	150	150
CO	550	550
Lead	3	3

Source: SCAQMD 2015

SCAQMD has also developed Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) in response to concern regarding exposure of individuals to criteria pollutants in local communities. LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that will not cause or contribute to an air quality exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard at the nearest sensitive receptor, taking into consideration ambient concentrations in each source receptor area (SRA), project size, and distance to the sensitive receptor. However, LSTs only apply to emissions within a fixed stationary location, including idling emissions during both project construction and operation. LSTs have been developed for NO_x, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. LSTs do not apply to mobile sources such as cars on a roadway (SCAQMD 2008a). As such, LSTs for operational emissions do not apply to on-site development since the majority of emissions would be generated by cars on the roadways.

LSTs have been developed for emissions from construction areas up to five acres in size. SCAQMD provides lookup tables for sites that measure one, two, or five acres. The project site is located in SRA 24, Perris Valley. LSTs for construction in SRA 24 at a five acre site are shown in

Table 4. Because the project site is between two and five acres information from the five acre site was used. LSTs are provided for receptors at a distance of 25 to 500 meters from the project site boundary. LSTs are provided for receptor distances of 50 and 100 meters from the site boundary; therefore, as shown in

Table 4, LSTs for a receptor distance of 50 meters are used to provide a more conservative estimate.

Table 4 SCAQMD LSTs for Construction (SRA 24)

Pollutant	Allowable emissions (lbs./day) from a 5-acre site in SRA 24 for a receptor 50 meters away
Gradual conversion of NO _x to NO ₂	302
CO	2,178
PM ₁₀	40
PM _{2.5}	10

Source: SCAQMD 2009, see Appendix A

The SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the SCAB. The most recently adopted air quality plan in the SCAB is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which was adopted by the Board in March 2017.

A project may be inconsistent with the AQMP if it would generate population, housing, or employment growth exceeding the forecasts used in the development of the AQMP. The 2016 AQMP relies on local city general plans and the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) Regional Transportation Plans' (RTP) forecasts of regional population, housing, and employment growth in its own projections for managing Basin air quality.

The project would not provide residential units that would cause a direct increase in the city's population. While the project may provide new employment opportunities in the city of Moreno Valley that could contribute to population growth, this contribution would be nominal. If all project employees relocate to the city, which is a conservative assumption given the connected nature of the region and the nature of the employment opportunities, project-related population growth would constitute less than one percent of projected city growth. Thus, the level of population growth associated with the project was anticipated in SCAG's long-term population forecasts and would not exceed official regional population projections. As such, the project would not conflict with the 2016 AQMP. No impact would occur.

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Response:

Construction activities associated with development would generate temporary diesel emissions and dust. Construction emissions modeled include emissions generated by construction equipment used on-site and emissions generated by vehicle trips associated with construction, such as worker and vendor trips. It is assumed that heavy construction equipment would be operating at the site for eight hours per day, five days per week during project construction. In addition, it was assumed the project would comply with all applicable regulatory standards, which includes SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings).

To account for compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 1113, air pollutant emissions modelling included the assumptions that the construction site would be watered three times daily and that low VOC architectural coatings would be used (Salem 2018a). As shown in Table 5, estimated maximum daily construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds or LSTs. Therefore, project construction would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and the air quality impact related to construction emissions would be less than significant.

Table 5 Estimated Maximum Unmitigated Construction Emissions

	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs./day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Maximum Emissions (lbs./day)	28.24	33.13	21.17	< 0.1	21.47	11.64
SCAQMD Regional Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No
Maximum On-site Emissions (lbs./day)	28.24	33.13	21.17	< 0.1	21.47	11.64
SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs) ²	N/A	302	2,178	N/A	40	10
Threshold Exceeded?	N/A	No	No	N/A	No	No

¹ Air pollutant emissions modeling assumed compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust) and Rule 1113 (Architectural Coating).

² LSTs are for a 5-acre project in SRA 34 within a distance of 50 meters from the site boundary.

Notes: All emissions modeling was done using CalEEMod. Emissions presented are the highest of the winter and summer modeled emissions.

Source: Salem 2021 (Appendix A)

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Operational Emissions

Operational emissions associated with the project would include emissions associated with mobile sources (vehicle trips), energy sources (electricity and natural gas use), and area sources (landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products and architectural coating associated with on-site operational activities). As shown in Table 6, operational emissions would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any criteria pollutant. Therefore, the impact related to operational emissions would be less than significant.

Table 6 Operational Emissions

	Maximum Daily Emissions (lbs./day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Total Emissions	37.10	31.67	251.65	0.47	46.29	12.65
SCAQMD Thresholds	55	55	550	150	150	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Notes: All emissions modeling was done using CalEEMod. Emissions presented are the highest of the winter and summer modeled emissions.

Source: Salem 2018a (Appendix A)

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:

See discussion for (b) above.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:

Certain population groups, such as children, the elderly, and people with health problems, are particularly sensitive to air pollution. Sensitive receptors are defined as land uses that are more likely to be used by these population groups and include healthcare facilities, retirement homes, school and playground facilities, and residential areas. The nearest sensitive receptors are residences located approximately 70 feet south of the project site.

As demonstrated in Table 5, the project's construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD LSTs and therefore would not expose local sensitive receptors to substantial levels of criteria pollutant emissions due to on-site construction activities.

Refueling activities at the proposed gas station would potentially release benzene into the air; however, benzene emissions can be reduced by more than 90 percent by the vapor recovery systems required at fuel pumps. Nevertheless, benzene emissions may result in near source health risk (CARB 2005). Therefore, CARB recommends siting sensitive land uses, such as residences, at least 50 feet from typical gasoline dispensing facilities and at least 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities (i.e., facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) (CARB 2005). The proposed gas station would be classified as a typical gasoline dispensing facility. Fuel

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>pumps would be located at least 70 feet from the nearest residence. Therefore, the proposed fuel pumps would be located outside the recommended buffer of 50 feet, which would ensure that nearby sensitive receptors are adequately protected from benzene emissions. Furthermore, SCAQMD has stringent requirements for the control of gasoline vapor emissions from gasoline dispensing facilities as set forth in SCAQMD Rule 461, Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing, which requires compliance with all equipment and operation standards as well as maintenance and inspection protocol. Compliance with SCAQMD Rule 461 would protect nearby residents from exposure to emissions related to the proposed fueling station.</p> <p>Project-generated traffic could contribute to the creation of CO hotspots (i.e., localized concentrations of CO that exceed the state one-hour or eight-hour CO ambient air standards). A project's localized air quality impact is considered significant if CO emissions create a hotspot where either the California one-hour standard of 20 ppm or the federal and state eight-hour standard of 9.0 ppm is exceeded. This typically occurs at severely congested intersections (level of service [LOS] E or worse) and where the project may add substantial traffic and associated emissions.</p> <p>The entire SCAB is in conformance with federal and state CO standards, and most air quality monitoring stations no longer report CO levels. No stations in the vicinity of the project site have monitored CO in the last four years. Furthermore, as discussed above under subpart (b, c) of this section, the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for any pollutant. Therefore, it would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Diesel equipment operating at the site during construction may generate some nuisance odors. However, due to the distance of the nearest sensitive receptors (70 feet south) and the temporary nature of construction, construction-related odor impacts would be less than significant (Salem 2018a).</p> <p>CARB's <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective</i> (2005) and SCAQMD's <i>CEQA Air Quality Handbook</i> (1993) identify land uses associated with odor complaints. The project None of the proposed commercial uses for the project are identified as land uses associated with odor complaints by CARB or SCAQMD (Salem 2021). Therefore, the project would not generate objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5 – Circulation Element • Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.6 – Air Quality 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.3 – Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.3-1 – South Coast Air Basin • Appendix C – Air Quality Analysis, P&D Consultants, July 2003 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.10.050 – Air Quality of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code • Section 9.10.150 – Odors of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code • Section 9.10.170 – Vibration of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Section 12.50.040 – Limitations on Engine Idling 				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

Response:

In October, Gonzalez Environmental Consulting completed a Biological Habitat Assessment and Focused Burrowing Owl Surveys for the Project site. The report, included as an Appendix to the DBESP Report prepared by Hernandez Environmental Services, included detailed findings related to burrowing owl, as well as general findings about the site’s habitat features and biological resources particularly as they relate to the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). A DBESP Report was also completed in November 2022 by Hernandez Environmental Services, included as Appendix B. The following analysis summarizes and augments the findings of these reports.

Existing Conditions

The project site was previously used as a construction staging area for road improvements to Nason Street. Due to mechanical discing, the site has limited vegetation coverage, with non-native annuals and grasses such as Russian thistle (*Salsola*) and red bromes (*Bromus madritensis rubens*). Eucalyptus trees are present on the western side of the site, and mulefat (*Baccharis salicifolia*) is present in the southern portion of the site. Wildlife observed on the site during the Burrowing Owl survey included mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicana*), house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), raven (*Corvus corax*), jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*), California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beechyi*), pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*), side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*), and a possible sighting of Stephen’s kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*).

Special-status species are plants and animals 1) listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as Threatened or Endangered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA); 2) listed or proposed for listing as Rare, Threatened, or Endangered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA); 3) recognized as Species of Special Concern (SSC) by the CDFW; 4) afforded protection under Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and/or California Fish and Game Code (CFGC); and 5) occurring on lists 1 and 2 of the CDFW California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) system per the following definitions:

- List 1A = Plants presumed extinct in California
- List 1B.1 = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere, seriously endangered in California (over 80 percent of occurrences threatened/high degree and immediacy of threat)
- List 1B.2 = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere, fairly endangered in California (20-80 percent occurrences threatened)

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List 1B.3 = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere, not very endangered in California (<20 percent of occurrences threatened or no current threats known) ▪ List 2 = Rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere <p>In addition, special-status species are ranked globally (G) and subnationally (S) 1 through 5 based on NatureServe's (2010) methodologies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ G1 or S1 – Critically Imperiled globally or subnationally (state) ▪ G2 or S2 – Imperiled globally or subnationally (state) ▪ G3 or S3 – Vulnerable to extirpation or extinction globally or subnationally (state) ▪ G4 or S4 – Apparently secure globally or subnationally (state) ▪ G5 or S5 – Secure globally or subnationally (state) ▪ ? – Inexact Numeric Rank ▪ T – Intraspecific Taxon (subspecies, varieties, and other designations below the level of species) ▪ Q – Questionable taxonomy that may reduce conservation priority <p>The site offers generally poor habitat for wildlife because of previous uses on the site. Wildlife observed on the project site included the mourning dove, house finch, house sparrow, raven, jackrabbit, California ground squirrel, pocket gopher, Stephen's kangaroo rat (possible), side-blotched lizard, and western fence lizard.</p> <p>No burrowing owls or burrowing owl burrows were observed on-site during burrowing owl surveys from July 16 to July 20, 2018. However, the project site includes potential foraging habitat for burrowing owls. Due to the site's disturbed condition, development of the project is not expected to impact the long-term viability of burrowing owls that would forage on-site (VHBC 2018). Therefore, impacts to burrowing owls would be less than significant.</p> <p>While the site is generally poor habitat for wildlife and contains limited vegetation due to prior disturbance, there is some vegetative structure (trees, shrubs) that could support nesting birds protected under the CFGC and the MBTA. Nesting birds may use the site to forage and may be impacted by the project. In addition, project construction could adversely affect nesting birds if construction occurs while nesting birds are present on or adjacent to the site, though direct mortality or abandonment of nests. The loss of a nest due to construction activities would be a violation of the MBTA and CFGC 3505 et. seq., and impacts to nesting birds would be potentially significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level.</p> <p>The project site may provide habitat for Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR), which is federally listed as endangered, and state listed as threatened (CDFW 2018). SKR is protected by the Stephens Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKRHCP), which is managed by the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA). The SKRHCP sets aside space for SKR conservation, while authorizing incidental "take" of the species that could occur during otherwise lawful activities. The SKRHCP identifies eight core reserves for conservation of SKR, encompassing over 41,000 acres in</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Riverside County (Western Riverside Council of Governments 2018). The project site is not in a core reserve but is in the plan area of the SKRHCP.</p> <p>Section 8.60 of the MVMC requires that all applicants for development permits within the boundaries of the plan area pay an impact and mitigation fee of \$500 per gross acre located within the parcel to be developed and the area disturbed by related off-site improvements. The project site is in the plan area and the applicant would be required to pay the mitigation fee for protection of the SKR. Fees are remitted to the RCHCA for preparation and implementation of the SKRHCP. In order to proceed with project activities that could result in incidental take of SKR, the project applicant would require “take” authorization granted by the City of Moreno Valley, which would be granted concurrently with a grading permit because a possible sighting of SKR occurred on the project site. The project would pay the applicable fees and obtain a take permit; therefore, impacts to SKR would be less than significant.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure, and compliance with MBTA requirements, would be required to reduce impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level.</p> <p>BIO-1 Nesting Birds Avoidance</p> <p>To avoid disturbance of nesting and special-status birds, including species protected by the MBTA and CFGC, activities related to the project, including but not limited to vegetation removal, ground disturbance, and construction and demolition, shall occur outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31), if feasible. If construction must begin during the breeding season, then a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted no more than three (3) days prior to initiation of ground disturbance and vegetation removal activities. The nesting bird pre-construction survey shall be conducted on foot inside the project boundary, including a 300-foot buffer. The survey shall be conducted by a biologist familiar with the identification of avian species known to occur in southern California communities. If nests are found, an avoidance buffer (dependent upon the species, the proposed work activity, and existing disturbances associated with land uses outside of the site) shall be determined and demarcated by the biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, construction lathe, or other means to mark the boundary. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during the nesting season. No ground-disturbing activities shall occur inside this buffer until the avian biologist has confirmed that breeding/nesting is completed and the young have fledged the nest. Encroachment into the buffer shall occur only at the discretion of the qualified biologist.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds by avoiding construction activities during the nesting season and creating an avoidance buffer if construction occurs during the nesting season.</p>				
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response:</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Plant communities are considered sensitive biological resources if they have limited distributions, have high wildlife value, include sensitive species, or are particularly susceptible to disturbance. CDFW ranks sensitive communities as “threatened” or “very threatened” and keeps records of their occurrences in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB).</p> <p>The project site is dominated by non-native vegetation, and plant growth is limited due to the site’s history of mechanical discing. Eucalyptus trees are located on the west side of the site. Mulefat is present at the terminus of the “V-ditch” on the south side of the site along with tree tobacco (<i>Nicotiana glauca</i>). The site does not contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. There would be no impact.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) identifies a historic natural drainage on the project site that has been diverted to underground culverts north and south of the site (NWI 2018). These wetlands and non-wetland waters are subject to United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act (CWA), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction under the CWA and Porter-Cologne, and CDFW jurisdiction under the CFGC. Because the project has the potential to impact state or federal waters the project applicant has prepared a Jurisdiction Delineation, which can be found in the DBESP as part of the Biological Resources appendix. The Jurisdictional Delineation found that the Project site contains one ephemeral drainage feature that flows through the eastern portion of the Project site. The drainage onsite originates from a culvert outlet from SR 60 which provides flow into a trapezoidal concrete channel, which sheet flows prior to entering the site. The ephemeral drainage is tributary to the San Jacinto River. The drainage enters the northern portion of the site as a channel lined with cloth/fabric matting. The channel then narrows and becomes a natural bottom channel before entering a concrete trapezoidal channel. The drainage becomes an earthen channel in the southeastern portion of the site prior to exiting the site through a culvert. The onsite drainage is severely disturbed. The drainage is dominated by disturbed areas and upland habitat with remnant patches of mulefat scrub. The drainage extends approximately 859 feet through the eastern portion of the site and consists of approximately 0.27 acre of ephemeral streambed, including approximately 0.016 acre of associated riparian vegetation. The onsite drainage and associated riparian vegetation are considered WRCMSHCP riparian/riverine resources. Refer to Figure 8. The onsite ephemeral drainage has low functions and values for flood storage and flood flow modification, sediment trapping and transport, nutrient retention and transformation, toxicant trapping, public use, and wildlife and aquatic habitat due to its small size, severe anthropogenic impacts, and lack of perennial or intermittent sources of water. The proposed Project will impact the entire onsite drainage totaling (0.27 acre/859 linear feet). Implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to natural and beneficial functions and values.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The following mitigation measure would be required to reduce impacts to state and federally protected wetlands to a less than significant level.

BIO-2 Jurisdictional Waters

Implementation of the proposed Project will result in impacts to approximately 0.27 acres of riparian/riverine resources, as determined in the Jurisdictional Delineation report. To mitigate for permanent impacts to the 0.27 acre of ephemeral drainage feature and associated riparian vegetation, the Project Proponent proposes to provide offsite mitigation through the purchase of 0.54-acre, a 2:1 ratio, of re-establishment credits at the Riverpark Mitigation Bank. The River Park Mitigation Bank proposes to re-establish alkali plain wetland system habitat and rehabilitate alkali plain wetland habitat and replace functions and services of aquatic resources and associated habitats that have been degraded or destroyed. Functions and values restored include long-term water storage, flood flow dissipation, greater nutrient retention, greater removal of elements and compounds, spreading of low flows for greater retention and removal of dissolved substances, increased structural habitat, habitat interspersions, and wildlife connectivity, and higher support for sensitive species. Therefore, unlike the onsite drainage feature, the proposed mitigation would provide for the conservation of wetland habitat with superior functions and values. A receipt of purchase shall be provided to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Response:
Wildlife movement corridors, or habitat linkages, are generally defined as connections between habitat patches that allow for physical and genetic exchange between otherwise isolated animal populations.

The project site is not located in an Essential Connectivity Area (ECA) as mapped in the California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project: A Strategy for Conserving a Connected California (2010). ECAs are mapped based on coarse ecological condition indicators, rather than the needs of particular species and thus serve the majority of species in each region. In addition, much of the land in the City has been converted from open space to commercial industrial, residential, and recreational uses, resulting in habitat fragmentation. Therefore, regional wildlife movement in the vicinity of the project site is limited. Because the project site does not provide a wildlife corridor, habitat linkage, or nursery site for migratory fish or wildlife species, there would be no impact.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:
The project would be subject to the requirements of Chapter 9.17.030 of the MVMC, which addresses landscape and irrigation design standards, including protections for trees and other vegetation. Requirements for protection of biological resources include retaining existing vegetation on any portion of a development not designated for grading or construction, and preservation of heritage trees. Heritage trees include those with a diameter of fifteen inches measured twenty-four inches above ground level. Removal

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>of heritage trees is not permitted without approval from the community development director. The project would not remove heritage trees without approval from the community development director, as required by the MVMC. Adherence to the MVMC would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.</p>				
<p>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or another approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The City of Moreno Valley is encompassed by the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) was created in 2004 to develop the MSHCP. The MSHCP plan area covers approximately 1.26 million acres west of the crest of the San Jacinto Mountains to the Orange County line and focuses on conservation of 146 species and includes over 500,000 acres of Conservation Area. The MSHCP grants “Take” authorization of plant and wildlife species within the plan area for otherwise lawful actions, such as public and private development that may incidentally Take or harm species of habitat, in exchange for the assembly and management of a coordinated MSHCP Conservation Area (RCA 2003).</p> <p>The project site is not in a Conserved Land Unit or Conservation Easement within the MSHCP. The site is also not within a Criteria Cell designated for future conservation. Therefore, the applicant does not need to obtain approval from the RCA. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.1 – Biological Resources 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.9 – Biological Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.9-1 – Planning Area Biological Geographic Sections - Figure 5.9-2 – Planning Area Vegetation Community - Figure 5.9-3 – Project Site Location within the MSHCP Area - Figure 5.9-4 – Reche Canyon/Badlands Area Plan • Appendix E – Biological Resources Study, Appendix E 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.17.030 G – Heritage Trees 4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 8.60 – Threatened and Endangered Species 5. Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), http://www.wrc-rca.org/about-rca/multiple-species-habitat-conservation-plan/ 6. Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKRHCP), Governing Documents RCHCA, CA 				
<p>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Archaeological Associates conducted a Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment of the project site in November 2020 to identify potentially significant cultural resources in the</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>project vicinity, see Appendix C. The assessment included a field survey and a records search of applicable databases. Results are discussed in the impact analysis below.</p> <p>The project site is a vacant lot covered with sparse vegetation and contains one residential structure. There are no sites within the City that are listed as a state landmark (California State Parks 2019), nor are any sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places (National Park Service 2018). The City of Moreno Valley General Plan discusses two historic buildings: the Old Moreno Schoolhouse, which was designated a city landmark in 1988, but has since been converted into a private residence; and the First Congregational Church of Moreno, which is still in use as an ancillary structure to the congregation’s primary sanctuary building. The Old Moreno Schoolhouse is approximately 2.1 miles southeast of the project site, and the historic church is approximately 2.7 miles west of the project site. Four historic residences are mapped within one mile of the site, and six historic grove irrigation features. None of the historic resources revealed by the records search are on the project site. The residence that is adjacent to the site to the west was built in 1981 and is classified as modern. There are no historic resources on the project site and the project would not cause an adverse change to any historic resources. Therefore, there would be no impact on historical resources.</p>				
<p>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response:</p> <p>There are no known archaeological resources on the project site (Archaeological Associates 2020). As a previously disturbed site with no structures aside from the existing single-family residence, it is unlikely that archaeological resources would be unearthed during excavation or grading. However, it is possible that these activities could unearth previously undiscovered archaeological resources, or human remains. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>CUL-1 Unanticipated Discovery of Prehistoric and Archaeological Resources</p> <p>In the event that archaeological or paleontological resources are unearthed during project construction, all earth-disturbing work near the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist and/or paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as preservation in place or data recovery, shall occur as required by the archeologist and/or paleontologist in coordination with City staff and descendants and/or stakeholder groups, as warranted. Once the resource has been properly treated or protected, work in the area may resume. A Native American representative shall be retained to monitor any mitigation work associated with Native American cultural material.</p> <p>CUL-2 Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains</p> <p>In the event that human remains are encountered during the course of any future development California State Law (Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Section 5079.98 of the Public Resources Code) states that no further earth disturbance shall occur at the location of the find until the Riverside County Coroner has been notified. If</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant. With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 and Mitigation Measure CR-2 would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains by ensuring that any cultural resources encountered during project activities are handled in a suitable manner.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formally dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Response:
See response for (c) above.

Sources:

1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
 - Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.2 – Cultural and Historical Resources
2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
 - Section 5.10 – Cultural Resources
 - Figure 5.10-1 – Locations of Listed Historic Resource Inventory Structures
 - Figure 5.10-2 – Location of Prehistoric Sites
 - Figure 5.10-3 – Paleontological Resource Sensitive Areas
 - Appendix F – Cultural Resources Analysis, Study of Historical and Archaeological Resources for the Revised General Plan, City of Moreno Valley, Archaeological Associates, August 2003.
3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code
4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Title 7 – Cultural Preservation
5. Cultural Resources Inventory for the City of Moreno Valley, Riverside County, California, prepared by Daniel F. McCarthy, Archaeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside, October 1987 (*This document cannot be provided to the public due to the inclusion of confidential information pursuant to Government Code Section 6254.10.*)

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:
Construction of the project would result in short-term consumption of energy from the use of construction equipment and processes. Energy use during construction would be primarily from fuel consumption to operate heavy equipment, light-duty vehicles, machinery, and generators. The California Green Building Standards Code includes specific requirements related to recycling, construction materials, and energy efficiency standards that would apply to construction of the project to minimize wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary energy consumption. California Green Building Standards Code mandatory measures for nonresidential buildings that would reduce project energy demand include weather-resistant exterior walls, designated recycling areas for solid waste disposal, and HVAC air filters with a Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) of 8. Minimum standards for lighting efficiency are also established.

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Operation of the project would generate energy demand for the use of a the proposed fueling station and the other commercial/retail structures, as well as fuel from vehicle trips and electricity for lighting. However, compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code would ensure that modern energy efficiency standards are met for the project’s energy-demanding components. Furthermore, siting multiple commercial uses together in proximity to residential areas would result in efficient pooled energy use for lighting, grid connection, and vehicle trips. In addition, Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would require a 10 percent energy reduction on the project site, including features such as designated parking spaces for fuel efficient vehicles and installation of energy efficient lighting. These requirements would prevent wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Response:
 The City of Moreno Valley Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy (2012) is the City’s plan for reducing energy consumption, water consumption, and greenhouse gas emissions. The Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy lists future policy measures to improve energy efficiency, as well as goals for energy use reduction in municipal operations and public places. Mitigation Measure GHG-1, as described above and in Section 8 *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, requires a 10 percent reduction in project energy and would implement features such as parking for fuel efficient vehicles, energy efficient lighting, and energy-conserving “cool roofs.” These energy-efficiency measures would ensure the project’s consistency with the Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy.

The MVMC includes energy efficiency requirements for commercial development. Specifically, Section 9.08.100 requires submission of a lighting plan that demonstrates efficient use of lighting, and Section 9.13.060 requires landscaping design that allows for solar access and shade to facilitate energy conservation.

Compliance with the MVMC and implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- Sources:**
1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
 - Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.6 – Energy Resources
 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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 https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/SP_042.pdf	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Response:

This section is based on the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation for the project site, prepared by Salem Engineering Group on June 26, 2018, and included as Appendix D.

The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone (Salem 2018b). No active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the site. The active fault nearest to the project site is associated with the San Jacinto Fault system, approximately 2.4 miles from the site. There would be no impact.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:

The project site is located in the highly seismic Southern California region within the influence of several fault systems that are considered to be active or potentially active. Specifically, the project site is located within the Peninsular Range Geomorphic Province, between the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains to the east, and the Santa Ana Mountains to the west and south. The Peninsular Range has historically been a province of relatively high seismic activity. As with any development in the region, there is the potential for substantial adverse effects to people or structures due to strong seismic ground shaking. Table 7 presents the nine nearest fault zones and their associated maximum earthquake magnitudes.

Table 7 Regional Faults

Fault Name	Approximate Distance from Site (miles)	Maximum Earthquake Magnitude ¹
San Jacinto	2.4	7.9
San Jacinto	5.7	7.6
San Jacinto	6.1	7.1
S. San Andreas	12.8	8.2
S. San Andreas	14.8	8.0
Elsinore	20.1	7.8
Elsinore	21.7	7.5
Cucamonga	22.1	6.7
S. San Andreas	22.5	7.4

¹Earthquake magnitude refers to the size of the earthquake as recorded on the Richter scale based on seismometer-measured wave amplitude and distance to earthquake center. Earthquakes ranging from 6-6.9 are generally classified as “Strong”, while those ranging from 7-7.9 are classified as “Major.”

Source: Salem 2018b (Appendix D)

The project would be compliant with the California Building Code (CBC), 2016 Edition, which is adopted by the MVMC. Compliance with the CBC and MVMC, as recommended in the Geotechnical Engineering Report, would result in less than significant impacts related to seismically induced ground shaking from nearby faults.

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Liquefaction is the process by which soil is temporarily transformed to fluid form during intense and prolonged ground shaking or because of a sudden shock or strain. Liquefaction typically occurs in areas where the groundwater is less than 30 feet from the surface and where the soils are composed of poorly consolidated fine to medium sand. Settlement of liquefied sands following a liquefaction event can produce additional hazards.</p> <p>Soils on the project site within a depth of 37 feet predominantly consist of loose to very dense silty sand, sand, clayey sand, and very stiff sandy clay. Salem evaluated the potential for soil liquefaction during a seismic event using the LiqIT computer program. Analysis indicates that the soils at the project site have a low potential for liquefaction under seismic conditions (Salem 2018b). The total liquefaction-induced settlement risk was found to be negligible. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>				
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: A landslide is a movement of surface material down a slope. The geologic character of an area determines its potential for landslides. Steep slopes, the extent of erosion, and the rock composition of a hillside all contribute to the potential for slope failure and landslides. Slope failure can be triggered by erosion or grading, saturation of marginally stable slopes by rainfall or irrigation, or shaking of marginally stable slopes during earthquakes.</p> <p>The project site is relatively flat. The site does not have a history of landslides, nor is it in the path of potential landslide hazards. As such, there is no considerable risk related to landslides. There would be no impact.</p>				
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The project site is undeveloped, with its surface consisting of exposed soil and sparse vegetation. The upper soils underlying the project site are identified primarily as silty sand with various amounts of clay.</p> <p>Construction activities would disturb soil on the project site, resulting in potential for substantial soil erosion and loss of topsoil.</p> <p>As noted in Section 3, <i>Air Quality</i>, the project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 regarding incorporation of measures to reduce fugitive dust, which would reduce the potential for construction-related wind erosion. SCAQMD Rule 403 includes requirements for the application of water or stabilizing agents to prevent generation of dust plumes, pre-watering materials prior to the use of tarps to enclose haul trucks, stabilizing sloping surfaces using soil binders until vegetation or ground cover efficiently stabilize slopes, hydroseeding prior to rain, and washing mud and soils from equipment at the conclusion of trenching activities. Because the project site is generally flat (reducing the potential for high-speed stormwater flows during construction) and would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403, project construction would not result in substantial wind erosion or loss of topsoil.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Because the project would disturb more than one acre of land, it would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm water Discharges associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ) adopted by the SWRCB. Compliance with the permit requires the project applicant to file a Notice of Intent with the SWRCB. Permit conditions require preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which must describe the site, the facility, erosion and sediment controls, runoff water quality monitoring, means of waste disposal, implementation of approved local plans, construction sediment and erosion control measures, maintenance responsibilities, and non-stormwater management controls. Inspection of construction sites before and after storms is also required to identify stormwater discharge from the construction activity and to identify and implement erosion controls, where necessary.</p> <p>In addition, the project would comply with the MVMC, which requires a grading permit from the city engineer prior to grading. All activities requiring a grading permit also require an approved erosion control plan, which details protective measures against erosion.</p> <p>Because the project would comply with the regulations described above, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response:</p> <p>Lateral spreading is a phenomenon associated with liquefaction in which soils move laterally during seismic shaking. As discussed above, there are not substantial liquefaction or landslide risks at the project site. Due to the relatively flat topography of the site, the likelihood of lateral spreading is also low.</p> <p>Subsidence and collapse refer to the caving in or sinking of land. Subsidence is caused by a variety of activities, which include, but are not limited to, withdrawal of groundwater, pumping of oil and gas from underground, the collapse of underground mines, liquefaction, and hydrocompaction. The upper soils at the project site are primarily silty sand with various amounts of clay. The sandy soils are moisture-sensitive and moderately collapsible under saturated conditions. Therefore, there is a moderate risk of post-construction movement of the foundations and floor systems of proposed structures from subsidence. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level by requiring application of soil stability measures.</p> <p>GEO-1 Soil Stability Measures</p> <p>The project shall adhere to the following recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared by Salem Engineering Group on June 26, 2018, to reduce the potential for soil collapse:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The near-surface onsite sandy soils within the proposed building area shall be removed and re-compacted. Over-excavation and re-compaction within the proposed building areas shall be performed to a minimum depth of four feet below existing grade or three feet below proposed footing bottom, whichever is 				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>deeper. Within pavement areas, over-excavation and re-compaction shall be performed to a depth of two feet below existing grade or two feet below proposed grade, whichever is deeper. Any fill materials encountered during grading shall be removed and replaced with engineered fill. The actual depth of the over-excavation and re-compaction shall be determined by the geotechnical field representative during construction. The over-excavation and re-compaction shall also extend laterally to a minimum of five feet beyond the outer edges of the proposed footings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prior to placement of fill soils, the upper 8 to 10 inches of native subgrade soils shall be scarified, moisture-conditioned to no less than the optimum moisture content and re-compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the maximum dry density based on ASTM D1557 Test Method latest edition. All Engineered Fill shall be placed in thin lifts which will allow for adequate bonding and compaction (typically 6 to 8 inches in loose thickness). Engineered Fill soils shall be placed, moisture-conditioned to near optimum moisture content, and compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. ▪ A qualified engineer shall be present at the site during site preparation to observe site clearing, preparation of exposed surfaces after clearing, and placement, treatment and compaction of fill material. <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce potential impacts related to soil stability to a less than significant level by ensuring that the measures are in place to reduce impacts to soil stability.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Expansive soils are generally clays, which increase in volume when saturated and shrink when dried. The swelling that occurs in expansive soils exerts pressure that can damage the foundation of a building. When expansive soil is present, foundations must be designed to prevent uplift of the supported structure or to resist forces exerted on the foundation due to soil volume changes.</p> <p>Various amounts of clay exist throughout the upper soil layers of the project site, indicating the potential for expansive soil hazards. Therefore, there is the potential for expansion and collapse of soils that could damage the proposed structures. Adherence to Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce hazards related to expansive soils by requiring soil stability measures. In addition, Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would be required to reduce expansive soil impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>GEO-2 Expansive Soil Reduction Measures</p> <p>The project shall adhere to the following recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation prepared by Salem Engineering Group on June 26, 2018, to reduce the potential for structural damage due to expansive soils:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To reduce shrinking and cracking of concrete foundations, the following recommendations shall be adhered to the extent feasible: limiting the slump of 				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>the concrete, proper concrete placement and curing, and place crack control joints at periodic intervals, in particular, where re-entrant slab corners occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper finishing and curing of concrete shall occur in accordance with the latest guidelines provided by the American Concrete Institute, Portland Cement Association, and the American Society for Testing and Materials. <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 would reduce potential impacts related to the expansion and collapse of soil to a less than significant level by ensuring that the project would implement proper concrete foundations and that finishing and curing of concrete occurs in accordance with the latest applicable guidelines.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The project would be connected to the City's existing sewer system for wastewater disposal and would not require a septic system. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts associated with the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.</p>				
<p>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: According to the Moreno Valley General Plan EIR (2006), the project site is within an area of Low Potential for paleontological resources. There are no notable geologic features on the site. As a previously disturbed site with no structures, it is unlikely that paleontological resources would be unearthed during excavation or grading. However, it is possible that these activities could unearth previously undiscovered paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and Mitigation Measure GEO-3 is required to ensure proper handling of potentially unanticipated paleontological resources.</p> <p>GEO-3 Unanticipated Discovery of Paleontological Resources</p> <p>In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during project construction, all earth-disturbing work near the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as preservation in place or data recovery, shall occur as required by the paleontologist in coordination with City staff and descendants and/or stakeholder groups, as warranted. Once the resource has been properly treated or protected, work in the area may resume.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would reduce potential impacts related to the discovery of unanticipated paleontological resources a less than significant level by ensuring proper handling and preservation of any discovered paleontological resources.</p>				
<p>Sources:</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.5 – Geologic Hazards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 6-3 – Geologic Faults & Liquefaction • Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.4 -- Soils 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.6 – Geology and Soils <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.6-1 – Geology - Figure 5.6-2 – Seismic Hazards 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 8.21 – Grading Regulations 5. Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, City of Moreno Valley Fire Department, adopted October 4, 2011, amended 2017, http://www.moval.org/city_hall/departments/fire/pdfs/haz-mit-plan.pdf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 4 – Earthquake <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 4-1 – Right-Lateral Strike -Slip Fault - Figure 4-1.1 – Moreno Valley Geologic Faults and Liquefaction 2016 - Figure 4-1.2 – Moreno Valley Area Ground Shaking Map • Chapter 8 – Landslide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 8-1 – Moreno Valley Slope Analysis 2016 6. Emergency Operations Plan, City of Moreno Valley, March 2009, http://www.moval.org/city_hall/departments/fire/pdfs/mv-eop-0309.pdf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat Assessment 1 – Major Earthquakes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 9 – Types of Faults - Figure 10 – Earthquake Faults - Figure 11 – Comparison of Richter Magnitude and Modified Mercalli Intensity - Figure 12 – Magnitude 4.5 or Greater Earthquake Map - Figure 13 – Geologic Faults and Liquefaction 				

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:
Salem prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment for the project in 2021. The analysis in this section is based on the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessment, which is included as Appendix A.

Background
Project implementation would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through the burning of fossil fuels and other sources, thus potentially contributing to cumulative impacts related to climate change. In response to an increase in man-made GHG concentrations over the past 150 years, California has implemented AB 32, the “California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.” AB 32 codifies the statewide goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (essentially a 15 percent reduction below 2005 emission levels) and the adoption of regulations to require reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. On September 8, 2016, the governor signed Senate Bill 32 (SB 32) into law, which extends AB 32 by requiring the state to further reduce GHGs to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030.

On December 14, 2017, CARB adopted the 2017 Scoping Plan, which provides a framework for achieving the 2030 target established by SB 32. The 2017 Scoping Plan does not provide project-level thresholds for land use development. Instead, it recommends that local governments adopt policies and locally appropriate quantitative

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>thresholds consistent with a statewide per capita goal of six metric tons (MT) carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) by 2030 and two MT CO₂e by 2050 (CARB 2017b). As stated in the 2017 Scoping Plan, these goals may be appropriate for plan-level analyses (city, county, subregional, or regional level), but not for specific individual projects because they include all emissions sectors in the state.</p> <p>The vast majority of individual projects do not generate sufficient GHG emissions to directly influence climate change. However, physical changes caused by a project can contribute incrementally to cumulative effects that are significant, even if individual changes resulting from a project are limited. The issue of climate change typically involves an analysis of whether a project’s contribution towards an impact would be cumulatively considerable. “Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probable future projects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064[h][1]).</p> <p>Local Regulations</p> <p>In October 2012, the City of Moreno Valley released the <i>Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy</i>, a policy document that identifies actions the City can take to reduce the environmental and fiscal impacts of energy usage and GHG emissions in municipal facilities and within the community. The Climate Action Strategy includes an analysis of existing and future greenhouse gas emissions community wide and provides a set of policies to guide efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to meet or exceed state requirements without unduly compromising other community goals (City of Moreno Valley 2012).</p> <p>With the implementation of GHG reduction measures, the City of Moreno Valley is projected to reduce its community-wide emissions to a total of 798,137 MT CO₂e, which is 556 MT CO₂e below the 2020 reduction target. This is a decrease of 38.5 percent from the City’s 2020 BAU emissions inventory and 13 percent from the 2010 emissions. The reduction measures reduce GHG emissions from all sources of community wide GHG emissions including transportation, energy, area sources, water, and solid waste (City of Moreno Valley 2012).</p> <p>The City of Moreno Valley’s <i>Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy</i> does not constitute a qualified climate action plan for the purposes of streamlining CEQA GHG analyses because it was not adopted in a public process following environmental review. Therefore, this analysis does not utilize it to quantitatively determine the significance of the project’s GHG emissions.</p> <p>Significance Thresholds</p> <p>The adopted CEQA Guidelines provide regulatory guidance on the analysis and mitigation of GHG emissions in CEQA documents, while giving lead agencies the discretion to set quantitative or qualitative thresholds for the assessment and mitigation of GHGs and climate change impacts. SCAQMD considers emissions of over 10,000 MT of CO₂e per year to be significant.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Moreno Valley Climate Action Strategy is not qualified GHG reduction plan per Sections 15064(h)(3), 15125(d), and 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines because there was no environmental review of the document.</p> <p>The Association of Environmental Professionals white paper, <i>Beyond Newhall and 2020</i>, recommends that for projects with a horizon of 2020 or earlier, a threshold based on meeting AB 32 targets should be used (Association of Environmental Professionals 2016). Thus, projects with horizon years of 2020 or earlier and emissions below the SCAQMD threshold are not expected to require GHG mitigation for state mandates to be achieved. The project would be fully operational in 2020 per the estimated construction schedule (Appendix A); therefore, its horizon year is 2020.</p> <p>Although construction activity is addressed in this analysis, the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) does not discuss whether any of the suggested threshold approaches adequately address impacts from temporary construction activity. The <i>CEQA and Climate Change</i> white paper states that additional study is needed to make such an assessment or to develop separate thresholds for construction activity (CAPCOA 2008). Nevertheless, SCAQMD has recommended amortizing construction-related emissions over a 30-year period in conjunction with the project's operational emissions. Similar to the modeling performed for the air quality analysis in Section 3, <i>Air Quality</i>, GHG emissions modelling was performed using CalEEMod version 2016.3.2. Construction of the project would generate approximately 490.73 MT of CO_{2e}, or approximately 16.36 MT of CO_{2e} per year when amortized over a 30-year period (Salem 2021, Appendix A).</p> <p>Operational emissions include area source (consumer products, landscape maintenance equipment, and painting), energy use (electricity and natural gas), mobile source, water and wastewater conveyance, and solid waste emissions. Because CalEEMod does not calculate N₂O emissions from mobile sources, N₂O emissions were quantified separately using the CCAR General Reporting Protocol (CCAR 2009) direct emissions factors for mobile combustion (see Appendix A for calculations). The estimate of total vehicle miles travelled associated with the project is based on the CalEEMod modeling results (Salem 2022, Appendix A). The project would result in combined annual GHG emissions of approximately 6,357.14 MT of CO_{2e} per year, which would not exceed the SCAQMD emissions threshold of 3,000 MT of CO_{2e} per year. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: As discussed in the <i>Regulatory Setting</i>, the City of Moreno Valley's Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy has a number of reduction measures to reduce GHG emissions. Table 8 shows the project's consistency with applicable policies in the Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce potential impacts related to the GHG emissions to a less than significant level by requiring energy reduction appliances and energy efficiency beyond Title 24 standards, thereby ensuring consistency with policies set forth in the City of Moreno Valley's Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy. In addition, project emissions would fall below SCAQMD's recommended regional GHG threshold and would be consistent with SCAQMD AB 32 and SB 32 statewide emission targets.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, the project would have a less than significant impact related to consistency with GHG reduction plans.

Table 8 Consistency with Applicable City of Moreno Valley Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy Policies and Reduction Measures

Reduction Measure	Project Consistency
<p>New Construction Commercial Energy Efficiency</p> <p>Require energy efficient design for all new commercial buildings to be 10% beyond the current Title 24 standards. (Reach Code)</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The project would be required to implement CALGreen nonresidential mandatory measures. In addition, the proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure GHG-1 to incorporate energy efficient design features and ensure a 10% energy efficiency reduction beyond current Title 24 standards.</p>
<p>Energy Star Equipment</p> <p>Require Energy Star equipment and appliances in new construction and renovations.</p>	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>The proposed project would implement Mitigation Measure GHG-1, which requires the use of Energy Star equipment and appliances.</p>
<p>Low Impact Development</p> <p>Implement low impact development practices that maintain existing site hydrology to manage storm water and protect the environment. (Use of low impact development practices are required by the new regional water quality permit.)</p>	<p>Consistent</p> <p>As per the NPDES Construction General Permit, the project would be required to implement BMPs to maintain or replicate the pre-development hydrologic regime. MVMC Chapter 8.10 requires new development projects to incorporate BMPs to capture and infiltrate stormwater runoff on-site, which may include low impact development design features such as swales and permeable design materials. Implementation of required BMPs would maintain consistency with this policy and minimize impacts related to stormwater runoff.</p>
<p>Infill</p> <p>Steer development towards infill rather than greenfield areas. Consider differential impact fee system with lower fees for areas with infrastructure.</p>	<p>Consistent</p> <p>The project would involve a commercial infill development in an urbanized area.</p>

Sources: City of Moreno Valley 2012

GHG-1 Energy Efficient Design Features

To ensure consistency with the City of Moreno Valley Energy Efficiency and Climate Action Strategy, the project shall use Energy Star equipment and appliances in all proposed buildings. The project shall also incorporate energy efficient design features to ensure a 10 percent energy efficiency reduction beyond current Title 24 standards. Potential measures available to minimize the project’s energy demand include, but are not limited to:

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- Designate parking spaces for fuel efficient vehicles
- Install energy efficient lighting.
- Incorporate “cool roofs” into project design.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce potential impacts related to the GHG emissions to a less than significant level by requiring energy reduction appliances and energy efficiency beyond Title 24 standards.

Sources:

1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code
4. California’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, prepared by the California Air Resources Board, November 2017, https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf, accessed April 24, 2019

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:

Salem conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the project on May 25, 2018. The Phase I ESA is included as Appendix E. Salem identified no evidence of a Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) on the site. An REC is defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) as “the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment” (ASTM 2013).

The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during the construction of the project would be conducted in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22.

During project operation the fueling station would require the routine transport of petroleum fuels to the project site to refuel the underground storage tanks (UST) that would supply the pumps. Fuel trucks would likely enter the site from Nason Street after travelling on SR 60.

Fuel deliveries would be subject to federal and state requirements that regulate the transport of hazardous materials and the operation of fuel tanker trucks. The California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) oversees statewide implementation of the Unified Program, which protects citizens from hazardous waste and hazardous materials. The Unified Program certifies 81 local government agencies, known as Certified Unified Program Agencies (CUPAs), to apply regulatory standards related to hazardous materials (CalEPA 2018). The County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health is the CUPA responsible for the City of Moreno Valley. The Department’s Hazardous Materials Management Branch regulates and oversees USTs. To operate a UST, a permit is required. Prior to any UST installation,

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>modification, repair, or removal, plans must be submitted for review to ensure safety and regulatory compliance. Although inadequate maintenance of USTs may result in leaks, CCR Title 23, Chapter 16 and Riverside County Ordinance 617 mandate regular monitoring, maintenance, and inspection of USTs, which would ensure the safe and appropriate operation of these facilities (County of Riverside Department of Environmental Health 2018).</p> <p>Fueling station patrons would regularly use hazardous materials while dispensing gasoline from fuel pumps. Refueling activities release benzene into the air. Benzene is a natural part of gasoline and is a carcinogen (American Cancer Society 2018). However, benzene emissions can be reduced by more than 90 percent by the vapor recovery systems required at fuel pumps (CARB 2005). To further reduce benzene exposure risks, CARB recommends siting sensitive land uses, such as residences or schools, at least 50 feet from typical gasoline dispensing facilities and at least 300 feet from large gasoline dispensing facilities (i.e., facilities with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater; approximately 96 percent of gasolines dispensing facilities have a throughput of less than 2.4 million gallons per year) (CARB 2005). The proposed fueling station would be classified as a typical gasoline dispensing facility. The fuel pumps would be sited at least 70 feet from the nearest sensitive land use, the residence located west adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the proposed fuel pumps would be located outside of the recommended buffer of 50 feet.</p> <p>Improper handling of gasoline and other automobile-related chemicals on-site could result in spills. However, the transport, use and storage of hazardous materials would be required to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations, including the Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Chapter 6.5, Division 20, Sections 25100, et seq.). Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: See above response for (a).</p>				
<p>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: There are no schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. The nearest school is the Valley View High School, approximately 0.30 mile to the south. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials would be conducted in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act,</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. Impacts of hazardous materials on schools would be less than significant.				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Salem conducted a review of regulatory agency records to determine if hazardous materials/hazardous wastes have been stored or handled on the subject property and area properties of environmental concern. The following records were searched: California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor cleanup sites database; California Regional Water Quality Control Board Geotracker leaking underground fuel tank database; California Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources. In addition, the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health and Riverside County Fire Department were contacted regarding records of hazardous materials permits or events for the project site. The records search did not indicate the current or historic presence of hazardous materials on the project site or adjoining properties.</p> <p>A septic tank was discovered in the western portion of the project site during the ESA. The septic tank is used for domestic purposes only and is not anticipated to adversely impact the project (Salem 2018b).</p> <p>Based on review of the databases listed above, there would be no impact related to hazardous material sites.</p>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The nearest airport or airstrip to the project site is the March Air Reserve Base, approximately 4.5 miles southwest. The project site is outside of the influence area identified in the March Air Reserve Base airport land use compatibility plan (Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission 2014). No private airstrips are located in the project site vicinity. Consequently, there would be no safety hazard impacts related to airports or airstrips.</p>				
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: No roads would be permanently closed as a result of the construction or operation of the project. In addition, the project would not involve the development of structures that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Access to the project site would be provided via three driveways, one on Nason Street on the site's eastern border and two on Fir Avenue on the site's southern border. Therefore, the project</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
would not interfere with existing emergency evacuation plans or emergency response plans in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.				
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: As discussed in Section 20, <i>Wildfire</i>, the project site is not within a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ). The project would not substantially exacerbate existing wildfire hazards in the area and would provide adequate emergency access. Impacts related to wildland fire exposure would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.2.8 – Wildland Urban Interface • Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.9 – Hazardous Materials • Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.10 – Air Crash Hazards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 6-5 – Air Crash Hazards 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.5 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.5-1 – Hazardous Materials Sites - Figure 5.5-2 – Floodplains and High Fire Hazard Areas - Figure 5.5-3 – City Areas Affected by Aircraft Hazard Zones 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 4. March Air Reserve Base (MARB)/March Inland Port (MIP) Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) on November 13, 2014, (http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/17%20-%20Vol.%201%20March%20Air%20Reserve%20Base%20Final.pdf?ver=2016-08-15-145812-700) 5. Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, City of Moreno Valley Fire Department, adopted October 4, 2011, amended 2017, (http://www.moval.org/city_hall/departments/fire/pdfs/haz-mit-plan.pdf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5 – Wildland and Urban Fires <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5-2 – Moreno Valley High Fire Area Map 2016 • Chapter 12 – Dam Failure/Inundation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 12-2 Moreno Valley Evacuation Routes Map 2015 • Chapter 13 – Pipeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 13-1 – Moreno Valley Pipeline Map 2016 • Chapter 14 – Transportation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 14-1.1 – Moreno Valley Air Crash Hazard Area Map 2016 • Chapter 16 – Hazardous Materials Accident <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moreno Valley Hazardous Materials Site Locations Map 2016 6. Emergency Operations Plan, City of Moreno Valley, March 2009, (http://www.moval.org/city_hall/departments/fire/pdfs/mv-eop-0309.pdf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hazard Mitigation and Hazard Analysis • Threat Assessment 2 – Hazardous Materials • Threat Assessment 3 – Wildfire • Threat Assessment 6 – Transportation Emergencies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 17 – Air Crash Hazards 				
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response:				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The project site is located within the South Coast Hydrologic Region, which covers approximately 10,600 square miles of southern California watersheds draining to the Pacific Ocean. The South Coast Hydrologic Region includes all of Orange County, most of San Diego and Los Angeles Counties, and parts of Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties. The Region is bounded by the Traverse Ranges (including the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains) to the north, the San Jacinto Mountains and low-lying Peninsular Range to the east, and the international boundary with Mexico to the south.</p> <p>The project site is located in the San Jacinto Watershed, which drains approximately 540 square miles in western Riverside County. The project site is under the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB). The SARWQCB sets water quality objectives and monitors surface water quality through the implementation of the Santa Ana River Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan).</p> <p>The project site overlies the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin, which underlies the San Jacinto, Perris, Moreno, and Menifee Valleys in western Riverside County (California Department of Water Resources [DWR] 2003). Moreno Valley is located in the West San Jacinto Groundwater Basin Management Plan area (West San Jacinto Basin), which is delineated into groundwater management zones based on areas of lower groundwater flow, groundwater divides, and changes in groundwater quality. The project site is located in the Perris North Groundwater Management Zone. The West San Jacinto Groundwater Basin Management Plan, adopted by the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) in 1995, serves as a cooperative groundwater management plan to ensure the reliability and quality of the water supply in the West San Jacinto Basin (EMWD 2016).</p> <p>The project site is currently an undeveloped, disturbed lot with natural low-lying vegetation surrounded by a mix of residential and commercial uses. Project development would increase impermeable surfaces on site. Consequently, the project may incrementally reduce groundwater recharge and increase the amount of surface runoff. The City of Moreno Valley is a municipal permittee under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, the County of Riverside, and Incorporated Cities of Riverside County within the Santa Ana Region (Order Number R8-2010-0033) (“MS4 Permit”). The MS4 Permit, issued by the SARWQCB, regulates the discharge of pollutants in urban runoff from non-agricultural anthropogenic activities and sources. Under the MS4 Permit, the City of Moreno Valley and its co-permittees must require construction projects to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) where feasible to capture and treat stormwater prior to discharge to stormwater facilities. Such BMPs include, where appropriate, Low Impact Development techniques to be implemented at New Development and Significant Redevelopment project sites. These techniques include integrated and distributed infiltration, retention, detention, evapotranspiration, filtration, and treatment systems. The MS4 Permit states that the design goal shall be to maintain or replicate the pre-development hydrologic regime. Because the project would create 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface on the project site, it constitutes “New Development” under the MS4 Permit and is required to implement BMPs.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Because the project would involve disturbance of an area over one acre in size, it would also be required to comply with NPDES Construction General Permit Requirements, which would limit peak post-project runoff levels to pre-project levels. The applicant would also be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), a sediment and erosion control plan that describes the applicant's activities to prevent stormwater contamination, control sedimentation and erosion, and comply with the requirements of the statewide permit.</p> <p>The project would also comply with Moreno Valley regulations pertaining to stormwater runoff and water quality. According to MVMC Chapter 8.10, new development projects shall control stormwater runoff so as to prevent any deterioration of water quality that would impair subsequent or competing uses of the water. Required BMPs may include landscaping, permeable design materials, or on-site rain capture systems to control stormwater runoff. Chapter 8.10 also prohibits illicit connections to the storm drain system at commercial or industrial facilities and subjects such facilities to a regular program of inspection.</p> <p>Compliance with existing regulatory requirements would ensure that the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and would not create substantial runoff water or otherwise degrade water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The project site is currently undeveloped and project development would increase impermeable surfaces on site. Consequently, the project may incrementally reduce groundwater recharge and increase the amount of surface runoff. However, as per the NPDES Construction General Permit, the project would be required to implement BMPs to maintain or replicate the pre-development hydrologic regime. MVMC Chapter 8.10 requires the new development projects to incorporate BMPs to capture and infiltrate stormwater runoff on-site, which may include design features such as swales and permeable design materials. Implementation of required BMPs would minimize impacts related to groundwater recharge. Impacts related to groundwater recharge would be less than significant.</p> <p>The project site is under the jurisdiction of RWQCB Region 8 (Santa Ana Region). Region 8 includes the upper and lower Santa Ana River watersheds, the San Jacinto River watershed, and several other small drainage areas. The Santa Ana RWQCB provides permits for projects that may affect surface waters and groundwater locally and is responsible for preparing the Water Quality Control Plan for the region (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses of water in the region and establishes narrative and numerical water quality objectives. The State has developed total maximum daily loads (TMDLs), which are a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can have and still meet water quality objectives established by the region (Santa Ana RWQCB 2008). As discussed under threshold item a, the proposed project would be required to comply with the California State Construction General Permit (Order No. 2009-2009-DWQ, as amended by 2010-0014-DWQ and</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2012-0006-DWQ), which would minimize and avoid water quality impacts associated with soil erosion and stormwater runoff from the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not violate water quality objectives for beneficial uses in the vicinity of the project site or exceed TMDLs. Impacts related to conflicts with the water quality control plan would be less than significant.</p> <p>The project site overlies the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin, which is managed by and serves as a source of water supply for EMWD. In September 2014, the California Legislature enacted comprehensive legislation aimed at strengthening local control and management of groundwater basins throughout the state. Known as the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), the legislation provides a framework for sustainable management of groundwater supplies by local authorities, with a limited role for state intervention when necessary to protect the resource. The San Jacinto Groundwater Basin boundary was finalized on February 11, 2019. At the time of preparation of this Initial Study, the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) was in the process of determining the draft prioritization for the basin. It is scheduled to be released in Spring 2019 (DWR 2019). If the basin is designated a Medium or High priority basin, a Groundwater Sustainability Plan (GSP) will be adopted for the basin by 2022.</p> <p>As described in Section 19, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i>, the project would be served by EMWD’s existing and projected water supplies and would not require an expanded use of groundwater supplies. Therefore, impacts related to sustainable groundwater management would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>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:</p>				
<p>i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The project would alter the existing drainage patterns on the undeveloped project site by introducing new structures and impervious surfaces. The project would not alter the course of a stream or river because there are no such surface waters on the project site.</p> <p>The project would comply with Chapter 8.21 of the MVMC, which requires implementation of erosion control systems and construction BMPs to reduce erosion and siltation. In addition, the project applicant is required to submit an erosion control plan with the grading permit application. The project would comply with Chapter 8.10 of the MVMC, which requires new development projects to implement stormwater runoff BMPs. BMPs may include directing runoff to permeable areas, maximizing stormwater storage for reuse, and incorporating porous materials into the project design. Compliance with these requirements would ensure that stormwater would be captured and retained on-site, and would minimize the risks of erosion, flooding, or excess stormwater in the local stormwater drainage system. Potential impacts related to drainage patterns would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response:</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See response for (c)i above.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response: See response for (c)i above.				
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response: The project site is located in an area designated as Zone X by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which is outside of the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain (500-year flood) (FEMA 2008). According to the Safety Element of the Moreno Valley General Plan, the project site is not located in a flood zone or dam inundation area (City of Moreno Valley 2006). Therefore, the project would not impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur. A seiche is a standing wave in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water. The project site is not located near any lakes or other major bodies of surface water. Therefore, there would be no impacts from seiches. The project site is located approximately 44 miles from the Pacific Ocean and would not be at risk of inundation by tsunami. The project site is relatively flat and is not subject to mudflows. Consequently, the project would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation. No impact would occur.				
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Response: See response for (c)iv above.				
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response: See response for (b) above.				
Sources: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.7 – Water Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 6-4 – Flood Hazards • Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.5 – Water Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 7-1 Water Purveyor Service Area Map 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.5 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.5-2 – Floodplains and High Fire Hazard Areas • Section 5.7 – Hydrology and Water Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.7-1 – Storm Water Flows and Major Drainage Facilities - Figure 5.7-2 – Groundwater Basins 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.10.080 – Liquid and Solid Waste 4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 8.12 – Flood Damage Prevention 5. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 8.21 – Grading Regulations 6. Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) Groundwater Reliability Plus, http://gwrplus.org/ 7. Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) 2015 Urban Water Management Plan 				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Response:
 The project would be infill development on a vacant lot in an urbanized area of the City of Moreno Valley. The project does not include any development that would physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

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

Response:
 The project site is designated Commercial by the City of Moreno General Plan and is zoned Community Commercial (CC). According to Chapter 9.04.020 of the MVMC, the primary purpose of the CC district is to provide for the general shopping needs of area residents and workers with a variety of business, retail, personal and related or similar services.
 The project would include restaurants, a fueling station, and other commercial spaces. According to the MVMC, quick-serve restaurants and retail uses are permitted in the CC district. Drive-through restaurant and auto service station uses require a conditional use permit if the use is located within three hundred feet from a residential zone or use. One residence is on the project site to the west. However, the residence is vacant, and the site is zoned CC. Residences exist along Nason Street south of Fir Ave approximately 200 feet from the proposed gas station, and approximately 375 feet from the proposed drive-through restaurant. Therefore, the gas station use would require a conditional use permit.
 The City Planning Commission has authority to approve conditional use permits. According to the MVMC, conditional use permits may be approved if findings are made that a project is consistent with the general plan, complies with zoning and other regulations, will not be detrimental to public health or safety, conforms with applicable city redevelopment plan provisions, and is compatible with existing and planned land uses in the vicinity. Because the project would comply with the permit requirements described above, this impact would be less than significant.

- Sources:**
1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
 - Chapter 2 – Community Development Element – Section 2.1 – Land Use
 - Figure 2-1 – Neighboring Lands Uses
 - Figure 2-2 – Land Use Map
 - Chapter 8 – 2014 – 2021 Housing Element
 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
 - Section 5.12 – Population and Housing
 - Attachments #1 - #10 – Housing Sites Inventory
 - Exhibits A1 – A11, C, D, and E – Maps of Housing Sites
 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Response: The potential for mineral resource extraction within the City of Moreno Valley is limited (City of Moreno Valley 2006a). The nearest mineral resource extraction site is the Jack Rabbit Canyon Quarry, a sand and gravel quarry, approximately seven miles southeast of the project site. There are no known mineral resources of regional or statewide significance in the project vicinity (City of Moreno Valley 2006b). Consequently, there would be no impact to mineral resources of local or statewide value.				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Response: See response for (a) above.				
Sources: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.9 – Mineral Resources 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.14 – Mineral Resources 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 9.02.120 – Surface Mining Permits 4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Section 8.21.020 A 7 – Permits Required 5. The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA, Public Resources Code, Sections 2710-2796), https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dmr/lawsandregulations 				
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The analysis of the project’s noise impacts is based on the Noise and Vibration Study prepared by Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon), which is included as Appendix F.				
<p style="text-align: center;">1) Standard Unit of Noise Measurement</p> <p>Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). The A-weighting scale is an adjustment to the actual sound power levels to be consistent with that of human hearing response, which is most sensitive to frequencies around 4,000 Hertz (about the highest note on a piano) and less sensitive to low frequencies (below 100 Hertz). One of the most frequently used noise metrics that considers both duration and sound power level is the equivalent noise level (Leq). The Leq is defined as the single steady A-weighted level that is equivalent to the same amount of energy as that contained in the actual fluctuating levels over a period of time (essentially, the average noise level). Typically, Leq is summed over a one-hour period. Lmax is the highest RMS (root mean squared) sound pressure level within the measurement period, and Lmin is the lowest RMS sound pressure level within</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

the measurement period. Because of the logarithmic scale of the decibel unit, sound levels cannot be added or subtracted arithmetically. If a sound’s noise energy is doubled, the sound level increases by 3 dBA, regardless of the initial sound level. Noise level increases of less than 3 dBA typically are not noticeable.

Vibration refers to groundborne noise and perceptible motion and is typically measured in decibels (i.e., VdB). The background vibration velocity level in residential areas is usually around 50 VdB. The vibration velocity level threshold of perception for humans is approximately 65 VdB (FTA 2018). A vibration velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels for many people. The range of interest is approximately 50 VdB, which is the typical background vibration velocity level, to 100 VdB, which is the general threshold where minor damage typical buildings.

2) City of Moreno Valley Municipal Code

The MVMC sets forth the City’s standards, guidelines, and procedures concerning the regulation of operational noise. Specifically, Chapter 11.80, Noise Regulation, of the MVMC regulates noise levels in the City. These regulations are intended to ensure the public health, safety, welfare, and quality of life of the City and its residents, and to control excessive noise in the City.

The MVMC sets maximum continuous sound levels based on duration per day and maximum impulsive sound levels based on the number of repetitions per 24-hour period. An impulsive sound is defined as one of short duration, usually less than one second, with an abrupt onset and rapid decay (City of Moreno Valley 2017b).

Table 9 Maximum Continuous Sound Levels

Duration per Day (Continuous Hours)	Decibels (dBA)
8	90
6	92
4	95
3	97
2	100
1.5	102
1	105
0.5	110
0.25	115

Note: When the daily sound exposure is composed of two or more periods of sound exposure at different levels, the combined effect of all such periods shall constitute a violation of this section if the sum of the percent of allowed period of sound exposure at each level exceeds 100 percent.

Source: City of Moreno Valley Municipal Code Table 11.80.030-1

Table 10 Maximum Impulsive Sound Levels

Number of Repetitions per 24-Hour Period	Decibels (dBA)
1	145
10	135
100	125

Source: City of Moreno Valley Municipal Code Table 11.80.030-1A

The MVMC sets maximum sound levels for nonimpulsive sounds. Sounds may not exceed these levels when measured at a distance of 200 feet from the real property line of the source of the sound if the sound occurs on privately owned property, or from the source of the sound, if the sound occurs on public right-of-way, public space or other publicly owned property.

Table 11 Maximum Sound Levels (in dBA) for Source Land Uses

Residential		Commercial	
Daytime	Nighttime	Daytime	Nighttime
60	55	65	60

Source: City of Moreno Valley Municipal Code Table 11.80.030-2

The following noise standards from the MVMC also apply to the proposed project:

- Section 11.080.030.D(7) of the MVMC states that construction and demolition work is prohibited between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.
- Section 11.080.030.D(10) of the MVMC prohibits the operation of any pump, air conditioning, air-handling, or other continuously operating motorized equipment in a state of disrepair or in a manner which otherwise creates a noise disturbance distinguishable from normal operating sounds.
- Section 9.09.080 of the MVMC prohibits drive-through speakers at drive-in, drive-through, fast food and take-out restaurants from being located within 100 feet of any residential property. In addition, noise from drive-through speakers may not be detectable above daytime ambient noise levels when measured at the property boundary.
- Section 9.09.200 of the MVMC prohibits service stations from being operated in a manner that produces damage or nuisance from noise.
- Section 9.11.080 of the MVMC requires parking areas to minimize auto noise using sound walls, screen walls, and landscaping.
- Section 9.10.140 of the MVMC sets performance standards for noise from all commercial and industrial uses, prohibiting any noise created by loudspeakers, bells, gongs, buzzers, or other noise attention or attracting devices from exceeding 55 dBA at any one time when measured beyond the property boundary.

Existing Project Area Noise Levels

The primary sources of noise in the project vicinity are motor vehicles (e.g., automobiles, buses, and trucks) along Nason Street and Fir Avenue. Motor vehicle noise is characterized by a high number of individual events, which often create sustained noise levels. Ambient noise levels would be expected to be highest during the daytime and rush hour unless congestion slows speeds substantially. To determine ambient noise levels in the project site vicinity, two 15-minute noise measurements were recorded near the project site between 8:27 a.m. and 9:02 a.m. on April 2, 2018, using an ANSI Type II integrating sound level meter. Noise Measurement (NM) 1 was taken on the southern boundary of the project site and is representative of existing

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>ambient noise levels along Fir Avenue. NM 2 was taken east of the project site across Nason Street and is representative of existing ambient noise levels along Nason Street. In addition, a 24-hour measurement (LT1) was taken on June 6 and 7, 2023, to capture ambient noise levels throughout the day. This was taken on the southern boundary of the project site near NM1. <i>Roadway Noise</i></p> <p>The roadway noise analysis relies on existing and anticipated traffic counts provided in the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by LSA in September 2021. For all intersections and roadway segments, existing traffic volumes are based on historical data and counts collected by Counts Unlimited in September 2021. The project is anticipated to generate 574 net trips in the a.m. peak hour, 381 net trips in the p.m. peak hour, and 6,191 net daily trips.</p> <p>For the purposes of calculating roadway noise impacts, this analysis focuses on roadway segments adjacent to the nearest sensitive receptors. On Fir Avenue, between Project Driveway 1 and Nason Street, the project would generate approximately 2,770 daily trips. On Nason Street, between Fir Avenue and Eucalyptus Avenue, the project would generate approximately 1,840 daily trips. Roadway noise was modeled using the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Day Night average level (DNL), which utilizes the DNL method that adds 10 dBA to actual nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) noise levels to account for greater sensitivity to noise during that time period. DNL was used to analyze project impacts from roadway noise on nearby sensitive receptors. The project would have a significant effect if it would increase roadway noise levels by 3 dBA, which is the perception level for noise increases.</p> <p>According to the City General Plan 2040 Final Environmental Impact Report (City of Moreno Valley 2021b), the vehicle mix for Nason Street is 98 percent cars, 2 percent medium trucks, and 1 percent heavy trucks. Fir Avenue is not included in the traffic counts; therefore, the Nason Street values are also assumed for Fir Avenue. The night fraction of ADT for Nason Street was 18 percent (City of Moreno Valley 2021b). Other parameters include a 40 mile-per-hour speed limit on Nason Street, an effective distance of 70 feet to Nason Street, and a 2 percent road gradient. For Fir Avenue, other parameters include a 30 mile-per-hour speed limit on Fir Avenue, an effective distance of 25 feet to Fir Avenue, and a 2 percent road gradient.</p> <p>i) Sensitive Receptors</p> <p>Noise exposure goals for various types of land uses reflect the varying noise sensitivities associated with those uses. The City of Moreno Valley General Plan (2006) identifies schools, hospitals, churches, and single-family residences as sensitive land uses. Noise sensitive receptors nearest to the project site include single-family residences located approximately 70 feet south of the project site's southern boundary. Additional single-family residences are located approximately 175 feet southeast and approximately 360 feet west of the project site. One single-family residence is located adjacent to the project site's western border; however, this residence is vacant, and the property is zoned for commercial development. Therefore, this residence is not considered a noise sensitive receptor in the noise and vibration impact analysis. Valley</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>View High School is located approximately 1,400 feet (0.3 mile) south of the project site.</p> <p>a. <i>Would the project result in 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?</i></p> <p>b. <i>Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</i></p> <p>Short-Term Construction Noise and Vibration Impacts</p> <p>Project construction would include the following phases: site preparation, grading, building construction, architectural coating, and paving. Peak noise levels associated with the use of individual pieces of heavy equipment can range from about 70 to 89 dBA L_{max} at 50 feet from the source, depending on the types of equipment in operation at any given time and phase of construction. See Appendix F for typical peak noise levels associated with common types of heavy construction equipment, based on the FHWA <i>Highway Construction Noise Handbook</i> (2006b).</p> <p>Additional factors to consider are that the estimated construction noise levels do not take into account that equipment would be dispersed in various areas of the site in both time and space. Due to spatial and equipment limitations, only a certain amount of equipment can operate near a given location at a particular time. Therefore, the noise levels presented represent a conservative estimate of construction noise.</p> <p>Construction noise could be as high as approximately 85 dBA L_{eq} and 85 dBA L_{max} at the nearest sensitive receptors. As discussed above, construction noise would be considered significant if construction activities exceed the City of Moreno Valley's maximum continuous sound standards or maximum impulsive sound standards or if construction activities occur outside the allowed construction hours as set forth by the MVMC Section 11.080.030.D(7). Assuming that construction activities adhere to the allowed construction hours, construction activities with breaks would not occur continuously for more than ten hours each day. As such, construction noise would not exceed the City's most stringent maximum continuous sound standard of 90 dBA for sounds lasting for eight continuous hours. Construction noise would also not exceed the City's most stringent maximum impulsive sound standard of 125 dBA for sounds repeated 100 times over a 24-hour period. Therefore, construction noise would be less than significant.</p> <p>Certain types of construction equipment can generate high levels of groundborne vibration. Construction of the proposed project would potentially utilize a large bulldozer during site preparation and/or grading, loaded trucks during most construction phases, and a vibratory roller during the paving phase. At a distance of 50 feet (i.e., distance to the southern residences), a large dozer would generate a vibration level of 78 VdB, a loaded truck would generate a vibration level of 77 VdB, and a vibratory roller would generate a vibration level of 85 VdB. Such vibration levels would exceed FTA's recommended threshold of 72 dBA for residences and buildings where people normally sleep. Per the MVMC, construction activities may not occur between the hours of 8:00</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

p.m. and 7:00 a.m.; therefore, construction vibration would not occur during normal sleep hours. Construction-related vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Noise Impacts

The project would introduce new commercial land uses on the project site. Existing residences in the project vicinity may periodically be subjected to noise associated with off-site vehicle traffic, on-site vehicle traffic, and on-site operation of commercial uses. None of the proposed uses would generate high levels of vibration; therefore, impacts related to operational vibration would be less than significant.

On-site operational noise would include continuous noise sources such as noise from the car wash and HVAC equipment, as well as intermittent noise sources such as on-site vehicle circulation and parking lot noise, idling from cars at the drive-through restaurant and car wash, and the drive-through restaurant speakers. In addition, the project would generate new traffic on-site and off-site on Nason Street and Fir Avenue. Operational noise sources are discussed below.

Parking Lot Activities

The major noise sources associated with parking lot activities include moving cars, engine start-ups, door slams, radios, car alarms, and tire squeals (human conversations are generally dominated by other sources of vehicle noise in a parking lot). As shown in **Error! Reference source not found.**, parking lot activity would generate instantaneous noise levels up to 66 dBA L_{max} at 100 feet from the source. The closest on-site parking stall is located approximately 25 feet from the project site boundary. Therefore, parking lot noise at 200 feet from the property line (225 feet from the on-site parking stall) would be approximately 59 dBA L_{max}. Parking lot noise levels would not exceed the City’s daytime and nighttime noise standards of 65 dBA and 60 dBA, respectively, for commercial uses. In addition, peak noise levels from parking lot noise would be intermittent over time. Section 9.11.080 of the MVMC requires parking areas to minimize auto noise using sound walls, screen walls, and landscaping. Because parking lot noise would not exceed the City’s daytime and nighttime noise standards and there are existing walls along the residential uses to the west and south of the site that break line of sight to the project’s parking lot additional screening is not necessary. Therefore, parking lot noise impacts would be less than significant.

Vehicle Circulation

Vehicle circulation noise would be intermediate, and the speed limit for vehicles moving throughout the project site would be regulated through site design. On-site circulation noise for vehicles traveling 14 miles per hour is approximately 44 dBA at 100 feet from the source. Vehicle circulation areas on-site would be approximately 25 feet from the project site boundary. Therefore, vehicle circulation noise at 200 feet from the property line (225 feet from the vehicle circulation areas on-site) would be approximately 37 dBA. Vehicle circulation noise would not exceed the City’s daytime and nighttime noise standards of 65 dBA and 60 dBA, respectively, for commercial uses. Therefore, vehicle circulation noise impacts would be less than significant.

Off-site Roadway Noise Impacts

The project would generate new vehicle trips that would use area roadways. The project would generate approximately 6,191 net daily trips. On Fir Avenue, between Project

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Driveway 1 and Nason Street, the project would generate approximately 2,770 daily trips. On Nason Street, between Fir Avenue and Eucalyptus Avenue, the project would generate approximately 1,840 daily trips. When combined with existing traffic, the project would result in a total of 6,130 daily trips on this segment of Fir Avenue and 25,300 daily trips on this segment of Nason St. Roadway noise levels were modeled using the HUD DNL Calculator for existing and existing plus project conditions.</p> <p>Existing roadway noise on Nason Street is modeled to be approximately 69 dBA Ldn at the nearest sensitive receptor (residences located 175 feet southeast of the project site along Nason Street). Therefore, the project would increase roadway noise by 1 dBA Ldn as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, project impacts to roadway noise on Nason Street would not be perceptible. Existing roadway noise on Fir Avenue is approximately 67 dBA Ldn. The project would increase roadway noise by 1 dBA Ldn as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, project impacts to roadway noise on Fir Avenue would not be perceptible. Off-site roadway noise impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>With implementation of cumulative projects between 2018 and 2023, existing roadway noise on Nason Street is modeled to increase by 1 dBA Ldn at the nearest sensitive receptor on Nason Street and less than 1 dBA Ldn at the nearest sensitive receptor on Fir Avenue. Therefore, cumulative project impacts would not be perceptible. Cumulative off-site roadway noise impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>N-1 Drive-Through Restaurant Speaker</p> <p>To ensure that drive-through speaker noise is not perceptible above the existing ambient noise level at the project site's property line, implementation of one of the following noise control measures is required to reduce drive-through speaker noise by at least 5 dBA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construct a wall of sufficient height and length and of such materials along the project site's eastern and western boundaries such that drive-through speaker noise is reduced by 5 dBA: OR ▪ Reorient the drive-through lane so that the drive-through speaker is located on the drive-through restaurant's southern side. Reorientation of the drive-through lane would reduce drive-through speaker noise by approximately 9 dBA: OR ▪ Reducing the dBA from the speaker box by approximately 5 dBA by manually turning down the noise level. <p>N-2 Car Wash Equipment</p> <p>To ensure that total operational noise does not exceed the City of Moreno Valley's nighttime noise standard, the car wash's operational hours shall be restricted to 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1 would ensure that operation of the proposed project does not exceed the City's drive-through restaurant speaker noise standard. Implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2 would reduce total nighttime operational noise to approximately 54 dBA Leq, which would be below the City of Moreno Valley's</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

nighttime noise standard of 60 dBA Leq for commercial uses. Impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED

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

Response:
The project site is located approximately 4.5 miles northeast of the nearest airport or airstrip, the March Air Reserve Base, and lies outside of an airport land use plan (Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission 2014). There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. No impact would occur.

- Sources:**
1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
 - Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.4 – Noise
 - Figure 6-2 – Buildout Noise Contours
 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
 - Section 5.4 – Noise
 - Figure 5.4-1 – March Air Reserve Base Noise Impact Area
 - Figure 5.4-2 – Buildout Noise Contours – Alternative 1
 - Figure 5.4-3 -- Buildout Noise Contours – Alternative 2
 - Figure 5.4-4 -- Buildout Noise Contours – Alternative 3
 - Appendix D – Noise Analysis, Wieland Associates, Inc., June 2003.
 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code
 - Section 9.10.140 Noise and Sound
 4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 11.80 Noise Regulations
 5. March Air Reserve Base (MARB)/March Inland Port (MIP) Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) on November 13, 2014, (<http://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/17%20-%20Vol.%201%20March%20Air%20Reserve%20Base%20Final.pdf?ver=2016-08-15-145812-700>)

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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 road or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:
The project would not include any residential development and therefore would not directly induce population growth. The proposed commercial development would provide new job opportunities in Moreno Valley, which may indirectly induce indirect population growth should employees relocate to the city. The estimated current population of the City of Moreno Valley is 207,629 (California Department of Finance 2018). SCAG estimates a population increase to 255,200 by 2035, or an increase of 47,571.

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Due to the nature of project-related employment opportunities and the connected nature of the region, employees would likely be drawn from the local workforce and would not result in the relocation of any new residents to Moreno Valley. Most employees would likely be drawn from the existing local population. Therefore, impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The project involves the construction of a commercial development on a vacant lot. The project would not displace existing housing or people. There would be no impact.</p>				
<p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 2 – Community Development Element – Section 2.1 – Land Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 2-1 – Neighboring Lands Uses - Figure 2-2 – Land Use Map • Chapter 8 – 2014 – 2021 Housing Element 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.12 – Population and Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attachments #1 - #10 – Housing Sites Inventory - Exhibits A1 – A11, C, D, and E – Maps of Housing Sites 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 				
<p>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p>				
<p>i) Fire protection?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Fire protection services for the City of Moreno Valley are provided by the Moreno Valley Fire Department (MVFD), which is part of the CALFIRE/Riverside County Fire Department’s regional, integrated, cooperative fire protection organization. Of MVFD’s seven fire stations, the Morrison Park Station is the nearest to the project site, approximately one mile southwest.</p> <p>The project would increase demand for fire protection services in the City. Under Chapter 3.42.060 of the MVMC, no building permit shall be issued for new commercial development without payment of a fire facilities commercial and industrial development impact fee. This fee is deposited into a fund used only for the purpose of maintaining existing and developing new fire service facilities.</p> <p>Design, construction, and operation of the project would be required to comply with applicable fire prevention/protection standards established by the City. Such requirements include all provisions of the 2016 California Fire Code, except where amended, which is adopted by Section 8.36 of the MVMC. The MVMC amends the California Fire Code to require an automatic sprinkler system for new buildings with areas greater than 3,600 square feet. Because the project would comply with regulations that are in place to fund fire protection services and the project would occur</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
in the existing service area, no new or expanded facilities would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.				
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The City of Moreno Valley contracts police services from the Riverside County Sheriff's Department, which provides complete law enforcement services as the Moreno Valley Police Department (MVPD) (County of Riverside 2016). The closest MVPD station to the project site is located at 22850 Calle San Juan De Los Lagos, approximately 4.4 miles southwest.</p> <p>Development of the project would incrementally increase demand for police protection services but would not necessitate new officers or facilities (Clark 2019). The project site is surrounded by existing commercial and residential development that is served by police protection services. Pursuant to Chapter 3.42.070, the project applicant would be required to pay police facilities, commercial and industrial development impact fees. Payment of this fee recovers the cost to police protection services imposed by the project. Development of the project would incrementally increase demand for police protection services and the project would occur in the existing service area but would not necessitate new officers or facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The nearest school to the project site is Valley View High School, approximately 0.3 mile south. The project does not include housing and, therefore, would not directly increase the population of school-aged children. The project would not result in adverse impacts to schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools, thus there would be no direct physical impact on Valley View High School or other schools. There would be no impact.</p>				
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Moreno Valley's city park system has 40 parks and/or joint use facilities. Three parks are within 1.1 miles of the project site: Rock Ridge Park, Morrison Park, and Weston Park.</p> <p>The project involves the development of commercial facilities and would not directly lead to an increase in population or associated demand for parks. Because the project is a non-residential development, the project would not create the need for new or expanded park facilities, nor would the project result in physical effects to any existing parks. There would be no impact.</p>				
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: As described in Section 13, <i>Population and Housing</i>, the project would not directly result in a substantial influx of new residents to the City, as employment opportunities created by the project would likely be filled by the existing workforce and would not require relocation of prospective employees to the city. Therefore, the project would not lead to</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

the substantial physical deterioration of governmental facilities or require new or physically altered facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

Sources:

1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
 - Chapter 2 – Community Development Element – Section 2.5 – Schools
 - Figure 2-3 – School District Boundaries
 - Chapter 2 – Community Development Element – Section 2.6 – Library Services
 - Chapter 2 – Community Development Element – Section 2.7 – Special Districts
 - Chapter 2 – Community Development Element – Section 2.5 – Other City Facilities
 - Chapter 4 – Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element – Section 4.3 – Parks and Recreation
 - Figure 4-2 – Future Parklands Acquisition Areas
 - Figure 4-3 – Master Plan of Trails
 - Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.1 – Police Protection and Crime Preventions
 - Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.2 – Fire and Emergency Services
 - Figure 6-1 – Fire Stations
2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
 - Section 5.13 – Public Services
 - Figure 5.13-1 – Location of Public Facilities
3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code

XVI. RECREATION – Would the project:

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

Response:

The City of Moreno Valley owns 34 parks or joint use facilities with 400 acres of developed park land, along with an additional 6,000 acres of open space (City of Moreno Valley 2010). Three parks are within 1.1 miles of the project site: Rock Ridge Park, Morrison Park, and Weston Park.

The project does not include any new recreation facilities. As described in Section 13, *Population and Housing*, the project does not include residential development and is not expected to result in a significant growth in population. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial increased use of nearby recreational facilities. The project would not lead to the substantial physical deterioration of facilities or require additional facilities. The City does not collect park impact fees from commercial development projects (City of Moreno Valley 2017). There would be no impact.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Response:

See response for (a) above.

Sources:

1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 4 – Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element – Section 4.3 – Parks and Recreation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 4-1 Open Space - Figure 4-2 – Future Parklands Acquisition Areas - Figure 4-3 – Master Plan of Trails 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.13 – Public Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.13-1 – Location of Public Facilities 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 				

XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:

a) Conflict with program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Response:
 Sidewalk currently exists along Nason Street on the eastern boundary of the project site and the city recently added a Class 2 bikeway along Nason Street in the project vicinity. In addition, the project would add sidewalks along Fir Avenue. The project would also provide bicycle parking spaces in compliance with the California Green Building Standards Code. Public transit provided by the Riverside Transit Agency is available approximately 750 feet east of the project site at the Fir Avenue and Super Target bus stop. The project would not involve construction or operational activities that would adversely affect public transit, bikeways or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Response:

Existing Conditions Summary
 Based on the criteria as discussed in the “Level of Service Procedures and Thresholds” section of this report, all intersections currently operate at a satisfactory LOS. Additionally, all freeway segments and ramp merge/diverge areas currently operate at a satisfactory LOS. Queues for some turn movements at study area intersections exceed the existing available turn-pocket storage lengths under existing conditions.

Project Completion (2023) Conditions Summary
 Based on the criteria discussed in the “Level of Service Procedures and Thresholds” section of this report, all intersections are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under project completion conditions. However, under project completion plus project conditions, only the intersection of Morrison Street/Fir Avenue is forecast to operate at an unsatisfactory LOS. As such, based on the criteria stated in the City’s TIA guidelines, the project is forecast to create an operational deficiency at this intersection. All other intersections are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under project completion plus project conditions. Table 1-A of the TIA lists improvements recommended at study intersections and the corresponding funding mechanisms. (Figures and tables are located at the end of each chapter). With the implementation of the improvements recommended in Table 1-A, the intersection of Morrison Street/Fir Avenue is forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS.

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Based on the criteria discussed in the “Level of Service Procedures and Thresholds” section of this report, all freeway segments and ramp merge/diverge areas are forecast to operate at a satisfactory LOS under both project completion without and plus project conditions.</p>				
<p>Queues for some of the turn movements at study area intersections are forecast to exceed the existing available turn-pocket storage lengths under both project completion without and plus project conditions. It is to be noted that no improvement is feasible for the queuing deficiency for the northbound right turn movement at the intersection of Lasselle Street/Iris Avenue due to right-of-way constraints. As such, the queuing deficiency for this movement will continue to exist.</p>				
<p>Active Transportation and Public Transit Analysis</p>				
<p>The project does not conflict with any existing or proposed bicycle, pedestrian, or public transit facility. Therefore, it can be considered as conforming to all adopted plans, policies, and programs concerning these facilities and will not have a significant impact.</p>				
<p>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis</p>				
<p>Pursuant to the City’s Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis guidelines, projects located in a low VMT generating zone are exempted from a VMT assessment. As per the Western Riverside Council of Governments’ (WRCOG’s) Screening Tool, the project lies in a low VMT generating Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). Additionally, the project is consistent with the City’s General Plan. Therefore, the project can be screened from a VMT analysis and will not have a significant VMT impact.</p>				
<p>At intersections and roadway segments where the project would have a significant impact, mitigation is required.</p>				
<p>T-1 Morrison Street/Fir Avenue Improvements</p>				
<p>The project applicant shall be responsible for restriping Morrison Street/Fir Avenue. The project applicant shall restripe the single 22 feet wide westbound shared left-through-right lane to a dedicated left-turn lane (with a storage length of 75 feet) and a shared through-right-lane, each 11 feet wide; restrict on-street parking along the westbound approach on Fir Avenue for 75 feet east of the intersection.</p>				
<p>T-2 Nason Street Improvements</p>				
<p>The project applicant shall restripe Nason Street from the State Route 60 ramps to Dracea Avenue from four to six lanes to improve the roadway LOS to acceptable standards. The City shall determine on an as needed basis the timeline for this improvement.</p>				
<p>T-3 Nason Street/Fir Avenue Improvements</p>				
<p>The project applicant shall pay a fair share (15 percent) of the transportation system improvement fees to implement the following transportation system improvements to Nason Street/Fir Avenue:</p>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extend the storage length of the westbound left-turn lane (Fir Avenue onto Nason Street) by 35 feet. A portion of an existing median shall be removed to allow for this improvement. 				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures T-1 through T-3 would improve impacts at project-impacted intersections and roadway segments to acceptable standards by requiring additional turn lanes, restriping, and queuing storage. Refer to Tables 10-A and 10-B of the TIA (Appendix G) for a summary of LOS at Morrison Street/Fir Avenue with implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1. Refer to Figure 10-1 of the TIA for the conceptual design of the improvements described in Mitigation Measure T-3.</p>				
<p>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The project would not include sharp curves, dangerous intersections, or incompatible uses that would increase hazards. The three driveways included in the project would be designed to meet applicable safety standards and codes and would not cause a safety hazard. Furthermore, implementation of Mitigation Measure T-3 would require the project applicant to contribute a fair share toward transportation improvements that would increase the safety and efficiency of the circulation system at the intersections adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The project would include three driveways that provide access to the site, one on Nason Street and two on Fir Avenue. Thus, emergency access to the site would be sufficient with two entry points. In addition, a queuing analysis was completed for the project. As shown in Tables 8-a through 8-C of the TIA, queues from movements are projected to exceed the existing available turn-pocket storage lengths under existing, existing plus project, cumulative and cumulative plus project conditions. The eastbound left-turn queues at the intersection of Nason Street/Fir Avenue would exceed the available storage length under existing and future analysis scenarios. However, the project would increase the storage length of the turn pocket as part of project design. Therefore, the queues would not exceed available storage. Project design would not cause any other alterations on the site that would result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5 Circulation Element <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 9-1 – Circulation Plan - Figure 9-2 – LOS Standards - Figure 9-3 – Roadway Cross-Sections - Figure 9-4 – Bikeway Plan 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.2 – Traffic/Circulation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.2-1 – Circulation Plan - Figure 5.2-2 – General Plan Roadway Cross-Sections - Figure 5.2-3 – Year 2000 Number of Through Lanes - Figure 5.2-4 – Year 2000 Daily Volume/Capacity (V/C) Ratios - Figure 5.2-5 – Year 2000 Average Daily Traffic Volumes - Figure 5.2-6 – Proposed Circulation Plan - Figure 5.2-7 – LOS Standards 				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix B – Traffic Analysis, City of Moreno Valley General Plan Traffic Study, Urban Crossroads, June 2004. 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 3.18 Special Gas Tax Street Improvement Fund 5. Moreno Valley Master Bike Plan, adopted January 2015 6. Riverside County Transportation Commission, Congestion Management Program, December 14, 2011 				

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in [Public Resources Code Section 21074](#) as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

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

Response:

As of July 1, 2015, California Assembly Bill 52 of 2014 (AB 52) was enacted and expands CEQA by defining a new resource category, “tribal cultural resources.” AB 52 establishes that “A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).

PRC Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and is:

1. 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
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency.

As discussed in Section 3, *Cultural Resources*, there are no known cultural resources at the project site and no resources listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (California State Parks 2019). The City mailed notice letters on January 30,

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>2019, to potentially interested Native American stakeholders for a 30-day consultation request period. The City received comments letters from the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians and Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (formerly known as the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians) tribes on March 7, 2022, the Pechanga Band of Indians on March 25, 2022, and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians on April 10, 2022. These were in response to the AB 52 notice mailed to these and other tribes that was received by the tribes on February 22, 2022. These comments as part of the AB 52 process inform the mitigation measures listed below.</p> <p>Although excavation and grading will not impact known tribal cultural resources, the possibility for unknown resources to be encountered cannot be completely ruled out. Implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less-than-significant level by ensuring that any discovery of archaeological resources of Native American origin are appropriately identified and processed, as applicable.</p> <p>The following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to tribal cultural resources to a less-than-significant level.</p>				
<p>TCR-1 Archaeological Monitoring</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the Developer shall retain a professional archaeologist to conduct monitoring of all ground disturbing activities. The Project Archaeologist shall have the authority to temporarily redirect earthmoving activities in the event that suspected archaeological resources are unearthed during Project construction. The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the Consulting Tribe(s) including Pechanga Band of Indians, Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians, and Yuhaaviatam of the San Manuel Nation (formally known as the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians), the contractor, and the City, shall develop a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan (CRMP) as defined in TCR-3. The Project archeologist shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the City, the construction manager and any contractors, and Consulting Tribal representatives; and will conduct a mandatory Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training to those in attendance. The archaeological monitor shall have the authority to temporarily halt and redirect earth moving activities in the affected area in the event that suspected archaeological resources are unearthed.</p>				
<p>TCR-2 Native American Monitoring</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of a grading permit(s), the Developer shall secure agreements with the Pechanga Band of Indians and Morongo Band of Mission Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians for tribal monitoring. The Developer is also required to provide a minimum of 30 days' advance notice to the tribes of all ground disturbing activities. The Native American Tribal Representatives shall have the authority to temporarily halt and redirect earth moving activities in the affected area in the event that suspected archaeological resources are unearthed. The Native American Monitor(s) shall attend the pre-grading meeting with the Project Archaeologist, City, the construction manager and any contractors and will conduct the Tribal Perspective of the mandatory Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training to those in attendance.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>TCR-3 Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan (CRMP)</p> <p>The Project Archaeologist, in consultation with the Consulting Tribe(s), the contractor, and the City, shall develop a CRMP in consultation pursuant to the definition in AB52 to address the details, timing and responsibility of all archaeological and cultural activities that will occur on the project site. A consulting Tribe is defined as a Tribe that initiated the AB 52 tribal consultation process for the Project, has not opted out of the AB52 consultation process, and has completed AB 52 consultation with the City as provided for in Cal Pub Res Code Section 21080.3.2(b)(1) of AB52. Details in the Plan shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Project description and location b. Project grading and development scheduling; c. Roles and responsibilities of individuals on the Project; d. The pre-grading meeting and Cultural Resources Worker Sensitivity Training details; e. The protocols and stipulations that the contractor, City, Consulting Tribe (s) and Project archaeologist will follow in the event of inadvertent cultural resources discoveries, human remains/cremations, sacred and ceremonial items, including any newly discovered cultural resource deposits that shall be subject to a cultural resources evaluation. f. The type of recordation needed for inadvertent finds and the stipulations of recordation of sacred items. g. Contact information of relevant individuals for the Project; <p>TCR-4 Cultural Resources Disposition</p> <p>In the event that Native American cultural resources are discovered during the course of ground disturbing activities (inadvertent discoveries), the following procedures shall be carried out for final disposition of the discoveries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. One or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed with the tribes. Evidence of such shall be provided to the City of Moreno Valley Planning Department: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Preservation-In-Place of the cultural resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources. ii. Onsite reburial of the discovered items as detailed in the treatment plan required pursuant to Mitigation Measure CR-3. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed. No recordation of sacred items is permitted without the written consent of all Consulting Native American Tribal Governments as defined in CR-3 The location for the future reburial area shall be identified on a confidential exhibit on file with the City, and concurred to by the Consulting Native American Tribal Governments prior to certification of the environmental document. <p>The City shall verify that the following note is included on the Grading Plan:</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>If any suspected archaeological resources are discovered during ground –disturbing activities and the Project Archaeologist and/or Native American Tribal Representatives are not present, the construction supervisor is obligated to halt work in a 100-foot radius around the find and call the Project Archaeologist and the Tribal Representatives to the site to assess the significance of the find.</p>				
<p>TCR-5 Inadvertent Finds</p>				
<p>If potential historic or cultural resources are uncovered during excavation or construction activities at the project site that were not assessed by the archaeological report(s) and/or environmental assessment conducted prior to Project approval, all ground disturbing activities in the affected area within 100 feet of the uncovered resource must cease immediately and a qualified person meeting the Secretary of the Interior's standards (36 CFR 61), Tribal Representatives, and all site monitors per the Mitigation Measures, shall be consulted by the City to evaluate the find, and as appropriate recommend alternative measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate negative effects on the historic, or prehistoric resource. Yuhaaviatam of San Manuel Nation (formerly known as San Manuel Band of Mission Indians) shall be directly notified in the event of an inadvertent discovery and may elect to monitor the remainder of the ground disturbance if this occurs. Further ground disturbance shall not resume within the area of the discovery until a treatment plan has been prepared and approved by all Consulting Parties, then work may resume after the treatment plan has been completed. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area and will be monitored by additional archeologist and Tribal Monitors, if needed. Determinations and recommendations by the consultant shall be immediately submitted to the Planning Division for consideration, and implemented as deemed appropriate by the Community Development Director, in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and any and all Consulting Native American Tribes as defined in CR-3 before any further work commences in the affected area. If the find is determined to be significant and avoidance of the site has not been achieved, a Phase III data recovery plan shall be prepared by the Project Archeologist, in consultation with the Tribe, and shall be submitted to the City and Consulting Tribes for their review and approval prior to implementation of the said plan.</p>				
<p>TCR-6 Human Remains</p>				
<p>If human remains and/or cremations are discovered, no further disturbance shall occur in the affected area until the County Coroner has made necessary findings as to origin.</p>				
<p>A. Should human remains and/or cremations be encountered on the surface or during any and all ground-disturbing activities (i.e., clearing, grubbing, tree and bush removal, grading, trenching, fence post placement and removal, construction excavation, excavation for all water supply, electrical, and irrigation lines, and landscaping phases of any kind), work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery shall immediately stop within a 100-foot perimeter of the discovery. The area shall be protected; project personnel/observers will be restricted. The County Coroner is to be contacted within 24 hours of discovery.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The County Coroner has 48 hours to make his/her determination pursuant to State and Safety Code §7050.5. and Public Resources Code (PRC) § 5097.98.</p> <p>B. In the event that the human remains and/or cremations are identified as Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of determination pursuant to subdivision (c) of HSC §7050.5.</p> <p>C. The Native American Heritage Commission shall immediately notify the person or persons it believes to be the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD has 48 hours, upon being granted access to the Project site, to inspect the site of discovery and make his/her recommendation for final treatment and disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the remains and all associated grave goods pursuant to PRC §5097.98</p> <p>D. No photographs are to be taken except by the coroner, with written approval by the consulting Tribe[s].</p>				
<p>TCR-7 Non-Disclosure of Reburial Locations</p>				
<p>It is understood by all parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or associated grave goods shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code 6254 (r)., parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code 6254 (r).</p>				
<p>TCR-8 Archaeology Report – Phase III and IV</p>				
<p>Prior to final inspection, the developer/permit holder shall prompt the Project Archeologist to submit two (2) copies of the Phase III Data Recovery report (if required for the Project) and the Phase IV Cultural Resources Monitoring Report that complies with the Community Development Department's requirements for such reports. The Phase IV report shall include evidence of the required cultural/historical sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the pre-grade meeting. The Community Development Department shall review the reports to determine adequate mitigation compliance. Provided the reports are adequate, the Community Development Department shall clear this condition. Once the report(s) are determined to be adequate, two (2) copies shall be submitted to the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California Riverside (UCR) and one (1) copy shall be submitted to the Consulting Tribe(s) Cultural Resources Department(s).</p>				
<p>ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Response:
See response for (a) above.

Sources:

1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006
 - Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.2 – Cultural and Historical Resources
2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006
 - Section 5.10 – Cultural Resources
 - Figure 5.10-1 – Locations of Listed Historic Resource Inventory Structures
 - Figure 5.10-2 – Location of Prehistoric Sites
 - Figure 5.10-3 – Paleontological Resource Sensitive Areas
 - Appendix C – Cultural Resources Analysis, Study of Historical and Archaeological Resources for the Revised General Plan, City of Moreno Valley, Archaeological Associates, August 2003.
3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code
4. Moreno Valley Municipal Code Title 7 – Cultural Preservation
5. Cultural Resources Inventory for the City of Moreno Valley, Riverside County, California, prepared by Daniel F. McCarthy, Archaeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside, October 1987 (*This document cannot be provided to the public due to the inclusion of confidential information pursuant to Government Code Section 6254.10.*)

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:

Water

The City receives potable water service from EMWD. EMWD’s potable water supply is sourced approximately 75 percent from imported water from the Metropolitan Water District, and 25 percent from groundwater wells (EMWD 2019). In its 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, EMWD provides projections for both water supply and water demand. EMWD is capable of meeting current and projected water demands through 2040 under normal, historic single-dry and historic multiple-dry year conditions. Projections for meeting water demand include population growth projections in EMWD’s service area.

The project would create demand for approximately 16,328 gallons per day, or 18.3 acre-feet per year (AFY)(Salem 2018a; Appendix A). This demand represents one percent of the anticipated 2020 supply of 166,300 AFY (EMWD 2015). EMWD projects its water supply to be in balance with demand through the year 2040 because projections include a steady increase in demand. Because the project is consistent with the site’s land use designation, the water demand associated with the project is considered in EMWD’s water demand projections.

The project would also be required to comply with any existing or future regulations on water use that the City implements, including metering and conservation pricing. Therefore, impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Wastewater Treatment</i></p> <p>Local governments and water districts are responsible for complying with federal regulations, both for wastewater plant operation and the collection systems (e.g., sanitary sewers) that convey wastewater to the wastewater treatment facility. Proper operation and maintenance are critical for sewage collection and treatment as impacts from these processes can degrade water resources and affect human health. For these reasons, publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) receive Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) to ensure compliance with water quality regulations set forth by the state. WDRs, issued by the state, establish effluent limits on the kinds and quantities of pollutants that POTWs can discharge. These permits also contain pollutant monitoring, recordkeeping, and reporting requirements. POTWs that intend to discharge into the nation’s waters must obtain a WDR prior to initiating discharge.</p> <p>Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) provides wastewater service to the City of Moreno Valley. EMWD treats approximately 43 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater at its four regional water reclamation facilities through 1,813 miles of sewer pipelines (EMWD 2018). Through progressive utilization of wastewater storage and recycling, EMWD reuses 100 percent of the wastewater generated in its service area as recycled water (EMWD 2016a). The reclamation facility serving Moreno Valley is The Moreno Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility, which treats an average of 10.6 mgd, and has capacity to treat 16 mgd (EMWD 2016b). Therefore, available wastewater treatment capacity is approximately 5.4 mgd.</p> <p>According to CalEEMod calculations, the commercial uses proposed by the project would create demand for an estimated 16,328 gallons of water per day or 0.02 mgd (Salem 2018a; Appendix A). Conservatively estimating that wastewater generation would be 80 percent of water demand, the project would generate approximately 0.01 mgd (13,062 gallons of wastewater per day). This increase would demand approximately 2 percent of the available capacity at the Moreno Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility. Expected wastewater flow from the project would not exceed the capabilities of the serving treatment plant. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p><i>Stormwater Drainage</i></p> <p>As discussed in Section 9, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i>, the project site is undeveloped and mostly permeable. The project would increase on-site impervious surface area, decreasing groundwater recharge and increasing surface runoff. Because the project would create 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface on the project site, it would constitute “New Development” under the MS4 Permit and would be required to implement best management practices. In addition, the project would be required to comply with Chapter 8.10 of the MVMC, which regulates stormwater and urban runoff. Chapter 8.10 allows for the city engineer to identify the BMPs that may be implemented by a development project to prevent deterioration of water quality. Therefore, compliance with applicable regulations would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p><i>Electric Power</i></p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

The project would increase demand for electric power at the project site. As shown in Table 14, the project would increase electricity demand by approximately 459,488 kilowatt hours (kWh) per year.

Table 14 Estimated Electric Power Demand

Land Use	Electricity Demand (kWh/year)
Convenience Market With Gas Pumps	67,770
Fast Food Restaurant With Drive Thru	141,248
High Turnover (sit-down) Restaurant	154,490
Parking Lot	14,980
Strip Mall	81,000
Total Increase in Electricity Demand	459,488

Source: CalEEMod Annual Operational Outputs Appendix A

The project site is located in the electric power service area of Moreno Valley Utility (MVU), a public power utility responsible for serving over 6,500 customers in Moreno Valley (City of Moreno Valley 2019). The project may require modification of existing electrical transmission and distribution systems to connect to the new developments at the project site. Energy demands associated with the project are discussed in Section 6, *Energy*. As infill development, the project would not require the MVU to expand its service area. Service would be provided in accordance with the rules and regulations of MVU on file with and approved by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Impacts related to electric power facilities would be less than significant.

Natural Gas

Natural gas service in Moreno Valley is provided by the Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas). The project would increase demand for natural gas at the project site. As shown in Table 15, the project would increase electricity demand by approximately 1.5 million kilo-British thermal units (kBTU) per year.

Table 15 Estimated Natural Gas Demand

Land Use	Natural Gas Demand (kBTU/year)
Convenience Market With Gas Pumps	8,233
Fast Food Restaurant With Drive Thru	738,432
High Turnover (sit-down) Restaurant	807,660
Parking Lot	0
Strip Mall	9,840

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Total Increase in Natural Gas Demand	1,564,165			
Source: CalEEMod Annual Operational Outputs Appendix A				
<p>A large-diameter gas transmission pipeline runs along Cottonwood Ave, approximately 0.75 miles south of the project site (SoCal Gas 2016). As infill development, the project is located near existing natural gas distribution infrastructure. The project may require modification of existing natural gas pipelines near the project site in order to connect to new developments at the project site. Service would be provided in accordance with the rules and regulations of SoCal Gas on file with and approved by the CPUC. Impacts related to natural gas would be less than significant.</p>				
Telecommunications				
<p>In Moreno Valley, telecommunications services are provided by Frontier and Spectrum. The project may require modification of existing telecommunications lines near the project site in order to connect to the new developments. As infill development, the project is located near existing telecommunications infrastructure. Therefore, impacts related to telecommunications would be less than significant.</p>				
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: See response for (a) above.</p>				
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: See response for (a) above.</p>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: The City of Moreno Valley provides trash, recycling, and special waste handling services to residents and businesses through a contract with Waste Management (City of Moreno Valley 2018). The landfill serving Moreno Valley is the Badlands Sanitary Landfill, located within the City and operated by the Riverside County Department of Waste Resources (RCDWR). The landfill has a permitted capacity of 4,000 tons per day. Average daily intake is 1,667 tons per day. Therefore, the available daily capacity is 2,333 tons per day. While the current Badlands facility has an estimated closure date of 2024, the City of Moreno Valley would be served by the Lamb Canyon Landfill upon closure of the Badlands Sanitary Landfill. All of the landfills managed by RCDWR have the potential to expand (County of Riverside 2014).</p> <p>The project has two components, construction and operation, that would result in the generation of solid waste. The handling of all debris and waste generated during construction of the project would be subject to the California Integrated Waste</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) requirements for salvaging, recycling, and reuse of materials from construction activities. The project’s construction phase would generate waste. However, the generation of construction waste would be temporary, lasting for approximately 12 months. Therefore, the Badlands Sanitary Landfill would have adequate capacity for construction waste from the project.

AB 939 requires all cities and counties to divert a minimum of 50 percent of all solid waste from landfills. AB 341, passed in 2011, sets a statewide goal for 75 percent disposal reduction by the year 2020. In addition, SB 1383 of 2016 established the following goals: a 50-percent reduction in the level of the statewide disposal of organic waste from 2014 levels by 2020, and a 75-percent reduction in the level of the statewide disposal of organic waste from 2014 levels by 2025.

As shown in Table 16 project operation would generate approximately 203,800 pounds (102 tons) of solid waste per year based on project estimated CalEEMod operational waste generation (Appendix A). This equates to approximately 558 pounds per day. Assuming a 50 percent diversion rate (per AB 939), an estimated 279 pounds per day would go to a landfill. This would represent less than one percent of the remaining daily capacity of the Badlands Sanitary Landfill (2,333 tons). If the project were instead served by the Lamb Canyon Landfill, in the event of the closure of Badlands Sanitary Landfill, project-generated waste would likewise account for less than one percent of the remaining capacity. Lamb Canyon Landfill has a permitted daily capacity of 5,000 tons per day, with average daily intake of 1,703 tons per day. It has an estimated closure date of 2029.

Table 16 Estimated Solid Waste Generation

Land Use	Waste Generated (lbs./year)	Waste Generated (lbs./day)
Convenience Market With Gas Pumps	30,180	82.7
Fast Food Restaurant With Drive Thru	73,720	212.9
High Turnover (sit-down) Restaurant	83,300	228.2
Parking Lot	0	–
Strip Mall	12,600	34.5
Total Increase in Waste Generation	203,800	558.0

Source: CalEEMod Annual Operational Outputs Appendix A

The project would be required to comply with solid waste diversion regulations and would be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity. Therefore, long-term disposal needs associated with the project would not exceed the capacity of local infrastructure, and impacts would be less than significant.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Response:

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See response for (d) above.				
<p>Sources:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 2 – Conservation Element – Section 2.4 – Utilities Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.7 – Water Quality Chapter 7 – Conservation Element – Section 7.3 – Solid Waste Chapter 7 -- Conservation Element – Section 7.5—Water Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 7-1 – Water Purveyor Service Area Map Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 5.7 – Hydrology and Water Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 5.7-1 – Storm Water Flows and Major Drainage Facilities Figure 5.7-2 – Groundwater Basins Section 5.13 – Public Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figure 5.13-1 – Locations of Public Facilities Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 8.10 Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Controls Moreno Valley Municipal Code Section 8.21.170 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). Moreno Valley Municipal Code Chapter 8.80 – Recycling and Diversion of Construction and Demolition Waste 				
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response:</p> <p>The project site is designated Local Responsibility Area for fire protection responsibility and is not in or near a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ). State Responsibility Areas designated High and Very High occur approximately two miles north, three miles east, and three miles south of the project site (CAL FIRE 2007). As described in Section 17, <i>Transportation/Traffic</i>, the project would provide emergency access, and would not result in significant impacts to the circulation system. Therefore, the project would not substantially adversely affect emergency response or evacuation. Because the project is not in or in the immediate vicinity of a very high fire hazard severity zone and would not adversely affect emergency response or evacuation, this impact would be less than significant.</p>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response:</p> <p>As described above, the project site is not in a VHFHSZ. Development of the 3.25-acre project site would not substantially change the existing fire hazards in the area. The project would require standard infrastructure associated with commercial development, such as water and electricity, but would not require infrastructure associated with fire hazard prevention/response other than a water connection. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>				
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
Response: See response for (b) above.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response: As described above, the project site is not in or near a VHFHSZ or state responsibility area. The project site is relatively flat. As described in Section 7, <i>Geology and Soils</i> , and Section 10, <i>Hydrology and Water Quality</i> , there are no substantial hazards related to landslides or flooding in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, impacts related to post-fire flooding or landslide risks would be less than significant.				
Sources: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moreno Valley General Plan, adopted July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 6 – Safety Element – Section 6.2- Fire and Emergency Services – 6.2.8—Wildland Urban Interface 2. Final Environmental Impact Report City of Moreno Valley General Plan, certified July 11, 2006 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 5.5 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5.5-2 – Floodplains and High Fire Hazard Areas 3. Title 9 – Planning and Zoning of the Moreno Valley Municipal Code 4. Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, City of Moreno Valley Fire Department, adopted October 4, 2011, amended 2017, http://www.moval.org/city_hall/departments/fire/pdfs/haz-mit-plan.pdf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 5 – Wildland and Urban Fires <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 5-2 – Moreno Valley High Fire Area Map 2016 • Chapter 8 – Landslide <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Figure 8-1 – Moreno Valley Slope Analysis 2016 5. Emergency Operations Plan, City of Moreno Valley, March 2009, http://www.moval.org/city_hall/departments/fire/pdfs/mv-eop-0309.pdf <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat Assessment 3 – Wildfire 				
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Response: As discussed in Section 4, <i>Biological Resources</i> , the project site does not include any mapped essential habitat connectivity areas in its immediate vicinity. Regional wildlife movement is restricted due to the urbanized nature of the City. As such, no native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or native wildlife nursery sites exist on the project site. The only suitable habitat for special-status species on the site is nesting bird habitat and potential SKR habitat. Compliance with regulations related to habitat conservation plans and implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce impacts to a less-than-				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>significant level by requiring biological surveys and fees. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would require a jurisdictional delineation by a qualified biologist to identify state and federally protected wetlands on the site and to determine appropriate avoidance and protection measures. As noted under Section 5, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, there are no structures on the site. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>				
<p>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 project, and the effects of probable future projects.)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: As described in the discussion of environmental checklist Sections 1 through 18, the project would have no impact, a less than significant impact, or a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated, with respect to all environmental issues. Cumulative impacts of several resource areas have been addressed in the individual resource sections above: Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, Noise, and Transportation/Traffic (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3)). CalEEMod was utilized to assess the air quality and GHG impacts resulting from the project, concluding that the impacts associated with these two issues were less than significant. As discussed in Section 4.3, <i>Air Quality</i>, and Section 4.8, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>, the issue of climate change typically involves an analysis of whether a project’s contribution towards an impact would be cumulatively considerable, and air quality thresholds are designed by local air districts to ensure that projects in each air basin do not result in exceedance of state and national standards and lead to a cumulative impact. As air quality and GHG impacts would not exceed applicable thresholds cumulative impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>As discussed in Section 16, project-related traffic would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative traffic impacts at one intersection and roadway segments on Nason Street. Implementation of Mitigation Measures T-1 through T-3, which involves payment of a fair share fee for road improvements and restriping that would reduce cumulative traffic impacts to a less than significant level. As shown in Table 4-C of the TIA, there are 23 planned projects in the vicinity of the project site that were analyzed as part of the cumulative traffic analysis (Appendix G). The cumulative project closest to the project site is approximately 1,000 feet to the northwest. Therefore, planned projects are not close enough to the site to result in cumulative impacts related to such issues such as noise and hydrology. However, traffic noise was analyzed in Section 4.13, <i>Noise</i>, and cumulative traffic noise impacts would be less than significant. Other resource areas (e.g., agricultural resources, mineral resources) were determined to have no impact. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to these issues. Some resource areas (e.g., geology, hazards and hazardous materials) are by their nature project-specific and impacts at one location do not add to impacts at other locations or create additive impacts. As such, cumulative impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.</p>				

ISSUES & SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Response: Impacts to human beings are generally associated with air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise impacts. As detailed in Section 1, <i>Air Quality</i>, and Section 8, <i>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</i>, the project would not result, either directly or indirectly, in significant impacts related to air quality or hazardous materials. As discussed in Section 12, <i>Noise</i>, Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-2 would be required to reduce noise impacts from operational car wash and restaurant noise. Compliance with applicable rules and regulations and recommended mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts on human beings to a less-than-significant level.</p>				