



## CITY OF HEMET

### INITIAL STUDY

**Case Number: Conditional Use Permit No. 18-006**      **Date: April 17, 2019**

**Project Title: Page Plaza Drive-Through Restaurants**

**Contact:** City of Hemet  
Carole Kendrick, (951) 765-2375  
Planning Department  
445 East Florida Avenue  
Hemet, California 92543

**Project Location:** Northwest corner of Thornton Avenue and Sanderson Avenue in the City of Hemet.

**Project Applicant Name and Address:**

Rich Development LLC.  
600 North Tustin Avenue, Suite 150  
Santa Ana, California 92705

**General Plan Designation:** Community Commercial (FAR 4.0)

**Zoning:** Page Plaza Specific Plan (SP00-1)

**Project Abstract.**

The development of two pad sites as fast food restaurants located at the intersection of Thornton Avenue and Sanderson Avenue within the Page Plaza shopping center. The interior pad would feature a 3,700 square foot building containing restaurant and retail uses. The pad at the intersection would feature 2,500 square feet containing a coffee shop. Both buildings would have speakers for customer-employee communications and a drive-through pick up window. In addition, each parcel will have parking, landscaping, and refuse container areas in relation to each business.

The project site sits approximately three feet below the grade of the adjoining Sanderson Avenue and Thornton Avenue streets. Parkway improvements, including landscaping, irrigation, utilities, sidewalk, curb and gutter are installed. Three palm trees that serve to identify Page Plaza stand inside the property at the corner.

**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

The project site is located within the Page Ranch Land Use District. Page Ranch is a large specific plan area developed north of Salt Creek and Domenigoni Parkway and generally west of Sanderson Avenue and south of Stetson Avenue. The area is largely flat with single family residential communities built from the late 1980s to present with the development of the Del Webb Active Adult community and also includes a future mixed-use node. The area is the location of West Valley High School and the 60-acre Brubaker Park facility.

The site is located south of the Hemet-Ryan Airport Land Use District and south of the Airports Land Use Commission, (ALUC) Land Use Compatibility Plan for Hemet-Ryan Airport, (LUCP) (Figure HR 1) of the General Plan for which an Interim Overlay Zone has been established while the ALUC updates the Hemet-Ryan LUCP. The site is located within Zone D (West) of the Hemet-Ryan Airport land Use Compatibility Plan Airport (Figure HR-1) of the General Plan. Zone D (West) encourages a density of no more than 800 people per acre, prohibits building heights in excess of 70 feet high, discourages highly sensitive uses, (such as children’s schools, hospitals, and nursing homes); and requires notice of over flights on deeds.

The site is located west of the Hemet South District that is anchored by the senior-oriented Seven Hills Golf Course community. The gated single family community (Willow Walk) of Page Ranch Community Development (PCD 79-93) lies east of the project site with primary access from Thornton Avenue. The homes within this tract face interior streets. A six-foot block wall extends at the rear of these homes along Sanderson Avenue. A subdivision of single family homes exist on the south side of Thornton Avenue. These homes face the project site and take access from Thornton Avenue.

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

Eastern Municipal Water District: water and sewer services.

The AB 52 Tribal consultation process was begun on February 28, 2019. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians requested consultation. The consultation process resulted in the identification of Mitigation Measures TRI-1 through TRI-4 to protect cultural resources and to preserve confidentiality. The consultation process was closed out on April 9, 2019.

**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, has consultation begun is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

The AB 52 Tribal consultation process was begun on February 28, 2019. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians requested consultation. The consultation process resulted in the identification of Mitigation Measures TRI-1 through TRI-4 to protect cultural resources and to preserve confidentiality. The consultation process was closed out on April 9, 2019.

**Sources to be Incorporated by Reference**

City of Hemet 2030 General Plan  
City of Hemet Municipal Code, Chapter 90  
Airports Land Use Commission Hemet-Ryan Land Use Compatibility Plan  
Page Plaza Specific Plan

**Persons Who Prepared Initial Study**

David M. Leonard, Contract Planner

**Persons Contacted and/or Consulted**

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project represents a late stage of site development within the Page Plaza retail center. The pad sites have been graded in preparation of development of the project site. All utilities and street improvements, as well as landscape and irrigation improvements, have been constructed adjacent to the site.

The proposed project involves the development of two pad sites as drive-through restaurants located at the intersection of Thornton Avenue and Sanderson Avenue within the Page Plaza shopping center. The pads total 84,984 square feet that includes building pads, parking lot, and landscaping. The westerly pad, Building B on the Site Plan, would feature a 3,700 square foot building containing restaurant and retail uses. The easterly pad, Building A, would feature 2,500 square feet containing a drive-through coffee shop. Both buildings would have speakerphones for customer-employee communications and a drive-through pick up window. In addition, each parcel will have parking, landscaping, and refuse container areas in relation to each business. The majority of parking exists at the site. Only spaces in front of each building will be added. Most of these are ADA spaces.

Each pad must have off-street parking of 1 space per 200 SF up to 2,000 SF, plus 1 space per 60 SF above 2,000 SF for the drive-through restaurant uses; and one space per 250 SF for retail use. Under these calculations, Building B requires 19 spaces and Building A requires 24 spaces. These include ADA and EV recharging spaces. The Municipal Code requires a minimum que of six (6) vehicles in the drive-through lane. A queuing analysis prepared for the project identified a need for eleven (11) vehicles in the drive through lane for each building. The project proposes a que for each pad of thirteen (13) vehicles.

An ADA path of travel has been identified through the project site. Outdoor dining is provided for each restaurant.

The project site sits approximately three feet below the grade of the adjoining Sanderson Avenue and Thornton Avenue streets. Parkway improvements, including landscaping, irrigation, utilities, sidewalk, curb and gutter are installed. Three palm trees that serve to identify Page Plaza stand inside the property at the corner. Additional landscaping is required in the parking lot pursuant to Article XXVI of the Municipal Code.

All utilities were stubbed at the site as part of the original development of the Page Plaza retail center. No offsite extension of utilities, with the potential of creating indirect impacts, will occur. Mechanical equipment is designed on the rooftops of the proposed structures to be screened by parapet walls of the buildings.

Overhead street lights are existing around the project site. Future lighting will rely on wall mounted sconces and bollards.

**PROJECT LOCATION**



FIGURE 1

Page Plaza  
Air Quality Impact Analysis  
Regional and Project Location

SOURCE: Google Map, 2018; Riverside County, 2016  
Z:\RDE1805\Reports\AQ\fig1\_RegLoc.mxd (11/16/2018)

## TABLE OF MITIGATION MEASURES

### Noise

NOI-1: Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, evidence shall be submitted to Planning Department staff that the speakerphones for each drive through restaurant have been equipped with an Audio Volume Control device and that said device is operational. The audio control shall be lowered during nighttime operations in conformance with the General Plan noise standards.

### Traffic

T-1: Sanderson Avenue/Thornton Avenue: Convert east-west signal phasing from permitted to split phase prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit. With conversion of the signal phasing, the eastbound left-turn queues will not exceed available storage.

### Tribal

TRI-1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall commission an assessment of the potential for archeological and cultural resources to be performed by a qualified archeologist in conjunction with recognized Native American tribes, including the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, in order to determine the presence and extent of any such resources within the project area and evaluate the significance of such resources. The assessment shall include a NAHC and CHRIS records search, a Phase I walkover survey, and preparation of an archeological report containing the results of this assessment. A phase II archeological evaluation will be completed if recommended in the assessment.

TRI-2: Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall enter a Treatment and Disposition Agreement (TDA) with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians to address treatment and disposition of archaeological/cultural resources and human remains associated with Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians that may be uncovered or otherwise discovered during construction of the project. The TDA may establish provisions for tribal monitors. Following execution of the TDA by the developer and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the TDA will be incorporated by reference into the grading permit.

TRI-3: If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are made during ground-disturbing activities, the applicant, a qualified archaeologist, and the Soboba and Pechanga Bands of Luiseno Indians shall assess the significance of such resources and shall confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to PRC Section 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources. PRC Section 21084.3 further requires that agencies shall avoid damaging effects to tribal cultural resources, if feasible. If the City, the qualified archaeologist, and the Soboba and Pechanga Tribes cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the Community Development Director or designee for decision. The Community Development Director or designee shall make the determination based on the provisions of the CEQA with respect to archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Soboba and Pechanga Tribes. Notwithstanding any other rights available under the law, the decision of the City Community Development Director or designee shall be appealable to the City Planning Commission and/or City Council.

TRI-4: If human remains are encountered on the property, then the Riverside County Coroner's Office MUST be contacted within 24 hours of the find, and all work halted until a clearance is given by that office and any other involved agencies. If it is determined that the remains might be those of a Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians shall be notified and appropriate measures provided by State law shall be implemented.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

The results of the analysis indicates 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.

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

**Summary of potentially significant impacts that could occur with implementation of this project:** (describe)

Noise – Without recommended Mitigation Measure NOI-1, noise from speakerphones would exceed the nighttime decibel level of 65 DbA impacting residences located south of the project site.

Traffic – Without recommended Mitigation Measure T-1, the level of service during the am peak hour would exceed acceptable level of service requirements because vehicles in the left turn lane would exceed the que capacity of that lane.



## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST QUESTIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b>				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have an adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Damage scenic resources, including, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views 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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources: Field review; Google Earth; Building Plans and Photometric Plan, Chipman Architects.

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) The Community Design Element of the Hemet General Plan provides polices that serve to protect the views of hillsides within and flanking the City. These policies are implemented through the City’s Municipal Code. As an infill development, potential impacts upon scenic vistas could occur based on building height and signs. The proposed building height is less than 32 feet, including tower elements. No free standing signs are proposed. Based on the proposed design, and by complying with the Municipal Code, potential impacts on scenic vistas are less than significant.

b) The project site is not located near a State Scenic Highway. However, Sanderson Avenue is designated as a local scenic highway in the Circulation Element of the General Plan. General Plan Land use **Policy LU 13.3** states “Ensure that the design and appearance of new landscaping, structures, equipment, signs, or grading within Designated and Eligible State and County scenic highway corridors are compatible with the surrounding scenic setting or environment.” **Policy OS 22.4** “Imposes conditions on development within scenic highway corridors requiring dedication of scenic easements consistent with the Scenic Highways Plan, when it is necessary to preserve unique or special visual features.” A 25-foot setback is required along local scenic highways. All parkway improvements have been constructed and the scenic highway setback is in place. The project site has been graded as part of the overall Page Plaza retail center and no historic trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings exist at the site. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.

c) The proposed project has been reviewed for compliance with all provisions of the Municipal Code. The project meets all provisions of the Municipal Code and corresponding regulations governing the scenic highway status of Sanderson Avenue have been met. Therefore the impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

d) In addition to existing street lighting and parking lot lighting, the proposed project will introduce wall-mounted lighting for safety and security. A photo-metric plan has been provided that demonstrates that light cast from the new fixtures will comply with the City standard for shielding lighting to reduce glare. Fixtures will be equipped with frosted acrylic lens to reduce night time glare. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, 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"/>	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: Exhibit 4.2-1 of the Hemet 2030 General Plan and field review.

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) **Exhibit 4.2-1 of the Hemet 2030 General Plan** designates Farmland classifications throughout the City based on the California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The project site is classified as *Urban and Built-Up Land* in keeping with the status of the project site as a developed shopping center. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in the conversion of any farmland and there is no impact.

b) **Exhibit 4.2-1 of the Hemet 2030 General Plan** identifies lands within an active Williamson Act contract. Lands within the status are generally located at the eastern end of the City where terrain ascends toward forest lands. The project site is not identified within a Williamson Act contract and there is no impact.

c) The proposed project is an infill development within an existing shopping center. All necessary forms of infrastructure are at the site and would not require disturbance of areas currently used for agricultural purposes. There are no adjacent properties that engage in farming activities and none in the vicinity of the project. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b>				
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 air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to increased pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis: Proposed Drive-Through Fast-Food Restaurants at the Existing Page Plaza, City of Hemet, California, November 28, 2018, LSA

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), together with the Air Resources Board (ARB), maintains ambient air quality monitoring stations in the Basin. The air quality monitoring stations closest to the proposed project site are the Perris, Lake Elsinore, and Rubidoux Monitoring Stations. These stations are located approximately 13, 19, 28 miles, respectively, to the northwest of the proposed project site, and monitors air pollutant data for hourly and 8-hour ozone, CO, nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and sulfur dioxide (SO2). In addition, other criteria pollutants (i.e., particulate matter less than 10 microns in size [PM10] and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size [PM2.5]) data were obtained from the Lake Elsinore Monitoring Station. The air quality trends from these three stations are used to represent the ambient air quality in the vicinity of the proposed project site. The ambient air quality data monitored at these stations within the past three years are listed in Table 1.

As shown in Table 1, the ambient air quality data indicate that CO, PM10, PM2.5, NO2, and SO2 levels are consistently below the relevant State and federal standards. The State 1-hour O3 standards were exceeded between 23 and 33 times and the State 8-hour O3 standards were exceeded between 50 and 86 times in the last three years. The Federal 8-hour O3 standards were exceeded between 49 and 80 times in the last three years. The State 24-hour and annual PM10 standards were exceeded in the last

three years.

**Table 1 Ambient Air Quality Monitored in the Project Vicinity**

Pollutant	Standard	2015	2016	2017
<b>Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) – Perris Monitoring Station</b>				
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)		0.124	0.131	0.120
Number of days exceeded:	State: > 0.09 ppm	25	23	33
Maximum 8-hour concentration (ppm)		0.103	0.099	0.106
Number of days exceeded:	State: > 0.07 ppm	50	56	86
	Federal: > 0.07 ppm	49	55	80
<b>Coarse Particulates (PM<sub>10</sub>) – Perris Monitoring Station</b>				
Maximum 24-hour concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		188	76	75
Number of days exceeded:	State: > 50 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	26	4	6
	Federal: > 150 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	6	0	0
Annual arithmetic average concentration ( µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		33.1	32.2	32.6
Exceeded for the year:	State: > 20 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Fine Particulates (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) – Lake Elsinore Monitoring Station</b>				
Maximum 24-hour concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		41.7	31.5	27.2
Number of days exceeded:	Federal: > 35 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	2	0	0
Annual arithmetic average concentration (µg/m <sup>3</sup> )		11.6	10.5	11.5
Exceeded for the year:	State: > 12 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	No	No	No
	Federal: > 15 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	No	No	No
<b>Carbon Monoxide (CO) – Lake Elsinore Monitoring Station</b>				
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)		0.8	1.2	1.2
Number of days exceeded:	State: > 20 ppm	0	0	0
	Federal: > 35 ppm	0	0	0
Maximum 8-hour concentration (ppm)		0.6	0.6	0.8
Number of days exceeded:	State: ≥ 9.0 ppm	0	0	0
	Federal: ≥ 9 ppm	0	0	0
<b>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) – Lake Elsinore Monitoring Station</b>				
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)		0.047	0.051	0.049
Number of days exceeded:	State: > 0.18 ppm	0	0	0
	Federal: > 0.10 ppm	0	0	0
Annual arithmetic average concentration (ppm)		0.008	0.008	0.008
Exceeded for the year:	State: > 0.030 ppm	No	No	No
	Federal: > 0.053 ppm	No	No	No
<b>Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) – Rubidoux Monitoring Station</b>				
Maximum 24-hour concentration (ppm)		0.001	0.001	0.002
Number of days exceeded:	State: > 0.04 ppm	0	0	0
Maximum 1-hour concentration (ppm)		0.0019	0.0056	0.0012
Number of days exceeded:	State: > 0.25 ppm	0	0	0
	Federal: > 0.075 ppm	0	0	0

Source: EPA. Air Data Air Quality Monitors. Website: [http://www.epa.gov/airdata/ad\\_maps.html](http://www.epa.gov/airdata/ad_maps.html) (accessed November 2018).

µg/m<sup>3</sup> = micrograms per cubic meter  
NA = not available

EPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency  
ppm = parts per million

## Air Quality Management Plan Consistency

A consistency determination plays an essential role in local agency project review by linking local planning and unique individual projects to the air quality plans. A consistency determination fulfills the CEQA goal of fully informing local agency decision-makers of the environmental costs of the project under consideration at a stage early enough to ensure that air quality concerns are addressed. Only new or amended General Plan elements, Specific Plans, and significantly unique projects need to undergo a consistency review due to the air quality plan strategy being based on projections from local General Plans. Projects are considered consistent with, and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the AQMP, if the growth in socioeconomic factors (e.g., population, employment) is consistent with the underlying regional plans used to develop the AQMP.

The future emissions forecasts are primarily based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by SCAG. Thus, demographic growth forecasts for various socioeconomic categories (e.g., population, housing, and employment by industry) developed by SCAG for its 2016 Regional Transportation Plan (SCAG 2016) were used to estimate future emissions in the Final 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2016).

Pursuant to the methodology provided in Chapter 12 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993), consistency with the 2016 AQMP is affirmed when a project (1) does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new violation and (2) is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP. Consistency review is presented as follows:

1. The proposed project would result in short-term construction and long-term operational pollutant emissions that are all less than the CEQA significance emissions thresholds established by the SCAQMD, as demonstrated above; therefore, the proposed project could not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of any air quality standards violation and will not cause a new air quality standard violation.

2. The CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993) indicates that consistency with AQMP growth assumptions must be analyzed for new or amended General Plan elements, Specific Plans, and significant projects. Significant projects include airports, electrical generating facilities, petroleum and gas refineries, designation of oil drilling districts, water ports, solid waste disposal sites, and offshore drilling facilities; therefore, the proposed project is not defined as a significant project.

The land use designation for the project site is community commercial in the City's General Plan. The proposed project involves the construction and operation of two drive-through restaurants that was included as part of the project; therefore, it is consistent with the current land use designation and would not require a General Plan Amendment or zone change. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an inconsistency with the current land use designation. As such, the proposed project is not anticipated to exceed the AQMP assumptions for the project site and is found to be consistent with the AQMP for the Basin. Based on the consistency analysis presented above, the proposed project would be consistent with the current regional AQMP and would not result in a new or worsening impact related to implementation of the AQMP. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

### b) Pollutants with Regional Effects

The SCAQMD has established daily emissions thresholds for construction and operation for the evaluation of proposed projects in the Basin. The emissions thresholds were established based on the attainment status of the Basin with regard to air quality standards for specific criteria pollutants. Because the concentration standards were set by the EPA at a level that protects public health with an adequate margin of safety, these emissions thresholds are regarded as conservative and would overstate an individual project's contribution to health risks.

### Regional Thresholds for Construction Emissions

The following CEQA significance thresholds for construction emissions have been established for the Basin:

- 75 pounds per day (lbs/day) of volatile organic compounds (VOCs);
- 100 lbs/day of NO<sub>x</sub>;
- 550 lbs/day of CO;
- 150 lbs/day of PM<sub>10</sub>;
- 55 lbs/day of PM<sub>2.5</sub>; and
- 150 lbs/day of sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>).

### Thresholds for Localized Impacts Analysis

The SCAQMD published its Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology in July 2008, recommending that all air quality analyses include an assessment of both construction and operational impacts on the air quality of nearby sensitive receptors from emissions of CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Localized significance thresholds (LSTs) represent the maximum emissions from a project that would not be expected to result in an exceedance of the NAAQS or CAAQS. LSTs are based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant within the project's Source Receptor Area (SRA) and the distance to the nearest sensitive receptor. For this project, the appropriate SRA is Hemet/San Jacinto Valley (SRA 28).

If the total acreage disturbed is less than or equal to 5 acres per day, then the SCAQMD's screening look-up tables can be used to determine if a project has the potential to result in a significant impact. In the case of CO and NO<sub>x</sub>, because ambient levels are below the NAAQS and CAAQS, a project is considered to have a significant impact if project emissions result in an exceedance of one or more of these standards. PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are both nonattainment pollutants (SCAQMD 2006). Although ambient levels for PM<sub>2.5</sub> measured at the Lake Elsinore station do not exceed a State or federal standard, the basin is in a nonattainment status. PM<sub>10</sub> project emissions are considered significant since they increase ambient concentrations by a measurable amount. Therefore, the significance criteria for these two pollutants are the pollutant concentration thresholds presented in SCAQMD Rules 403. The Rule 403 threshold of 10.4 µg/m<sup>3</sup> applies to construction emissions. As shown in Table 2, VOC emissions do not exceed a State or federal standard. As shown in Table 3, SO<sub>x</sub> emissions do not exceed a State or federal standard.

### Construction Emissions

Construction of the proposed project would occur in five phases. The total peak-day construction emissions for each phase are summarized in Table 2 and detailed in Attachment B of the air quality assessment. The emissions listed in Table 2 represent the maximum daily emissions generated during each construction phase. Because on-site construction operations must comply with dust control and other measures prescribed by SCAQMD Rule 403, compliance with dust control rules is assumed in the analysis.

Table 2 shows that construction equipment/vehicle emissions during construction periods would not exceed any of the SCAQMD established daily emissions thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the SCAQMD construction emissions thresholds and short-term (construction) air quality impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

**Table 2: Short-Term Regional Construction Emissions**

Construction Phase	Total Regional Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day)							
	VOC	NOx	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	Fugitive PM <sub>10</sub>	Exhaust PM <sub>10</sub>	Fugitive PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Exhaust PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Site Preparation	1.76	19.51	8.25	0.02	5.89	0.88	2.98	0.81
Grading	1.46	16.07	6.97	0.02	5.00	0.74	2.55	0.68
Building Construction	2.29	16.11	13.65	0.02	0.04	0.92	0.01	0.89
Paving	0.90	8.49	9.41	0.01	0.15	0.47	0.04	0.43
Architectural Coatings	5.99	1.69	1.87	0.00	0.01	0.11	0.00	0.11
Peak Daily Emissions	1.76	19.51	8.25	0.02	5.89		0.88	
SCAQMD Thresholds	75.00	100.00	550.00	150.00	150.00		55.00	
Exceedance?	No	No	No	No	No		No	

Source: Compiled by LSA Associates, Inc. (November 2018).

Note: Column totals may not add due to rounding from the model results.

CO = carbon monoxide

NOx = nitrogen oxides

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

SO<sub>2</sub> = sulfur dioxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

VOC = volatile organic compounds

Long-Term Operational Emissions

Long-term air pollutant emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources involving any project-related changes. The proposed project would result in net increases in both stationary- and mobile-source emissions. The stationary-source emissions would come from area and energy sources. Operational emissions associated with the proposed project (including energy use for appliances, landscaping equipment, use of consumer products, and motor vehicles) were calculated using CalEEMod and are shown in Table 3. Trip generation rates were taken from the project’s Trip Generation Memorandum. Table 3 shows that the increase in all criteria pollutants as a result of the proposed project would not exceed the corresponding SCAQMD daily emission thresholds for any criteria pollutants. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**Table 3: Regional Operational Emissions**

Source	Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day)					
	VOC	NOx	CO	SOx	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Area	0.14	<0.01	<0.01	0	0	0
Energy	0.05	0.46	0.38	<0.01	0.03	0.03
Mobile	5.42	22.75	42.58	0.12	8.62	2.39
<b>Total Emissions</b>	<b>5.60</b>	<b>23.21</b>	<b>42.97</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>8.65</b>	<b>2.42</b>
<b>SCAQMD Thresholds</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>55.0</b>	<b>550.0</b>	<b>150.0</b>	<b>150.0</b>	<b>55.0</b>
Exceedance?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: Compiled by LSA (November 2018).

Note: Column totals may not add due to rounding from the model results.

CO = carbon monoxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

NOx = nitrogen oxides

PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

SOx = sulfur oxides

VOC = volatile organic compounds

c) The proposed project would be required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short term air pollutant emissions. As shown in **Tables 2 and 3**, the project does not exceed pollution thresholds for VOC, NOx, CO, SOx, and Particulate Matter (PM) emissions. However, the basin is in a nonattainment status for PM10 emissions. Therefore, SCAQMD Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures (BACMs) so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 403 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off site. Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rule 403 are summarized below. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the PM10 component). Compliance with these rules would reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors to a level of

insignificance and no mitigation is required.

SCAQMD Rule 403 Measures

- Water active sites at least three times daily (locations where grading is to occur will be thoroughly watered prior to earthmoving).
- All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard in accordance with the requirements of California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114 (freeboard means vertical space between the top of the load and top of the trailer).
- Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 mph or less.

d) Odor complaints are most commonly associated with agricultural land uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, and landfills, etc. SCAQMD Rule 402 (Nuisance) and the California Health and Safety Code, Division 26, Part 4, Chapter 3, Section 541700, prohibit the emission of any material that causes nuisance to a considerable number of persons or endangers the comfort, health, or safety of the public. Potential operational airborne odors could result from cooking activities associated with the restaurant buildings. These odors would be similar to those at existing restaurant uses in Page Plaza and confined to the immediate vicinity of the new buildings in accordance with the Riverside County Department of Health Regulations. The other potential source of odors would be the new trash receptacles at the new buildings and the neighborhood park planned for the proposed project. However, the receptacles would have lids and would be emptied on a regular basis, before potentially substantial odors would have a chance to develop. Therefore, there would be no significant adverse air quality impact with respect to objectionable odors that could affect a substantial number of people. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

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

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:

a) Have an 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 type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies and regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Have an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: Riverside Conservation Authority <https://www.wrc-rca.org/rcamaps/>, City of Hemet 2030 General Plan, City of Hemet Municipal Code, Chapter 90, Page Plaza Initial Study, Michael Brandman Associates, April 2001, The MSCHP <http://www.rctlma.org/mshcp>.

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) Before the commercial center was developed, a field survey was performed by Michael Brandman Associates that identified no sensitive plant or wildlife communities. Despite its developed condition, the project site lies within the historic range of the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR). The Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA) prepared a Habitat Conservation Plan for the (SKR). Under that plan, the USFWS and DFG authorized a limited amount of incidental take subject to conservation and mitigation actions. The HCP area covers 533,954 acres within RCHCA member jurisdictions, including approximately 30,000 acres of occupied SKR habitat. The RCHCA has established a regional system of eight core reserves for conservation of SKR and the ecosystem upon which it depends. The core reserves encompass about 51,200 acres, including 15,000 acres of SKR-occupied habitat. Most land included in these reserves is presently in public ownership; some privately held properties remain in the Lake Mathews-Estelle Mountain, Lake Skinner-Domenigoni Valley, and San Jacinto-Lake Perris reserves. The land acquisition requirement under the SKR HCP has been met, and any private lands in and around the established SKR reserves are not part of a reserve. Hemet's implementing regulations for the SKR HCP are found in Sections 58-91 through 58-104 of the Hemet Municipal Code. The proposed project will be required to pay mitigation fees pursuant to the Hemet Municipal Code. Therefore the impact is less than significant.

b) The project site has been graded as part of a larger commercial center that serves as an infill development. The property does not contain any natural habitat, including riparian or other sensitive communities. Therefore there is no impact.

c) The project site has been graded as part of a larger commercial center that serves as an infill development. The property does not contain any wetlands habitat. Therefore there is no impact.

d) The project site is identified as **Residential/Urban/Exotic in Exhibit 4.4-1 (Vegetation map) of the Hemet General Plan**. The designation denotes the urban development that has occurred within the project area and has included previous grading of the project site in preparation of the development now proposed. In the absence of supporting habitat, no impact on native wildlife is identified.

e) The proposed project will comply with Chapter 31 and Sections 58-91 through 58-104 of the Hemet

Municipal Code to mitigate impacts upon the Stephens Kangaroo Rat. Therefore, no conflict with local policies or ordinances will occur.

f) The Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) is a multi-jurisdictional effort that includes the entire unincorporated area of western Riverside County and fourteen cities, including the City of Hemet. The MSHCP covers 146 species and addresses biological diversity within 1.26 million acres, from just west of the San Jacinto Mountains to the Orange County border. The MSHCP is designed to protect more than 30 federally-threatened and endangered species, and to conserve 510,000 acres of native habitat, of which 347,000 acres are already in public and quasi-public ownership. The MSHCP serves as a HCP pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the federal ESA, as well as a Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP) under the NCCP Act of 2001. Though the USFWS and DFG have authority to regulate the take of threatened and endangered species, consistent with the terms and conditions of approval of the MSHCP, the USFWS and DFG have granted "Take Authorization" for otherwise lawful actions in Hemet General Plan FEIR AECOM City of Hemet 4.4-5 Biological Resources exchange for the assembly and management of coordinated MSHCP Conservation Areas for 146 "covered species" (including 14 narrow endemic plant species). Of the 146 "covered species," 118 species are considered "adequately conserved" within the MSHCP. The primary intent of the MSHCP is to provide for the conservation of a range of plants and animals and in return, provide take coverage and mitigation for projects throughout Western Riverside County to avoid the cost and delays of mitigating biological impacts on a project-by-project basis. It allows the incidental take (for development purposes) of species and their habitat from development.

The MSHCP establishes Criteria Areas which represent the areas within which MSHCP Criteria will be applied and from which 153,000 acres of new conservation will be achieved to contribute toward assembly of the overall MSHCP Conservation Area. Criteria have been developed for individual cells or cell groupings and are presented for each Area Plan in the MSCHP. The Hemet planning area is within the San Jacinto Valley Area Plan and is closest to or contains portions of Criteria Area Subunits 3 and 4. Specific criteria for each Criteria Area, subunit, cell group, and cell are contained in the MSHCP.

As an urban infill project, the project is not located within a Criteria Unit, subunit, cell group, or cell contained in the MSHCP. Therefore, the project is not in conflict with a habitat conservation plan resulting in no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources: Page Plaza Initial Study, Michael Brandman Associates, April 2001, City of Hemet 2030 General Plan

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a-b) Exhibit 4.5-1 Cultural Resource Sensitivity identifies the project site as having a Medium potential for cultural resources. Prior to the development of Page Plaza commercial center, the initial study for that project recognized the potential for subsurface resources to exist within the property. Mitigation called for monitoring the grading operation by a qualified archaeologist. That mitigation was accomplished. Due to additional grading for building footings and utilities, additional mitigation has been requested as provided in Section XVIII: Tribal Cultural Resources. No historic resources have been identified on the project site.

c) Prior to the development of the Page Plaza commercial center, a cemetery was located at the northwest corner of the property. A mitigation measure was applied that required that the County Coroner be contacted in the event human remains were encountered during grading operations. That mitigation has been accomplished. The proposed project is located at the southeast corner of the original project site, well removed from the cemetery location. See Section XVIII Tribal Consultation for any further actions to be taken.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. ENERGY</b>				
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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources <sup>1</sup>California Energy Commission. Total System Electric Generation. Website: [https://www.energy.ca.gov/almanac/electricity\\_data/total\\_system\\_power.html](https://www.energy.ca.gov/almanac/electricity_data/total_system_power.html) (accessed March 27, 2019).  
<sup>2</sup>California Energy Commission. California Energy Demand 2018-2030 Revised Forecast. Website: [https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/URLRedirectPage.aspx?TN=TN222287\\_20180120T141708\\_The\\_California\\_Energy\\_Demand\\_20182030\\_Revised\\_Forecast.pdf](https://efiling.energy.ca.gov/URLRedirectPage.aspx?TN=TN222287_20180120T141708_The_California_Energy_Demand_20182030_Revised_Forecast.pdf) (accessed March 27, 2019).  
<sup>3</sup>U.S. Department of Transportation. "Table 4-23: Average Fuel Efficiency of U.S. Light Duty Vehicles." Website: [https://www.bts.gov/archive/publications/national\\_transportation\\_statistics/table\\_04\\_23/](https://www.bts.gov/archive/publications/national_transportation_statistics/table_04_23/) (accessed March 27, 2019).  
<sup>4</sup>U.S. Department of Energy. "Energy Independence & Security Act of 2007." Website: <https://www.afdc.energy.gov/laws/eisa> (accessed March 27, 2019).

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) Construction. The anticipated construction schedule assumes that the project would be built in approximately 10 months. The project construction would involve site preparation and grading, utility installation, paving, and building construction and architectural coating.

Energy would be consumed during construction and operation of the proposed project. Construction would require energy for the manufacture and transportation of building materials, preparation of the site for grading activities, utility installation, paving, and building construction and architectural coating. Petroleum fuels (e.g., diesel and gasoline) would be the primary sources of energy for these activities. However,

energy usage on the project site during construction would be temporary in nature. Energy usage during construction of the project would only utilize the energy required and would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary. Therefore, construction energy impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

Operation. The project includes the development of two drive-through restaurants on the proposed lots and a portion of the parking lot within the existing commercial complex. In total, the project would construct 6,200 sf of restaurant building area.

During project operation, electricity would be the main form of energy consumed on the site. Electricity would be used for building heating and cooling, lighting, and water heating. **Table 4** presents the energy use of the proposed project. It should be noted that the estimated electricity, natural gas consumption, and motor vehicle gasoline use for the proposed uses is only for the portion of the proposed restaurant uses; the retail stores at the Page Plaza shopping center are not included.

**Table 4: Estimated Annual Energy Use of Existing and Proposed Project**

Land Use	Electricity Use (kWh/year)	Natural Gas (Btu/year)	Patrons and Employees Vehicles Gasoline (gallons/year)
6,200 sf Commercial Use	294,376	1,695,330	181,490

Source: California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). Compiled by LSA. March 2019.  
 kWh = kilowatt hours  
 Btu = British thermal units  
 sf = square feet

As shown in **Table 4**, proposed uses on the site would generate a total of 294,376 kWh of electricity per year. The project would generate a net increase of 1,695,330 Btu of natural gas consumption on an annual basis. In addition, the project would result in energy usage associated with motor vehicle gasoline to fuel project-related trips. The proposed project would result in an increase of 3,794 net new daily trips and would have an annual VMT of 3,992,788. Using the 2015 fuel economy estimate of 22 mpg, the proposed project would result in the consumption of approximately 181,490 gallons of gasoline per year, (3,992,788 VMT per year/22 mpg = 181,490 gallons of gasoline per year).

The State of California provides a minimum standard for building design and construction standards through Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), known as the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC is updated every 3 years, and the current 2016 CBC went into effect in January 2017. Compliance with Title 24 is mandatory at the time new building permits are issued by local governments. The California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) adopted Part 11 of the Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (also referred to as the California Green Building Standards Code, or CALGreen) in 2010 as part of the State's efforts to reduce GHG emissions and reducing energy consumption from residential and nonresidential buildings. CALGreen code covers the following five categories: (1) planning and design, (2) energy efficiency, (3) water efficiency and conservation, (4) material conservation and resource efficiency, and (5) indoor environmental quality. The City has adopted both the CBC and CALGreen Code as part of Chapter 14, Building and Building Regulations, of the Municipal Code. The projected energy use of the project is representative of a worst-case scenario because the estimates do not account for energy efficiency measures that would be incorporated into the proposed project. The project would comply with the CALGreen Code requirements and Title 24 efficiency standards, which would further improve the energy efficiency of the project. In addition, as stated above, the existing energy use represents only the portion of the existing commercial building that is currently occupied.

Electricity is provided in the State through a complex grid of power plants and transmission lines. In 2017, California's in-state electric generation totaled 206,336 gigawatt-hours (GWh); the State's total system electric generation, which includes imported electricity, totaled 290,039 GWh<sup>1</sup>. Population growth is the primary source of increased energy consumption in the State; due to population projections, annual electricity use is anticipated to increase by approximately 1 percent per year through 2027<sup>2</sup>. The project's

net electricity usage would total less than 0.01 percent of electricity generated in the State in 2017, which would not represent a substantial demand on available electricity resources. (Calculation: 0.29 GWh (proposed project) / 206,336 GWh (generated in State in 2017) = < 0.01 percent).

The average fuel economy for light-duty vehicles (autos, pickups, vans, and SUVs) in the United States has steadily increased from about 14.9 mpg in 1980 to 22.0 mpg in 2015<sup>3</sup>. Federal fuel economy standards have changed substantially since the Energy Independence and Security Act was passed in 2007, which originally mandated a national fuel economy standard of 35 mpg by the year 2020, and would be applicable to cars and light trucks of Model Years 2011 through 2020<sup>4</sup>.

As stated previously, implementation of the proposed project would increase the project-related annual gasoline demand by 181,490 gallons. However, new automobiles purchased by patrons and employees driving to and from the project site would be subject to fuel economy and efficiency standards applied throughout the State. As such, the fuel efficiency of vehicles associated with the project site would increase throughout the life of the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in transportation-related energy uses.

In summary, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Consumption of energy resources as a result of implementation of the proposed project would be comparable to other restaurant developments in the City. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

b) The proposed project is required to comply with CALGreen Code, which includes provisions related to insulation and design aimed at minimizing energy consumption. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable plans related to renewable energy and energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: California Geological Survey: <https://geomaps.wr.usgs.gov/archive/scamp/graphic/ind>. City of Hemet 2030 General Plan. Soil Survey for Western Riverside County, USDA, 1971

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a-i) The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Alquist-Priolo Act) (California PRC Sections 2621–2630) was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures designed for human occupancy. The main purpose of the law is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The law addresses only the hazard of surface fault rupture and is not directed toward other earthquake hazards. The Alquist-Priolo Act requires the State Geologist to establish regulatory Earthquake Fault Zones around the surface traces of active faults and to issue appropriate maps. The maps are distributed to all affected cities, counties, and state agencies for their use in planning efforts. Before a project can be permitted in a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, cities and counties must require a geologic investigation to demonstrate that proposed buildings would not be constructed across active faults.

The nearest fault zones to the project site are the San Jacinto Fault that is associated with the San Jacinto River corridor, and the Casa Loma Fault, located in the northwest portion of the City of San Jacinto. Both faults are over five miles from the site. Therefore, the site does not lie within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

a-ii) Hemet is located near several known potential sources of strong seismic shaking (up to about 60 percent the force of gravity, “g”), including the numerous faults located within and near the planning area and described above under “Faults.” A major earthquake associated with any of these faults could result in moderate to severe ground shaking in the Hemet planning area.

The State of California provides minimum standards for building design through the California Building Standards Code (CBC, California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 24). General Plan Policy PS-1.1 calls for strictly enforcing the most recent state regulations governing seismic safety and structural design to minimize damage to structures from seismic or geologic hazards. Adherence to and implementation of Draft General Plan policies and programs requires compliance with existing state and local laws and regulations concerning fault rupture. Therefore, program-level impacts related to fault rupture would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

a-iii) Liquefaction, which may occur under strong ground shaking during earthquakes, is the transformation of granular sediment or fill material from a solid state to a temporarily liquid state. Liquefaction is a hazard because buildings on liquefying ground may sink or suffer structural damage. Evidence of liquefaction includes “sand boils,” which are expulsions of sand and water from below the surface due to increased pore-water pressure below the surface. Liquefaction during an earthquake requires strong shaking continuing for a long time and loose, clean granular materials (particularly sands) that may settle and compact because of the shaking.

Future land uses consistent with the General Plan would expose additional people and structures to hazards related to liquefaction and ground failure. However, General Plan policies and programs include a variety of actions aimed at protecting people and structures from soil liquefaction and ground failure. Policy PS-1.1 requires enforcement of state and local seismic and structural regulations (i.e., California Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, California Building Standards Code, and Hemet Municipal Code).

Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs requires implementation of existing state, and local laws and regulations concerning soil liquefaction and ground failure. Therefore, program-level impacts related to liquefaction and ground failure would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

a-iv) Landslide susceptibility is a function of various combinations of factors including rainfall, rock and soil types, slope, aspect, vegetation, seismic conditions, and human construction. Generally, landslides are expected to occur most often on slopes steeper than 15%, in areas with a history of landslides, and in areas underlain by certain geologic units. Based on these criteria, the project site is not at risk for landsliding. Therefore, there are no impacts related to landsliding and slope failure and no mitigation measures are required.

b) Because the site was previously graded as part of the larger shopping center much of the parking lot already exists, and there is no natural top soil on the site. The site is flat and lies below the grade of adjoining streets. The project is exempt from the requirements of preparing a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) because the site, being less than one acre of disturbance area, has very limited potential for erosion to occur. Therefore, potential erosion impacts are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Collapsible soils are typically young, loose deposits that have the potential for significant abrupt volumetric change when wetted. An increase in surface water infiltration such as from heavy irrigation or prolonged rainfall or from a rise in the groundwater, combined with the weight of a structure, can initiate settlement. These materials typically affect foundations, slabs, and exterior improvements to properties. Current provisions in building codes are considered suitable for design at sites with collapsible expansive soils. Ground subsidence is typically associated with regional changes in ground surface elevation associated with seismic warping, lowering of groundwater through pumping, and removal of oil and natural gas through pumping. Ground subsidence is occurring beneath the planning area, primarily due to groundwater withdrawal. However, these movements are distributed over large areas and, as a consequence, rarely produce damage.

Policies and programs in the General Plan include a variety of actions aimed at protecting people and structures from soil hazards. Policy PS-1.1 would require enforcement of state and local seismic and

structural regulations (i.e., California Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, California Building Standards Code, Hemet Municipal Code, and NPDES Permit Requirements). Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs would require compliance with state and local regulations, state-licensed surveys of soil and geologic conditions, and mitigation for any potential soil hazards. Therefore, program-level impacts related to soil hazards, including landslides, debris flows, subsidence, expansive soils, and collapsible soils would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d) The project site contains San Emigdio and Traver soils. These soils are well-drained sandy loam that shrink during compaction. Additional soils may have been imported during the grading for the center to balance soil shrinkage. Fine-grained native soils, bedrock, and artificial fill soils, consisting predominantly of silt and clay, may contain clay minerals that are susceptible to expansion upon addition of water and contraction under drying conditions. Certain clay minerals with high plasticity have higher potential for expansion. These materials can affect performance of foundations, slabs, and exterior property improvements. Most soil associations in the planning area have low shrink-swell potential, but expansive materials may exist in portions of the planning area. Current building code provisions are considered suitable for design at sites with expansive soils. Therefore, foundation designs should include proper characterization of the hazard through soils investigations and follow building codes and local experience. With these provisions, the impact from expansive soils will be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

e) The proposed project will be required to connect to a community sewer system operated by the Eastern Municipal Water District. Sewer connections are available at the site. Therefore there is no impact on soil capabilities for septic systems.

f) Older Pleistocene alluvial deposits have high potential to contain paleontological resources, and so are considered to have high paleontological sensitivity. These older Pleistocene sediments are present in the surface in the southern (generally south of Johnston Avenue), and also in the western (generally west of Warren Road) portion of the planning area. Surface exposure of older Pleistocene sediments generally occurs on the lower slopes of hills or mountains. A paleontologically important rock unit is one that: 1) has a high potential paleontological productivity rating, and 2) is known to have produced unique, scientifically important fossils.

The General Plan policies and programs include a variety of actions aimed at protecting paleontological resources. **Policy HR-2.3** would require resources found prior to or during site development be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist, and would require appropriate mitigation measures be implemented before resumption of development activities when resources are found. **Program HR-P-10** would require the City to use the development review process to require appropriate paleontological surveys. In this instance, the project site has undergone grading and soil re-compaction, that results in minor trenching activity for utilities. Therefore, there would be no impact on paleontological resources and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>				
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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources: Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis: Proposed Drive-Through Fast-Food Restaurants at the Existing Page Plaza, City of Hemet, California, November 28, 2018, LSA

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) Construction and operation of project development would generate GHG emissions. Overall, the following activities associated with the proposed project could contribute directly or indirectly to the generation of GHG emissions:

- **Construction Activities:** During construction of the project, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and vendor vehicles, which typically use fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs (e.g., CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O). Furthermore, CH<sub>4</sub> is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment.
- **Motor Vehicle Use:** Transportation associated with the proposed project would result in GHG emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels in daily automobile and truck trips.
- **Gas, Electricity, and Water Use:** Natural gas use results in the emission of two GHGs: CH<sub>4</sub> (the major component of natural gas) and CO<sub>2</sub> (from the combustion of natural gas). Electricity use can result in GHG production if the electricity is generated by combusting fossil fuel. California’s water conveyance system is energy-intensive.
- **Solid Waste Disposal:** Solid waste generated by the project could contribute to GHG emissions in a variety of ways. Landfilling and other methods of disposal use energy for transporting and managing the waste, and produce additional GHGs to varying degrees. Landfilling, the most common waste management practice, results in the release of CH<sub>4</sub> from the anaerobic decomposition of organic materials. CH<sub>4</sub> is 25 times more potent a GHG than CO<sub>2</sub>. However, landfill CH<sub>4</sub> can also be a source of energy. In addition, many materials in landfills do not decompose fully and the carbon that remains is sequestered in the landfill and not released into the atmosphere.

GHG emissions associated with project construction would occur over the short term from construction activities and would consist primarily of emissions from equipment exhaust. Long-term regional emissions would also be associated with project-related new vehicular trips and stationary source emissions (e.g., natural gas used for heating and electricity usage for lighting). The calculations presented below includes construction emissions in terms of CO<sub>2</sub> and annual CO<sub>2</sub>e GHG emissions from increased energy consumption, water usage, solid waste disposal, and estimated GHG emissions from vehicular traffic that would result from implementation of the proposed project.

Construction GHG Emissions

During construction of the proposed project, GHGs would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and vendor vehicles, each of which typically uses fossil based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O. Furthermore, CH<sub>4</sub> is emitted during the fueling of heavy equipment. Exhaust emissions from on-site construction activities would vary daily as construction activity levels change. **Table 5** lists the annual GHG emissions

from construction of the proposed project.

**Table 5: Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Construction Phase	Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MT/yr)			
	CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub> e
Site Preparation - 2019	1.63	<0.01	0	1.64
Grading - 2019	2.70	<0.01	0	2.72
Building Construction - 2019	159.37	0.03	0	160.12
Building Construction - 2020	28.98	<0.01	0	29.11
Paving - 2020	6.52	<0.01	0	6.57
Architectural Coating - 2020	1.33	<0.01	0	1.33
<b>Total Construction Emissions</b>	<b>200.53</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>201.49</b>
<b>Amortized over 30 years</b>	<b>6.68</b>	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6.72</b>

Source: Compiled by LSA (November 2018).

Note: Column totals may not add due to rounding from the model results.

CH<sub>4</sub> = methane

CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide

CO<sub>2</sub>e = carbon dioxide equivalent

MT/yr = metric tons per year

N<sub>2</sub>O = nitrous oxide

Per the SCAQMD guidance,12 due to the long-term nature of the GHGs in the atmosphere, instead of determining significance of construction emissions alone, the total construction emissions are amortized over 30 years (an estimate of the life of the proposed project), added to the operational emissions, and compared to the applicable GHG significance threshold. Amortized construction GHG emissions from Table I (6.72 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr) have been added to the operational GHG emissions in **Table 6** below.

#### Operational GHG Emissions

Operation of the proposed project would generate GHG emissions from area and mobile sources and indirect emissions from stationary sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source emissions of GHGs would include project-generated vehicle trips associated with on-site facilities and customers and employees to the project site. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities including landscaping and maintenance of proposed land uses, natural gas for cooking and heating, and other sources. Increases in stationary-source emissions would also occur at off-site utility providers as a result of demand for electricity, natural gas, and water by the proposed uses.

In 2006, the California legislature passed AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The law establishes a limit on GHG emissions for the State of California to reduce statewide emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. As a response, a project partnership led by the Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), has compiled an inventory of GHG emissions and developed reduction measures that could be adopted by the Partnership Cities of western Riverside County. Once adopted, the Subregional Climate Action Plan will serve as the basis for cities in western Riverside County to develop more detailed community-level climate action plans (CAPs). The City of Hemet's CAP, released in October 2018, builds on the regional work and refines it to provide City-specific information and to develop the local implementation plan for City-selected GHG reduction measures. The CAP identifies how the GHG reduction measures will be implemented and monitored by the City to ensure that progress is being made toward the GHG reduction target. The two relevant measures listed in the City of Hemet's CAP are applicable to the proposed project:

**CAP Policy R2-E2:** New Commercial Energy Efficiency. Increase energy efficiency in new commercial development an average 10 percent beyond 2008 Title 24 standards.

**CAP Policy R2-W2:** Water Conservation Strategies. Reduce water consumption in new developments by 20 percent through low-flush toilets, landscape ordinance, incentive programs, on-site storm water capture, and other similar programs.

The GHG emission estimates presented in **Table 6** show the emissions associated with the level of development envisioned by the proposed project at opening. Area sources include architectural coatings, consumer products, and landscaping. Energy sources include natural gas consumption for heating and

cooking. The proposed project will implement **CAP Policies R2-E2 and R2-W2** in order to aid in achieving the State’s emission reduction objectives in AB 32 and SB 32. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

**Table 6: Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Source	Pollutant Emissions (MT/yr)					
	Bio-CO <sub>2</sub>	NBio-CO <sub>2</sub>	Total CO <sub>2</sub>	CH <sub>4</sub>	N <sub>2</sub> O	CO <sub>2</sub> e
Total Construction emissions amortized over 30 years	0	6.68	6.68	<0.01	0	6.71
Area Sources	0	<0.01	<0.01	0	0	<0.01
Energy Sources	0	90.47	90.47	<0.01	<0.01	91.01
Mobile Sources	0	1,983.86	1,983.86	0.13	0	1,987.09
Waste Sources	14.50	0	14.50	0.86	0	35.92
Water Usage	0.60	0	0.60	0.06	<0.01	2.56
<b>Total Proposed Project Emissions</b>	<b>15.09</b>	<b>2,081.01</b>	<b>2,096.11</b>	<b>1.05</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,123.28</b>

Source: Compiled by LSA (November 2018)

Note: Column totals may not add due to rounding from the model results.

Bio-CO<sub>2</sub> = biologically generated CO<sub>2</sub>

CH<sub>4</sub> = methane

CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide

CO<sub>2</sub>e = carbon dioxide equivalent

MT/yr = metric tons per year

N<sub>2</sub>O = nitrous oxide

NBio-CO<sub>2</sub> = Non-biologically generated CO<sub>2</sub>

SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District

b) The proposed project could have the potential to conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The applicable plan for the proposed project is the City of Hemet CAP. The CAP’s GHG emission targets and goals are based on meeting the goals in AB 32 and SB 32 and established in the ARB 2017 Scoping Plan. The CAP supports four of the climate change action categories through energy efficiency, green building, recycling/waste, and water conservation through the proposed goals, objectives, and policies listed in the Conservation Element.

The California Governor issued EO S-3-05, GHG Emissions, in June 2005, which established the following reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- 2020: Reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- 2050: Reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

Implementing projects that are in compliance with the above mandatory CAP GHG reduction measures would result in a decrease of GHG emissions. The project proposes sustainability and efficiency measures consistent with the CALGreen Building Code and will be required to comply with the City’s CAP. These measures will be applied to the proposed project to reduce GHG emissions.

The following are the criteria for determining consistency with the CAP:

1. Is the project consistent with the General Plan land use designation?

**Determination:** Development of the project site would be General Commercial, which is consistent with the land uses specified in the City of Hemet’s General Plan. Therefore, the project meets this criterion.

2. Is the project consistent with the General Plan population and employment projections for the site, upon which the CAP modeling is based?

**Determination:** The City of Hemet General Plan’s build-out of population, housing, and employment figures has anticipated development of the project site as retail commercial zoning. This zoning plan and

projection were used in the preparation of the CAP. Therefore, the project meets this criterion.

3. Does the project incorporate the following CAP measures as binding and enforceable components of the project? Until these measures have been formally adopted by the City and incorporated in to applicable codes, the requirements must be incorporated as mitigation measures applicable to the project (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15183.5(b)(2)).

**Determination:** A project may demonstrate consistency with the CAP through incorporation of energy efficient building standards and indoor water conservation. The CAP measures selected would be included as building permit conditions and verified prior to the issuance of final certificate of occupancy. The project’s conformance with the CAP measure is described below.

**CAP Policy R2-E2: New Commercial Energy Efficiency.** Increase energy efficiency in new commercial development an average 10 percent beyond 2008 Title 24 standards.

**Consistent:** The proposed project will be required to be designed to meet Title 24 Part 6 year 2016 Building Energy Efficiency standards that provide over 40 percent greater efficiency than the 2008 Energy Efficiency Standards.

**CAP Policy R2-W2: Water Conservation Strategies.** Reduce water consumption in new developments by 20 percent through low-flush toilets, landscape ordinance, incentive programs, on-site storm water capture, and other similar programs.

**Consistent:** The proposed project will utilize water fixtures that are sold in California that are required to meet CCR Title 20, Sections 1601 – 1608 that require all water fixtures to be low flow and provide an average water use reduction of 30 percent. Project design features identified by the project would implement CAP measures R2-E2, and R2-W2. Therefore, the project meets this criterion.

Based on the analysis above, with implementation of the CAP GHG reduction measures, the project will be consistent with and will be built upon the goals, policies, and implementation programs contained in the adopted City CAP. Therefore, the proposed project will be consistent and not conflict with applicable City policies, regulations, or CAP adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. GHG impacts would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

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

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

Would the project:

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X
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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control, <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/>. Hemet Unified School District, <https://www.hemetusd.org/apps/maps/>. City of Hemet 2030 General Plan.

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) As restaurant uses, the proposed project must meet cleanliness standards to pass inspections by the Riverside County Health Department. Therefore, chemicals will be used in the form of cleaning supplies. Restaurant uses will also require the transport of used cooking oils. Since these uses involve materials that directly or indirectly may involve ingestion by humans, no hazardous materials will be used. Therefore, no transport of hazardous materials is associated with the proposed project and no impact will occur.

b) As restaurant uses, cooking will occur over controlled flame or heated coils which produces a potential fire hazard from accidents. Restaurants are subject to regular inspections by the Fire Department and Health Department to assure that conditions are clean and safe. The proposed uses will produce cooking emissions that do not pose a hazard to the public. Through compliance with the Building Code and routine inspections by Fire and Health officials, the potential impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Harmony Elementary School and West Valley High School are the nearest public schools to the project site and lie beyond a one-quarter mile radius. Since the proposed uses will not involve the use of hazardous substances, and the schools are more than one-quarter mile from the project site, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

d) According to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostar hazardous site locator, there are no hazardous sites located on or within one-half mile of the project site. Therefore, there is no hazard to the public or the environment resulting from this project and no mitigation is required.

e) The project site is located within two miles of the Hemet-Ryan Airport. Hemet-Ryan Airport is a County-owned, public use airport managed by the Riverside County Economic Development Agency. The Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics establishes statewide guidelines for airport land use compatible planning based on the State Aeronautics Act. Caltrans published the most recent edition of these standards in the California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook (CALUPH) in 2002. CALUPH standards address structures and functions of Airport Land Use Commissions (ALUCs), and provide guidance for assessing noise and safety compatibility.

The Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP), as adopted in 1992 and amended most recently in 2017, is the currently applicable Compatibility Plan for the Hemet-Ryan Airport. An Airport Influence Area is established around an airport using criteria defined by Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77. This criteria encompasses areas of concern with respect to noise, safety, and overflight. Basic Compatibility Criteria is the criteria used for assessing whether a land use plan, ordinance, or development proposal within an Airport Influence Zone is compatible. Basic Compatibility Criteria is reflected in Zones A through D. Zone D for the Hemet-Ryan Airport is divided at Cawston Avenue by Zone D (East) and Zone D (west). The project site is located within Zone D (West).

The ALUC development criteria for Zone D prohibits building heights in excess of 70 feet, discourages children's schools, hospitals, nursing homes; and requires a deed notice warning property owners of potential flight hazards. The maximum density per acre allowed in Zone D (West) is 800 people. The proposed project features two restaurants having a proposed building height of 32 feet. Based on the density tables in Appendix C1 of the ALUP, the proposed project will generate a density of 414 people per acre. At 1.95 acres, the density per acre of 212 people. The proposed project is therefore consistent with the Zone D (West) development criteria and the impact is less than significant. No mitigation is required.

f) As an infill development, all adjoin streets are constructed to their ultimate configurations and driveways providing access to the proposed uses are already established. As part of the development review, police and fire departments will evaluate the plan to assure that access during emergencies is available at all times. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

g) CAL FIRE has identified Wildland Fire Hazard Severity Zones throughout the City that are depicted in Exhibit 4.8-1 of the General Plan EIR. The project site is not located within any of the Wildland Fire Hazard Severity Zones. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

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

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:

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

Sources

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) Under the requirements of the 2010 Riverside County Area-wide Municipal Separate Storm Sewer (MS4) permit, the City is obligated to advise the development, construction, and business communities of the need to comply with proper general waste discharge permits. Dischargers whose projects disturb one (1) or more acres of soil, or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General

Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The project site involves the disturbance of less than one acre because the majority of the parking lot already exists. Therefore, under the provisions of the General Permit, the proposed project is exempt from the requirements of a SWPPP permit. The project is therefore less than significant and no mitigation is required.

The General Plan includes policies to protect water quality that include **CSI-2.8: Best Management Practice Features/Equipment** Require installation of best management practice features for water for all new development and for applicable rehabilitation. **CSI-4.3: Pollutant Discharge** Prevent pollutant discharge into storm drain systems and natural drainages and aquifers by cooperating in regional programs to implement the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program and providing education on best management practices for the public. **CSI-4.6: Aesthetic Design** Require use of landscaped swales and detention areas that provide percolation to the greatest extent possible using best management practices in order to promote sensitive and aesthetic design solutions for retaining on-site the incremental increases in runoff from a development site. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs requires compliance with existing federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations. Therefore, program-level impacts related to water quality standards would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

b) The proposed project will increased impervious surface coverage. Impervious surfaces lead to interference with groundwater recharge and depletion of groundwater supplies. Reductions in groundwater recharge in a given area could affect groundwater levels and the yield of hydrologically connected wells. Furthermore, groundwater is a source of drinking water within the planning area, and the Hemet-San Jacinto basins are currently in a state of overdraft, meaning more water is being removed than can be replaced by the natural recharge rate of the basin.

General Plan policies and programs are designed to protect groundwater resources in the planning area. **Policy CSI-2.7** would require the City to ensure that adequate aquifer recharge areas are preserved and protected, and **Program CSI-P-1** would require adoption of a multi-agency Groundwater Management Plan. **Policy CSI-4.4** would require projects to minimize stormwater runoff and provide onsite opportunities for groundwater recharge. In order to reduce demand for drinking water (and hence reduce demand for groundwater pumping in the plan area), General Plan **Policies CSI-2.6** and **CSI-2.8** require the use of BMPs to reduce water consumption, and require the installation of reclaimed water lines for all public area landscaping. **Program CSI-P.3** would require project review of discretionary projects to include reclaimed water lines connecting and serving the overall project, and implementation of a mechanism for funding of reclaimed water trunk lines. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs, and compliance with existing federal, state, and local laws and regulations concerning groundwater recharge and groundwater supplies, would result in a less-than-significant groundwater recharge impact. No mitigation measures are required.

c-i) The General Plan includes policies to control erosion and siltation. These include **PS-2.1: Clear Floodways** Ensure that waterways used for flood control are kept clear of obstructions and are regularly maintained. **PS-P-11: Floodway Modification.** If substantial modification to a floodway is proposed, design it to reduce adverse environmental effects to the maximum extent feasible, considering the following factors: stream scour and erosion protection and sedimentation. However, the project site has been graded with improvements in place to control runoff from the future pad areas. Therefore, future siltation from the site has extremely low potential. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c-ii and iii) Because the site was previously graded as part of the larger shopping center much of the parking lot already exists, and there is no natural top soil on the site. The site is flat and lies below the grade of adjoining streets. The project is therefore exempt from the requirements of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). As such, the project site does not possess size or characteristics that could generate significant impacts relating to erosion and increased surface runoff. The impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c-iv) The project site has been graded as part of a larger commercial center. Storm drain infrastructure has been installed to control surface water flows. The General Plan contains policies to guide changes to or perpetuation of drainage patterns. These include **CSI-4.2: 100-Year Storm Flows** Provide public storm drainage facilities to adequately accommodate expected 100-year flood flows. Ensure that roadways remain passable for at least one lane in each direction. **PS-2.2: Flood Area Preservation** Encourage flood control infrastructure that does not reduce the natural character or limit use of the site. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs requires compliance with existing federal, state, and local water quality laws and regulations. Therefore, program-level impacts related to drainage pattern alterations would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d) The project site is not located within a tsunami zone, but is within a Dam Inundation Zone. General Plan Exhibit 4.9-2 indicates that the project site could be impacted by failure of either the east or west dams of Diamond Valley Lake. Dam failure and inundation could occur when an earthquake, design flaw, or overflow during storms cause a dam to flood. Seismic waves can cause oscillations in enclosed bodies of water called seiche. The proposed project could be subject to seiche hazards from the Diamond Valley Lake.

General Plan policies and programs would prevent the exposure of people or structures to flood hazards, including dam inundation and seiche hazards. **Policies PS-2.1, and PS-2.2** would ensure waterways and channels are clear and preserved in a natural state. **Program CSI-P.5** would require the City to update the Master Flood Control and Drainage Plan, identifying upgrade and maintenance needs. Implementation of **Programs PS-P-7, PS-P-8, PS-P-9, PS-P-11, and PS-P-12** would ensure potential flood hazards are mitigated, require identification of funding sources, require incorporation of state and federal flood zone regulations into the City's Municipal Code, require appropriate flood control facilities for all development, and require site-specific studies to identify setbacks from a floodway. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs and compliance with existing federal, state, and local flood hazard laws and regulations would result in a less-than-significant flood hazard impact. No mitigation is required.

e) The proposed project will be required to implement the following policies and programs of the General Plan for water quality control and ground water management. For ground water management, **Policy CSI-2.7** would require the City to ensure that adequate aquifer recharge areas are preserved and protected, and **Program CSI-P-1** would require adoption of a multi-agency Groundwater Management Plan. **Policy CSI-4.4** would require projects to minimize stormwater runoff and provide onsite opportunities for groundwater recharge. In order to reduce demand for drinking water (and hence reduce demand for groundwater pumping in the plan area), **General Plan Policies CSI-2.6 and CSI-2.8** require the use of BMPs to reduce water consumption, and require the installation of reclaimed water lines for all public area landscaping. **Program CSI-P.3** would require project review of discretionary projects to include reclaimed water lines connecting and serving the overall project, and implementation of a mechanism for funding of reclaimed water trunk lines. For water quality control, **CSI-2.8: Best Management Practice Features/Equipment** Require installation of best management practice features for water for all new development and for applicable rehabilitation. **CSI-4.3: Pollutant Discharge** Prevent pollutant discharge into storm drain systems and natural drainages and aquifers by cooperating in regional programs to implement the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program and providing education on best management practices for the public. **CSI-4.6: Aesthetic Design** Require use of landscaped swales and detention areas that provide percolation to the greatest extent possible using best management practices in order to promote sensitive and aesthetic design solutions for retaining on-site the incremental increases in runoff from a development site. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs and compliance with existing federal, state, and local water quality and ground water management regulations would result in a less-than-significant flood hazard impact. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: City of Hemet 2030 General Plan, City of Hemet Municipal Code, Chapter 90, Page Plaza Specific Plan, Page Plaza Partners May 2001.

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) General Plan **Land Use Policy LU-3.2** requires Preservation of Stable, Existing Neighborhoods Preserve the integrity, quality and livability of Hemet’s existing residential neighborhoods by requiring that new and infill development be designed to complement existing residential uses, density and character. **Land Use Policy LU-3.5: Buffering of New Development.** Require new development to provide a transition from adjoining development of different land uses and intensity through the use of buffers, setbacks, edge treatments, site design, landscaping and building scale and orientation. The proposed project is an infill development within an existing community that includes residential uses to the east and south. The project has been designed with a maximum building height of less than 32 feet where landscaped setbacks and edge treatments have been provided. These elements serve to assure compatibility with the mass and intensity of development that compliments the community, and avoids a physical divide within the community. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs and compliance with Municipal Code, as evidenced by the project development plans, will result in no impact upon the community. No mitigation is required.

b) The proposed project is consistent with the Community Commercial Land Use designation of the Hemet General Plan. The project serves to implement **General Plan Policy GV P2.1** to promote infill development and redevelopment to revitalize existing communities; **GV P2.3** to Promote “people scaled,” walkable communities based on the scale and intensity of the proposed project; and **GV P4.2** Focus development in urban centers. The proposed project is consistent with the relevant land use policies of the General Plan. The project is located within the Page Plaza Specific Plan and is zoned as Specific Plan (SP). Drive through facilities are a conditionally permitted use within the specific plan. The design of the project meets the parking, landscaping, height, and setback requirements. Based on the above, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and the Page Plaza Specific Plan. Adherence to and implementation of General Plan policies and programs, compliance with Municipal Code, and the Page Plaza Specific Plan will result in no conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact 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"/>	X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on the general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: California Department of Conservation, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/mineralresources/> County of Riverside, [https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general\\_plan\\_2015/DEIR 521/04-14\\_MineralResources.pdf](https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/0/genplan/general_plan_2015/DEIR_521/04-14_MineralResources.pdf)

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) Mineral Land Classification (MLC) studies are produced by the California State Geologist as specified by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA, PRC 2710 et seq.) of 1975. To address mineral resource conservation, SMARA mandated a two-phase process called classification-designation. Classification is carried out by the State Geologist and designation is a function of the State Mining and Geology Board. The classification studies evaluate the mineral resources and present this information in the form of Mineral Resource Zones throughout the State. Figure 4.14-1 of the Riverside County RCIP EIR depicts Mineral Resource Zones in Riverside County. The City of Hemet does not have a Mineral Resource Zone, therefore there is no impact in the loss of mineral resources as a result of the proposed project. No mitigation is required.

b) No mineral resources are identified on or near the project site in the environmental impact reports for the Hemet General Plan, the Page Plaza Specific Plan, or referenced in the Municipal Code. Therefore, there is no evidence of an impact on mineral resources and no mitigation is required.

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

**XIII. NOISE**

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the general plan or noise ordinance, or other applicable standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources: Drive-Thru Speakerphone Noise Analysis: Proposed Fast-Food Restaurants at the Existing Page Plaza, City of Hemet, California, LSA Associates, August 6, 2018

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) The project would include two drive-thru speakerphones which would be used during the operation of the proposed fast-food restaurants. The City of Hemet regulates noise through the Noise Subsection of the Public Safety Element within the City’s General Plan. In order to demonstrate that the proposed drive-thru speakerphones would not result in a substantial noise impact, compliance with the applicable standards must be demonstrated. **Table 7** presents the applicable standards for stationary source operations. Additionally, the noise levels specified shall be lowered by five (5) decibels for simple tone noises, noises consisting primarily of speech or music, or for recurring impulsive noises and the noise standard is to be applied at the property lines of the affected land use.

**Table 7: Noise Level Performance Standards for Non-Transportation Noise Sources**

Noise Level Descriptor	Daytime (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.)	Nighttime (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.)
Hourly average level ( $L_{eq}$ )	60 dBA	45 dBA
Maximum equivalent level ( $L_{max}$ )	75 dBA	65 dBA

Source: Table 6.5 of the City of Hemet Public Safety Element (January 2012).  
dBA: A-weighted decibels

Analysis of the sound from the speakerphones assumed they would be positioned in a northwestern direction toward the ordering customer, that speakerphones would operate 24 hours a day, would operate simultaneously. Therefore, the nighttime noise level standard is more restrictive and sound was measured based on the nighttime noise level performance standards. Because the noise generated is primarily speech, the specific standards utilized are reduced to 40 dBA Leq and 60 dBA Lmax. The model for the proposed speakerphones is the HM Electronics, Inc. (HME) SPP2 speaker post. The factory recommended operating settings of the speakerphones result in a noise level of 84 dBA at a distance of 1 foot.

The closest off-site sensitive receptors are the single-family homes south of the proposed location of the speakerphones. The homes are approximately 95 feet south of Page Plaza and approximately 130 feet south of the proposed drive-thru speakerphones. The single-family homes are opposite roadways which contribute heavily to ambient noise levels during daytime hours, but may be relatively quiet during the more sensitive nighttime hours.

A noise model was run which assumed operations utilizing the pre-set, factory recommended settings. Noise levels at the closest single-family homes south of the proposed speakerphones were found to exceed the nighttime noise standard of 40 dBA Leq.

The HME speakerphones have the option to incorporate automatic volume control into many of its systems. Audio Volume Control allows for an automated adjustment of the speakerphone volume based on the outdoor, ambient noise level. When ambient noise levels naturally decrease at night, Audio Volume Control will reduce the outbound noise level on the system. The Audio Volume Control would reduce noise levels by 24 dBA as compared to the factory recommended preset levels. The noise modeling results showed that noise levels are well below the nighttime standards of 40 dBA Leq and 60 dBA Lmax at the nearest sensitive residential uses. Therefore, Audio Volume Control shall be utilized during the nighttime operations of the speakerphones to comply with the City's noise standards. The impact is less than significant with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1.

b) The vicinity of the project site is subjected to intermittent vibration from trains along the BNSF railroad, aircraft at the Hemet-Ryan airport, and heavy truck traffic along Sanderson Avenue. The proposed project will generate temporary vibration during construction. Pile driving equipment is not expected to be used that would generate vibration decibel levels of 93 to 125 VdB. Bulldozers and smaller equipment are expected to generate vibration decibels of 87 VdB or less.

Caltrans has a recommended standard of 0.2 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) with respect to the prevention of structural damage for normal buildings and the FTA maximum acceptable vibration standard of 80 vibration decibels (VdB) with respect to human response for residential uses (i.e., annoyance) at vibration-sensitive land uses. Because potential construction-related vibration is intermittent and temporary, and the type of equipment that generates extremely high vibration levels is not expected to be used, the impact is less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures

**NOI-1:** Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, evidence shall be submitted to the Planning Department that the speakerphones for each drive through restaurant have been equipped with an Audio Volume Control device and that said device is operational.

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

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Displace existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) The proposed project is an infill commercial development that will serve primarily an existing population

in the area. Utilities exist at the site so there are no extension of utilities that would induce growth elsewhere. The project serves to implement the land use designations of the Hemet General Plan and the Page Plaza Specific Plan. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

b) The site of the proposed project is a vacant development pad that was prepared for future commercial use. The project will not cause the removal of housing that would need to be replaced elsewhere. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

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

## XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Other public services/facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources; City of Hemet general Plan, City of Hemet Fire Department: <http://www.cityofhemet.org/index.aspx?NID=185>, City of Hemet Police Department: <http://www.cityofhemet.org/index.aspx?NID=287>, Hemet Unified School District: <https://www.hemetusd.org/apps/pages/index>, Mt. San Jacinto Community College District: <https://www.msjc.edu/Pages/default.aspx>

### Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) The proposed project will generate an incremental increase in potential impacts upon public services. These impacts are described as follows:

Fire Protection: Fire protection services are provided by the Hemet Fire Department, which consists of an administration center, five fire stations, and a training facility. The nearest fire station is Fire Station No. 4 located one-half mile northeast from the site at 1035 S. Cawston Avenue. The facility can house up to six fire apparatus that include an engine company, truck, and brush rig.

Hemet General Plan **Policy PS-7.3:Development Impacts** Require development projects to contribute development impact fees, form public safety districts, or other financing mechanisms based on their proportional impact and on-going demand for fire services. The proposed project is conditioned to contribute the required development impact fees. Implementation of General Plan policies and programs by the City to ensure that new fire service facilities are funded and constructed to serve new development, and to impose development impact fees would reduce or avoid program-level impacts. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Police Protection: Law enforcement services are provided by the Hemet Police Department. The Department operates a headquarters and two community substations. The substations are staffed exclusively by volunteers. Operations include a patrol division, detective investigations division, traffic bureau, community services bureau, and a communications center to handle calls and dispatches.

Hemet General Plan **Policy PS-8.1: Police Services**. Ensures through the development review process that new development and redevelopment will not result in a reduction of law enforcement services below acceptable, safe levels. Maintain sufficient and adequate facilities, personnel, and services to meet the community's needs. The performance standard for police services in Hemet is a seven minute average response time for emergency calls maintained within urban areas, and a nine minute average response time for emergency calls maintained within rural areas. **Policy PS-8.1** requires the City to maintain high public safety standards related to police protection, such as response times. Policy PS-8.3 requires development projects to pay their proportional share of the cost of providing additional police protection and services, including development of new facilities. **Program PS-P-24** directs the City to prepare a Police Department Master Plan to assess current service levels and project five-year personnel, facility, and equipment needs, as well as funding strategies.

Implementation of General Plan policies and programs would ensure that police facilities and services would be funded and constructed as-needed to serve new development. General Plan policies and programs and mitigation measures would reduce or avoid program-level impacts. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Schools: The project site lies within the Hemet Unified School District (HUSD) and the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District. HUSD serves over 21,000 students and strives to maintain a 30:1 student teacher ratio. Mt. San Jacinto Community College is primarily funded through state funds. New development projects, including commercial developments, are assessed impact fees in accordance with SB 50 (1998) to finance capital improvements for public school facilities. Payment of these fees would help to ensure that adequate facilities are provided concurrently with growth. Under SB 50, payment of these fees in the amount required are deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impact, for the purpose of CEQA.

Parks: Park and recreation facilities in the area are maintained by four agencies: the City of Hemet, Valley-Wide Parks and Recreation District (Valley-Wide District), HUSD, and the Riverside County Department of Parks and Recreation. The area includes 17 parks and recreational facilities. Pursuant to Measure C, the City established a park ratio of 5.0 acres of developed parkland for every 1,000 residents. The City has met this standard citywide with the provision of neighborhood, community, and regional parks. The Hemet General Plan contains policies and programs that address the development and maintenance of local parks. As a commercial development, the proposed project will not generate impacts upon local parks. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

Other Services: Libraries: In 2003 the City opened a new library in a 50,000-square-foot building that houses 103,000 volumes along with other community facilities. The Hemet Library offers Internet access from 23 computers, a homework center, a public conference room, a large children's area including a dedicated storytelling room, and a heritage room for local history staffed by the local genealogy society. The Hemet General Plan contains policies to advance library services through: **CSI-9.4: Funding**. Maintain, expand, and develop public and quasi-public facilities by identifying and soliciting funding from additional sources to supplement cultural, community, and library facilities and services. **CSI-9.5: Impact**

**Fees.** Continue to use City-collected, library-specific impact fees for the development, expansion, or rehabilitation of existing library facilities. The proposed project will contribute a proportionate share of development impact fees. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVI. RECREATION</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that physical deterioration of the facility would be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: Hemet General Plan

Explanation of Checklist Responses

- a) As commercial development, the proposed project will not generate a population that will generate increased use of any recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not directly or indirectly contribute toward the deterioration of recreational facilities. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.
- b) The proposed project is an infill commercial development that does not include recreational facilities or require the construction of recreational facilities elsewhere. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b.?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: Focused Traffic Impact Analysis, Page Plaza, City of Hemet, Riverside County, California, LSA Associates, Inc., November 2018. Hemet General Plan

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) As shown in **Table 8**, the proposed project would, after accounting for pass-by trips, generate 1,907 net daily trips with 138 net trips occurring in the a.m. peak hour and 92 net trips occurring in the p.m. peak hour.

**Table 8 - Project Trip Generation**

Land Use	Units	A.M. Peak Hour			P.M. Peak Hour			Daily
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
<b>BLDG A - Starbucks with Drive-Through Window</b>	<b>2.50 TSF</b>							
Trips/Unit <sup>1</sup>		-	-	-	-	-	-	820.38
Trip Generation		63	58	121	28	36	64	2,051
Pass-by Trips <sup>2</sup>		(31)	(28)	(59)	(14)	(18)	(32)	(1,015)
<b>Total Net Trips</b>		<b>32</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>1,036</b>
<b>BLDG B - Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window</b>	<b>3.70 TSF</b>							
Trips/Unit <sup>3</sup>		20.50	19.69	40.19	16.99	15.68	32.67	470.95
Trip Generation		76	73	149	63	58	121	1,743
Pass-by Trips <sup>4</sup>		(37)	(36)	(73)	(32)	(29)	(61)	(872)
<b>Total Net Trips</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>871</b>
<b>Gross Trip Generation</b>		<b>139</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>3,794</b>
<b>Total Pass-By Trips</b>		<b>(68)</b>	<b>(64)</b>	<b>(132)</b>	<b>(46)</b>	<b>(47)</b>	<b>(93)</b>	<b>(1,887)</b>
<b>Total Net Trip Generation</b>		<b>71</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>1,907</b>

Note:

TSF = Thousand Square Feet.

1 A.M. and P.M. peak hour rates are based on vehicle counts of a similar facility (Starbucks with Drive-Through) located at 2281 W Esplanade Avenue, San Jacinto. Daily Rate is from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition), Land Use 937 - "Coffee/Donut Shop with Drive-Through Window", Setting/Location - "General Urban/Suburban."

2. As there were no pass-by rate available for Starbucks facility or Land Use 937 - "Coffee/Donut Shop with Drive-Through Window" in the ITE Trip Generation Handbook, pass-by rates for Land Use 934 - "Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window" has been used for the facility. A pass-by rate of 49% was used for the a.m. peak hour and a pass-by rate of 50% was used for the p.m. peak hour. Since there is no data available for daily pass-by trips, the average of a.m. and p.m. pass-by rates was used as the daily pass-by rate.

3. Rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (10th Edition), Land Use 934 - "Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window", Setting/Location - "General Urban/Suburban."

4. Pass-by rates from the ITE Trip Generation Handbook , 3rd Edition for Land Use 934 - "Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive-Through Window." A pass-by rate of 49% was used for the a.m. peak hour and a pass-by rate of 50% was used for the p.m. peak hour. Since there is no data available for daily pass-by trips, the average of a.m. and p.m. pass-by rates was used as the daily pass-by rate.

#### Offsite impacts

Hemet General Plan Traffic **Policy C-1.3 Traffic Flow**. Maintains Level of Service (LOS) C or better for roadway segment operations, and LOS D or better for peak-hour intersection movements. Portions of Florida Avenue and Sanderson Avenue may operate at or below LOS D on a case-by-case basis. **Policy C-1.17 Traffic Analyses**. Requires evaluation of development proposals for potential impacts on the transportation and infrastructure system based on traffic analyses that follow the protocols established by the City. The traffic analysis should evaluate the need for both ultimate and interim improvements resulting from the development proposal. An intersection level of service analysis was conducted for existing with project conditions to determine intersection performance. The results of this analysis shows that the Sanderson Avenue/Thornton Avenue (a.m. peak hour) is forecast to operate at an unsatisfactory Level of Service (LOS). Since the intersection is operating at a satisfactory LOS D under existing condition, and is forecast to operate at an unsatisfactory LOS E under existing with project condition, the project creates a significant impact at this intersection. Under cumulative (2020) conditions, this intersection is already forecast to operate at an unsatisfactory LOS E under cumulative (2020) without the project and LOS F with the project. As noted in Policy C-1.3, Sanderson Avenue may operate at or below LOS D. However, mitigation has been identified to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

#### Onsite Impacts

A queuing assessment was performed for the proposed Starbucks to analyze the potential drive through queuing that could be expected behind the pick-up window. Stacking and drive-through queue counts were collected from two similar Starbucks locations. The drive-through queuing observations were conducted in October 2018 during typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday) a.m. peak period hours (6:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.) and p.m. peak period hours (3:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.). The data was collected at five-minute intervals at both locations. The entire queue length includes the queue forming at the pick-up window, from the pickup window to the order board, from the order board to the drive-through entrance, and any spill over queue from the drive-through entrance into the parking lot. The maximum queue observed was 11 vehicles for both locations.

The proposed site plan provides an approximate queuing space for 13 vehicles within the drive through lane. Thus, under worst-case scenario, there will be room for two additional vehicles in the drive-through lane. Additionally, it has been observed from the survey, the maximum observed queue behind the order board is 8 vehicles in one of the locations. The proposed project provides stacking for up to 6 vehicles from the order board to the drive-through entrance. Therefore, a spillover of two vehicle is anticipated to occur. However, according to the proposed site plan the vehicle spillover would occur only within the Starbucks customer parking area and would not affect circulation within the overall commercial shopping center.

No bus stops exist at the project site along Sanderson Avenue or Thornton Avenue. The design of the proposed includes clean air vehicle charging stations and bicycle facilities in compliance with Calgreen standards. Pedestrian access requirements will be addressed through ADA compliance. The proposed project will not conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, but does conflict with Level of Service requirements for the roadway system. Mitigation T-1 will reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.

b). CEQA Guideline 15064.3, subdivision b, requires an analysis of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) generated by a project. This analysis is not required to be implemented by lead agencies until July 1, 2020, though lead agencies may choose to implement the regulation before then. The City has not opted to implement this new CEQA Guideline before the July 1, 2020 deadline at this time.

c) A queuing assessment was performed for the proposed Starbucks to analyze the potential drive through queuing potential extending beyond the drive-through window line. Analysis shows that a que length to accommodate 11 vehicles is required and que length for 13 cars is provided. Therefore, there would be no hazards due to geometrical design and no mitigation is required.

d) The proposed project is design to comply with all City standards. As an infill development within an existing retail center, the project is consistent with the Hemet General Plan, the Page Plaza Specific Plan, and existing zoning. Provisions for emergency access have been addressed through these prior planning programs. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures:

**T-1:** Sanderson Avenue/Thornton Avenue: Convert east-west signal phasing from permitted to split phase prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit. With conversion of the signal phasing, the eastbound left-turn queues will not exceed available storage.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, 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 type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sources: Tribal consultation with Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, April 3, 2019; and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians on April 10, 2019.

## Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) A Tribal Consultation process was initiated on February 28, 2019 in conformance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52. A list of Tribes who had requested notification under AB 52 was contacted for information. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians requested consultation that was performed on April 3, 2019. The Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians requested consultation that was concluded on April 9, 2019. As a result of these consultations, **Mitigation Measures TRI-1 through TRI-4** were identified to address potential subsurface cultural resources. The consultation process was closed out following consultation with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians on April 9, 2019.

i and ii) The project site has been graded as part of the original retail center development and contains no historic resources. The property is not associated with any person or event of historic significance. The site is not listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, nor is the site identified as containing historical resources on a local historic database. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

### Mitigation Measures

**TRI-1:** Prior to issuance of a grading permit the applicant shall commission an assessment of the potential for archeological and cultural resources to be performed by a qualified archeologist in conjunction with recognized Native American tribes, including the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, in order to determine the presence and extent of any such resources within the project area and evaluate the significance of such resources. The assessment shall include a NAHC and CHRIS records search, a Phase I walkover survey, and preparation of an archeological report containing the results of this assessment. A phase II archeological evaluation will be completed if recommended in the assessment.

**TRI-2:** Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the developer shall enter a Treatment and Disposition Agreement (TDA) with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians to address treatment and disposition of archaeological/cultural resources and human remains associated with Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians that may be uncovered or otherwise discovered during construction of the project. The TDA may establish provisions for tribal monitors. Following execution of the TDA by the developer and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, the TDA will be incorporated by reference into the grading permit.

**TRI-3:** If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are made during ground-disturbing activities, the applicant, a qualified archaeologist, and the Soboba and Pechanga Bands of Luiseno Indians shall assess the significance of such resources and shall confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to PRC Section 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources. PRC Section 21084.3 further requires that agencies shall avoid damaging effects to tribal cultural resources, if feasible. If the City, the qualified archaeologist, and the Soboba and Pechanga Tribes cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the Community Development Director or designee for decision. The Community Development Director or designee shall make the determination based on the provisions of the CEQA with respect to archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Soboba and Pechanga Tribes. Notwithstanding any other rights available under the law, the decision of the City Community Development Director or designee shall be appealable to the City Planning Commission and/or City Council.

**TRI-4.** If human remains are encountered on the property, then the Riverside County Coroner's Office MUST be contacted within 24 hours of the find, and all work halted until a clearance is given by that office and any other involved agencies. If it is determined that the remains might be those of a Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians shall be notified and appropriate measures provided by State law shall be implemented.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>				
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm water, drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause adverse environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: Site plan. Riverside County Waste Management Plan, Hemet General Plan

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a). All utility services for water, wastewater treatment, storm water, drainage, electric power, and natural gas have been stubbed out on the site. Telecommunications coverage exists in the area by multiple providers. The required improvements have occurred within rights-of-way and other already disturbed areas within the development footprint. Therefore, there are no secondary impacts associated with the extension of utilities and services to the site. There is no impact and no mitigation is required.

b) Stetson Avenue is the boundary line between the City of Hemet Water District to the north, and the Eastern Municipal Water District, (EMWD), service area to the south where the project site lies. Metropolitan water District is a wholesale supplier of imported water under the State Water Project, augmented by local groundwater supply. EMWD also provides non-potable water supply for landscaping. **Hemet General Plan Policy CSI-1.2: Infrastructure.** Ensures that new development and redevelopment provides infrastructure for water, sewer, and storm water that adequately serves the proposed uses and that has been coordinated with affected infrastructure providers. **Policy CSI-1.4: Fee Structures.** Ensures

that fee structures are sufficient for new development and redevelopment to pay their fair share of the cost of infrastructure improvements and public facilities. **Policy CSI-2.3: Performance Standards.** Developments shall be required to install water facilities sufficient to meet performance standards established by the water agency serving the project. All facilities must be operational prior to issuance of building permits. **Policy CSI-2.6: Common Area Recycled Water.** Requires the installation of recycled water lines for all appropriate streetscapes and common areas when within one-half mile of either an existing and/or master planned tertiary water trunk line, as shown on any water district's master plan, as feasible. The facilities shall meet performance standards established by the supplier of reclaimed water to the site. **Policy CSI-2.8: Best Management Practice Features/Equipment.** Require installation of best management practice features for water for all new development and for applicable rehabilitation. **Policy LU-2.12: Use of Recycled Water Systems.** Requires connections and use of recycled water facilities where possible to irrigate public landscapes and create water elements that will add to community value. With the implementation of the General Plan Policies and Programs, the impact upon water resources will be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c) Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) provides wastewater collection and treatment at the project site. EMWD uses its Hemet/San Jacinto Regional Water Reclamation Facility, located in western San Jacinto, to conduct primary, secondary, and tertiary treatment of wastewater. Hemet General Plan **Policy CSI-3.1: Performance Standards.** Requires new development to install sufficient sewer facilities needed to meet performance standards established by the site's wastewater collection agency. This standards has been met with the development of Page Plaza. Implementing the policy would prevent development from moving forward in the absence of adequate wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It would also prevent the construction of non-residential uses which could not be provided with adequate wastewater conveyance and treatment. Implementation of the General Plan Policy would result in a less than significant impact. No mitigation measure is required.

d) To minimize solid waste disposal, the State Legislature passed the California Integrated Waste Management Act (CIWMA) of 1989 (AB 939), effective January 1990. According to the CIWMA, all cities and counties were required to divert 25% of all solid waste from landfill facilities by January 1, 1995, and 50% by January 1, 2000 and 75-percent solid waste diversion by 2020. Each city is required to develop solid waste plans demonstrating integration of the CIWMA plan with the County plan. Solid waste generated within city limits is collected by the City and delivered to the Lamb Canyon Landfill. The landfill is owned and operated by Riverside County. Lamb Canyon Landfill. The landfill is currently permitted to receive 5,000 tons per day (tpd) of refuse and has an estimated total disposal capacity of approximately 20.7 million tons. As of January 1, 2017, the landfill had a total remaining capacity of approximately 10.5 million tons. The current landfill remaining disposal capacity is estimated to last, at a minimum, until approximately 2029.

The proposed project contribute to increased solid waste generation. **Hemet General Plan Policy CSI-6.2:** Requires recycling to achieve maximum diversion of materials from disposal through the reduction, reuse, and recycling of wastes to the highest and best use. In addition, restaurant uses engage in programs to recycle spent cooking oils and other liquid wastes. With implementation of these policies and programs, the impact upon solid waste would be a less-than-significant. No mitigation measures are required.

d) Hemet General Plan **Policy CSI-P-16 and ZCSI-6.3: Waste Handling Strategy.** Requires the City to update its waste handling strategy, or contract with a private entity to ensure continued capability, to provide waste collection and disposal for the City as landfill options change. This strategy addresses the City's collection method, and identify a disposal site for the City's solid waste. The strategy must identify how the City will procure long-haul trucks and transfer facilities, contract with a private entity for solid waste collection and disposal, or identify additional solid waste collection and disposal solutions prior to the closure of the Lamb Canyon Landfill. **Policy CSI-6.2: Recycling** Strives to achieve maximum diversion of materials from disposal through the reduction, reuse, and recycling of wastes to the highest and best use. The proposed project is not in conflict with these strategies to comply with federal, state,

and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XX. WILDFIRE</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 type="checkbox"/>	X

Sources: Hemet General Plan

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a-d) Hemet General Plan **Exhibit 4.8-1: Wildland Fire Hazard** does not depict the project site as lying within a Wildland Fire Hazard Zone. The General Plan includes policies to guide development in or near a fire hazard zone, but none are applicable to the proposed project area. The proposed project is an infill development within an existing retail center and will not conflict with emergency access routes. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Checklist Responses

a) The project site has been graded as part of the earlier development of the Page Plaza retail center and has never been identified as habitat for sensitive wildlife species. Likewise, the project site has never been identified as containing important examples of California history or pre-history whether through onsite resources or associated with historic persons or events. Therefore, there is no impact and no mitigation is required.

b) The proposed project represents one of the last development components of the Page Plaza retail center. A cumulative traffic impact has been identified with respect to the operating Level of Service for the intersection of Sanderson Avenue and Thornton Avenue. Mitigation has been identified under **Mitigation Measure T-1** to reduce that impact to a level of insignificance. A Tribal consultation process has been implemented that included consultations, as requested by the Soboba band of Luiseno Indians and the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians. From these consultations, **Mitigation Measures TRI-1 through TRI-4** have been identified in order to reduce potential impacts on cultural resources to a level of insignificance.

c) The proposed project involves drive through restaurants with speakerphones that have the potential to impact nearby residences by noise that exceeds the City standard of 65 DbA for nighttime conditions. Mitigation has been identified under **Mitigation Measure NOI-1** to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.