

ADDENDUM
to the
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
[State Clearinghouse No. 2012061046]
for the
AMENDED AND RESTATED
ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN
and
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE AND
PACIFIC CLAY PRODUCTS, LLC
[collectively, the “Activity”]

Prepared by:

CITY OF LAKE ELSINORE
150 South Main Street
Lake Elsinore, California 92530

Contact: Grant Taylor, Community Development Director

ORGANIZATION OF THE ADDENDUM

This Addendum is organized as follows:

- Section 1.** States the purpose of the Addendum, summarizes it, and provides the address where documents referred to herein may be reviewed.
- Section 2.** Gives the Activity's location within the Project Area.
- Section 3.** Describes the Activity.
- Section 4.** Summarizes prior CEQA review for the Project.
- Section 5.** Overviews the application of CEQA to the Activity.
- Section 6.** Briefly explains the City's decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR for the Activity.
- Section 7.** Provides the Preliminary (checklist) Review of the Activity.

Attached to this Addendum are the following:

1. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

This Addendum to the certified Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) [State Clearinghouse No. 2012061046] for the previously approved Alberhill Villages Specific Plan (the “Project”) addresses the potential environmental impacts that may result from approval of a proposed Amended and Restated Alberhill Villages Specific Plan and proposed Development Agreement (collectively, the “Activity”) by the City of Lake Elsinore (“City”). The Activity would amend the Project by making textual changes to it as well as other minor physical changes described below and give the owner of the Project site rights under the Development Agreement but would not substantially change either the Project’s boundaries or its previously approved build-out densities.

This Addendum will be used by the City in its evaluation and analysis of the Activity. The City is designated the “lead agency” for California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code § 21000 *et seq.*: “CEQA”) compliance. In accordance with Section 21067 of CEQA, the lead agency is the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have significant effects upon the environment.

B. Executive Summary

The previously approved Project is a specific plan that includes approximately 8,244 dwelling units; 4,007,000 square feet of non-residential uses including civic/institutional, commercial/retail, professional office/medical and entertainment uses; a university campus or similar educational institution; and supporting uses including schools, parks, places of religious assembly, open space and green belt paseos; a General Plan amendment changing Project site’s land use designation to “Alberhill Villages Specific Plan” and changes the General Plan’s Circulation Element within the Project site; and a Zone Change changing the Project site’s zoning from a mix of zoning designations to “Alberhill Villages Specific Plan.”

In connection with the City’s approval of the Project and in compliance with CEQA, the FEIR was prepared to analyze potentially significant environmental impacts that might result as a consequence of implementing the Project. The City certified the FEIR less than a year ago on June 14, 2016, and concurrently adopted the mitigation monitoring program set forth in the FEIR. In order to ascertain whether the FEIR adequately identified and addressed any potentially significant environmental effects which may result from the Activity, City staff undertook additional analysis prior to the City taking any discretionary action in connection with the Activity.

Based upon that analysis, City staff concluded that (i) approving the Activity would not have a significant effect on the environment, (ii) the FEIR adequately disclosed the environmental issues associated with implementing the Activity, and (iii) while changes and/or additions to the FEIR are necessary, none of the conditions set forth in Section 15162 of the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA (Title 14, California Code of Regulations § 15000 *et seq.*: “CEQA Guidelines”), have

occurred. Consequently, City staff's analysis has resulted in the preparation of this "addendum" to the FEIR in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines.

C. Location of Documents

Copies of the Project, its FEIR, the proposed Amended and Restated Alberhill Village Specific Plan and Development Agreement, and all documents referenced herein, are available for public review during normal working hours at the offices of the City located at 150 South Main Street, Lake Elsinore, California 92530.

2. ACTIVITY LOCATION

The site of the Activity (the "Site") encompasses approximately 1,375 acres and is located in the northwest part of the City just south of Interstate 15. The Site has nearly identical boundaries as the previously approved Project, with the eastern boundary bordering Lake Street, the southeastern boundary bordering the Murdock Alberhill Ranch Specific Plan residential development, and the western boundary bordering the 1,000-acre Horsethief Canyon Ranch single-family planned development. A map showing the general location of the Site is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

Mining operations dating back to the 19th century continue to exist on a majority of the Site.

3. ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

In implementation of the Project, the City proposes to approve the Amended and Restated Alberhill Village Specific Plan, thereby amending and restating the Project and making the following changes to it:

- The removal of the Castle & Cooke Commercial-CA, Inc., parcel of 9.09 acres located at the northwest corner of Lake Street and Temescal Canyon Road.
- The removal of the Castle & Cooke Alberhill Ranch Homebuilding, Inc., 16.7 acre parcel located along the southerly portion of Temescal Canyon Road and the westerly portion of Lake Street near the intersection of Temescal Canyon Road and Lake Street.
- The elimination of the westerly Lake Area in the Phase 3 portion of Project adjacent to "C" Street (reducing the amount of Lake Area from 39.6 acres to 26.0 acres).
- The Land Area in Phase 3, previously occupied by the 13.6 acre Lake, was reconfigured to include added SF-5, SF-10 and MF-35 Residential Areas and

an 18.6 acre park area. A 3.2 acre Open Space Area was combined into the 21.3 acre Park Area.

- Minor clarifications of parcel lines in the Commercial and Open Space Land Use Areas in and around Temescal Canyon Road and Lincoln Street have been made due to the removal of the two adjacent Castle & Cooke parcels whose removal was incorrectly depicted in the City's Approved Land Use Plan, and to match the City's Temescal Canyon Road Bridge replacement project alignment.
- Identical to the previously approved Project, a 500-foot wide wildlife corridor is shown within the Amended and Restated Alberhill Village Specific Plan.

The proposed land use changes the Amended and Restated Alberhill Villages Specific Plan provides for are minimal in relation to the approved Project, and the land form changes are also minimal. Review of the stormwater detention capacity of the Project in light of the lake reconfiguration concludes that the proposed configuration of the 26.0 acre lake contains an adequate amount of storage capacity available to accommodate stormwater detention for the Project. The FEIR's Technical Appendices identified 16.9 acre-feet of detention required for the drainage subarea tributary to the 26.0 acre lake. The total volume of the proposed 26.0 acre lake is 312.4 acre-feet to its high water mark. The 16.9 acre feet of storage relates to less than 0.7 feet of depth in the Lake Area and the Lake Area has significant storage capabilities such that the removal of the 13.6 acre lake west of "C" Street does not impact the Lake Area's detention capabilities. In addition to the de minimus impact of the hydrology, elimination of the 13.6 acre lake will provide for a lesser amount of spring fed water dependency for the Lake Area. This is more advantageous for ongoing water conservation for the Project and the Elsinore Valley, and the remaining 26.0 acre lake will continue to be a recreational feature for the Project and City and area residents.

In addition, at the request of the Site's owner, Pacific Clay Products, LLC, the City will consider entering into a Development Agreement with the owner pursuant to Government Code Sections 65864, *et seq.* If approved, the Development Agreement would not cause any direct or indirect physical changes to the environment or economic or social impacts that would result in physical changes to the environment.

4. PRIOR CEQA REVIEW FOR THE PROJECT

On December 13, 2011, the City Council of the City adopted the City's current General Plan. As the California Supreme Court has noted, a city's general plan is its "constitution for all future development" within its jurisdiction and the single most important planning document governing its land use. (*Leshner Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek* (1990) 52 Cal.3d 531, 540.) Prior to adopting the General Plan, on December 13, 2011, the City certified a final EIR for it (State Clearinghouse No. 2005121019).

One step below the general plan in the land use approval hierarchy, and used for systematically implementing the general plan in a specific geographical area, is the specific plan. Once a city has adopted a general plan, it “may ... prepare specific plans for the systematic implementation of the general plan for all or part of the area covered by the general plan.” (Government Code § 65450.) Similar to the way a general plan must include certain elements, a specific plan must include, by text and diagram, the following:

- (1) The distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land, including open space, within the area covered by the plan.
- (2) The proposed distribution, location, and extent and intensity of major components of public and private transportation, sewage, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, energy, and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the area covered by the plan and needed to support the land uses described in the plan.
- (3) Standards and criteria by which development will proceed, and standards for the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, where applicable.
- (4) A program of implementation measures including regulations, programs, public works projects, and financing measures necessary to carry out paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(Government Code § 65451.) A specific plan must also include a statement of the relationship of the specific plan to the general plan. (*Id.*) Other subjects may be included if, in the judgment of the City’s judgment, they “are necessary or desirable for implementation of the general plan.” (Government Code § 65452.) A specific plan cannot be adopted unless it is consistent with the general plan. (Government Code § 65454.)

On June 14, 2016, the City Council of the City adopted Ordinance No. 2016-1361, approving the Project as the specific plan for the Site and amended the General Plan. In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the FEIR was prepared to identify and analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with public and private activities undertaken to implement the Project within the Site. By its adoption of Resolution No. 2016-076 on June 14, 2016, the City Council certified the FEIR and adopted findings, a statement of overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

5. APPLICATION OF CEQA TO THE ACTIVITY

According to the California Supreme Court, “The foremost principle under CEQA is that the Legislature intended the act ‘to be interpreted in such manner as to afford the fullest possible

protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language.” (*Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California* (1988) 47 Cal.3d 376.) CEQA achieves this goal by disclosing the potentially significant environmental effects of “projects.” Section 15378 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a “project” under CEQA to mean:

the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment ... The term “project” refers to the activity which is being approved and which may be subject to several discretionary approvals by governmental agencies. The term “project” does not mean each separate governmental approval.

Sections 15150 and 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of incorporation by reference and “tiering” to eliminate repetitive discussions of the same issues and focus the analysis on the actual issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review. “Tiering” refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as one prepared for a general plan or policy statement) with later EIRs and negative declarations on narrower projects; incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and concentrating the later EIR or negative declaration solely on the issues specific to the later project.” (CEQA § 15152(a).) Lead agencies are encouraged to tier the environmental analyses they prepare.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15153 authorizes a lead agency to employ a single EIR to describe more than one project, if the projects are essentially the same in terms of environmental impact. Further, a lead agency may use an earlier EIR prepared in connection with an earlier project to apply to a later project, if the circumstances of the projects are essentially the same.

However, on September 19, 2016, the California Supreme Court provided much needed clarification to the operation of CEQA’s “subsequent review” rules in *Friends of the College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College District* (2016) 1 Cal.5th 937, resolving a disagreement among appellate courts:

When an agency proposes changes to a previously approved project, CEQA does not authorize courts to invalidate the agency’s action based solely on their own abstract evaluation of whether the agency’s proposal is a new project, rather than a modified version of an old one. Under the statutory scheme, the agency’s environmental review obligations depend on the effect of the proposed changes on the decision-making process, rather than on any abstract characterization of the project as “new” or “old.” An agency that proposes project changes thus must determine whether the previous environmental document retains any relevance in light of the proposed changes and, if so, whether major revisions to the previous environmental document are nevertheless required due to the involvement of new, previously unstudied significant environmental impacts. These are determinations for the agency to make in the first instance, subject to judicial review for substantial evidence.

* * *

... [W]hether an initial environmental document remains relevant despite changed plans or circumstances – like the question whether an initial environmental document requires major revisions due to changed plans or circumstances – is a predominantly factual question. It is thus a question for the agency to answer in the first instance, drawing on its particular expertise.

To assist in answering this question, CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 provides the following test for determining if a subsequent EIR or a supplement to an EIR is required:

(a) When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially

reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

In turn, CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 sets out procedures for conducting CEQA review on a subsequent activity involving a site specific operation undertaken pursuant to a previously approved project.¹ According to the procedures set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 15168:

Subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.

(1) If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration.

(2) If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required.”

(3) An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into subsequent actions in the program.

(4) Where the subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the program EIR.

(5) A program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with subsequent activities if it deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible. With a good and detailed analysis of the program, many subsequent activities could be found to be within the scope of the project described in the program EIR, and no further environmental documents would be required.

¹ In its discussion of Section 15168, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research notes that:

“Use of the program EIR also enables the Lead Agency to characterize the overall program as the project being approved at that time. Following this approach when individual activities within the program are proposed, the agency would be required to examine the individual activities to determine whether their effects were fully analyzed in the program EIR. If the activities would have no effects beyond those analyzed in the program EIR, the agency could assert that the activities are merely part of the program which had been approved earlier, and no further CEQA compliance would be required. This approach offers many possibilities for agencies to reduce their costs of CEQA compliance and still achieve high levels of environmental protection.”

Following the directive of Section 15168(c)(4), City staff utilized a written checklist to document its evaluation of the Site and the Activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the Activity were covered in the FEIR; specifically, to determine whether any of the conditions or factors identified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 or 15163 required the preparation of either a subsequent EIR or supplement to the FEIR. (The City's checklist is set forth below in Section 7.)

6. EXPLANATION OF DECISION NOT TO PREPARE SUBSEQUENT EIR

In evaluating the proposed Activity, the City's focus was two-fold. First, the City compared the proposed Activity with the list of issue areas set forth in the June 2012 Alberhill Villages Specific Plan Initial Study ("IS") that was included as Appendix A to the FEIR. Second, following the Supreme Court's guidance in *Friends of the College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College District*, City staff reviewed the FEIR to determine what items discussed therein could be further clarified or elaborated since the FEIR's certification. As a result of this investigation, City staff determined that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines would occur as a result of the Activity to cause the City to prepare either a subsequent EIR or a supplemental EIR for the Activity.

Based upon a Site-specific review of the proposed Activity's potential environmental effects, City staff concluded that the FEIR adequately analyzed, pursuant to applicable legal standards, any potentially significant environmental effects which might result from the proposed Activity, and that such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the FEIR's analyses.

However, City staff also concluded from this investigation that it would be helpful to provide the public with information updating and amplifying some of the points raised in the FEIR as they pertain to the Activity. Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines provides a way for the City to update, amplify and make changes or additions to a previously certified EIR in situations such as this where neither a subsequent EIR nor supplement to an EIR is required. According to Section 15164, the City must prepare an "addendum" to the FEIR "if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred." Consequently, preparation of this Addendum was selected as the most appropriate CEQA compliance document utilizing the criteria set forth in Sections 15168 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines and also complies with the appropriate rules, regulations, and procedures for the City.

7. Preliminary "Checklist" Review [Public Resources Code § 15168(c)(4)]

(see following pages)

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
--	--	--	--	---	--	--------------

I. AESTHETICS. Would the Activity:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?					X	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?					X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?					X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?					X	

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the Activity:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?						X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?						X

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?					X	
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?					X	
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?					X	
III. AIR QUALITY. Would the Activity:						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?					X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?					X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?					X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?					X	
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the Activity:						
a) Have substantial adverse effects, 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?					X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?					X	
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?					X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?					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?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
--	--	--	--	---	--	--------------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Activity:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?					X	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?					X	
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?					X	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?					X	

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the Activity:

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

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					X	
iv) Landslides?					X	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Activity, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?					X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?					X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?					X	
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the Activity:						
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
--	--	--	--	---	--	--------------

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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Activity:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?					X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?					X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					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?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
e) For an Activity 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 Activity result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Activity area?						X
f) For an Activity within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Activity result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Activity area?						X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?						X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?					X	
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Activity:						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?					X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?					X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?					X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?					X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?					X	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?					X	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?						X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?						X
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Activity:						
a) Physically divide an established community?						X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Activity (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?					X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?						X

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
--	--	--	--	---	--	--------------

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Activity:

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?					X	
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?					X	

XII. NOISE. Would the Activity result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?					X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?					X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Activity vicinity above levels existing without the Activity?					X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Activity vicinity above levels existing without the Activity?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
e) For an Activity 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 Activity expose people residing or working in the Activity area to excessive noise levels?						X
f) For an Activity within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Activity expose people residing or working in the Activity area to excessive noise levels?						X
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Activity:						
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X	
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
--	--	--	--	---	--	--------------

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

a) Fire protection?					X	
b) Police protection?					X	
c) Schools?					X	
d) Parks?					X	
e) Other public facilities?					X	

XV. RECREATION.

a) Would the Activity increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					X	
b) Does the Activity include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
--	--	--	--	---	--	--------------

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the Activity:

a)	Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?					X	
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?					X	
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?						X
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?						X
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?						X

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?						X
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Activity 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:						
a) 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					X	
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.					X	
XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the Activity:						
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Activity from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?					X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the Activity that it has adequate capacity to serve the Activity's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?					X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Activity's solid waste disposal needs?					X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?					X	

**CHECKLIST COMPARING THE ACTIVITY TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ALBERHILL VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN PROJECT**

	Substantial Change in Project Requiring Major EIR Revisions	Substantial Change in Circumstances Requiring Major EIR Revisions	New Information Showing Significant Effects not Discussed in, or Substantially More Severe than Shown in, Previous EIR	New Information Showing Ability to Reduce but not Eliminate Significant Effects in Previous EIR	Less Than Significant Impact / No Substantial Changes or New Information Requiring Preparation of a Subsequent EIR	No Impact
--	--	--	--	---	--	--------------

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a)	Does the Activity have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?					X
b)	Does the Activity 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.)					X
c)	Does the Activity have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?					X

DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST ANSWERS

I. AESTHETICS/LIGHT AND GLARE

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant and for that reason adopted seven mitigation measures to reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any visual impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant and for that reason adopted three mitigation measures to reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any light or glare impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

The IS noted that the Site was currently being mined and was identified as “Other Land” on the Riverside County Important Farmland 2010 Sheet 1 of 3 map prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Therefore, implementation of the Activity would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.

III. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant and unavoidable even with the five mitigation measures adopted to reduce this impact. The Activity does not result in any air quality impacts over and above those already identified in the FEIR.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant and unavoidable even with the five mitigation measures adopted to reduce this impact. The Activity does not result in any air quality impacts over and above those already identified in the FEIR.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the five adopted mitigation measures will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any exposure impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the seven adopted mitigation measures will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any species impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing two adopted mitigation measures will mitigate this impact to a level below significant. The Activity does not result in any habitat impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

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

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (b).

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measure BIO-6 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measure BIO-8 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

- 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?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5 of the California Code of Regulations?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing seven adopted mitigation measures will mitigate this impact to a level below significant. The Activity does not result in any historical resource impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the California Code of Regulations?

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measure CR-8 will reduce this impact to less than significant. Since the Project

is nearly identical to the Activity and mitigation measure CR-8 also applies to it, the Activity will not result in any impacts on a unique paleontological resource or site or geological feature.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning map, issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the eleven adopted mitigation measures will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any exposure impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

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

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

- iv) Landslides?

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no impact on soil erosion or loss of topsoil will occur from the Activity.

- 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?

Mitigated to less than significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Mitigated to less than significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

- 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?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity will be served by a public wastewater system.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the two adopted mitigation measures will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any greenhouse gas emissions impacts over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant; however, the City will implement the three mitigation measures to ensure compliance. Given that the Activity is nearly identical to the Project, the Activity also will not conflict with any plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the two adopted mitigation measures will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not result in any significant hazard regarding hazardous materials over and above those already identified and mitigated in the FEIR.

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

Mitigated to less than significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant; however, the City will continue to implement on-going mandatory compliance with the M-3 zoning regulations. Given that the Activity is nearly identical to the Project, the Activity also will not emit or handle hazardous materials or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

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

The IS and FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. The Project site and the Activity site are essentially identical.

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

The IS noted the Project was not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. The Project site and the Activity site are essentially identical.

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

The IS noted the Project was not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. The Project site and the Activity site are essentially identical.

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

The IS concluded the Project would not impair or interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Given that the Activity is nearly identical to the Project, the Activity also will not impair or interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

The IS concluded the Project's potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires was less than significant. Given that the Activity is nearly identical to the Project, the Activity also will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR, the Activity would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measure HY-1 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not alter the Project site's drainage pattern.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measures HY-1, HY-2, HY-3 and HY-4 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not alter the Project site's drainage pattern or substantially increase the rate of amount of the Project's surface runoff.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measures HY-1, HY-5, HY-6, HY-7, HY-8 and HY-9, will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity does not create or contribute runoff water greater than that of the Project.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measures HY-1 through HY-9, will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Activity will not degrade water quality more the Project.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measures HY-10 and HY-11 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The physical layout of the Project and the Activity are nearly identical, and the Activity will also be subject to mitigation measures HY-10 and HY-11.

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

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (g).

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

The FEIR concluded the Project would result in No Impact and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR, the Activity would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The FEIR concluded the Project would cause No Impact by seiche or tsunami, and Less than Significant impacts for mudflow.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- a) Physically divide an established community?

The IS concluded the Project would result in No Impact since the Project site is currently and historically has been used for mining. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR, the Activity would not physically divide an established community.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

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

The FEIR concluded the Project would result in No Impact and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR and as noted above, the Activity maintains the Project's 500-foot wide wildlife corridor and would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Less than Significant. See preceding Response (a).

XII. NOISE

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measures NSE-1 through NSE-8 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Project and the Activity are nearly identical, and the Activity will also be subject to mitigation measures NSE-1 through NSE-8.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measures NSE-9 through NSE-10 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Project and the Activity are nearly identical, and the Activity will also be subject to mitigation measures NSE-9 through NSE-10.

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

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

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

Mitigated to a level below significant for both the Project and Activity. See preceding Response (a).

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

The IS concluded the Project would result in No Impact since the Project site is currently and historically has been used for mining. Similar to the Project analyzed in the FEIR, the Activity would not physically divide an established community.

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

No Impact. See preceding Response (e).

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact will occur from the Activity.

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

The IS concluded the Project would result in No Impact since the Project site is currently being mined and has no existing homes or necessitate or require the construction of replacement of housing elsewhere. Similar to the Project, the Activity likewise would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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

No Impact. See preceding Response (b).

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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 public services:

- a) Fire protection?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact to fire protection will occur from the Activity.

- b) Police protection?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact to police protection will occur from the Activity.

c) Schools?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact to schools will occur from the Activity.

d) Parks?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact to parks will occur from the Activity.

e) Other public facilities

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact to other public facilities will occur from the Activity.

XV. RECREATION

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change, impact or substantial physical deterioration to existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities will occur or be accelerated from the Activity.

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?

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, no adverse change or impact to previously approved recreational facilities will occur from the Activity.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

a) Cause an increase in traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

The FEIR concluded the Project's potential traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable even with the two mitigation measures adopted to reduce this impact. However, as explained in a memorandum from Liscott Law & Greenspan Engineers, attached hereto as Exhibit B, the roadway circulation proposed by the Amended and Restated Alberhill Villages Specific Plan do not change those in the approved Project and thus the Activity's traffic impacts will be equal to or less than the traffic impacts the FEIR identified for the approved Project.

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

No Impact. The FEIR concluded that the proposed Project would not conflict with the 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program (CMP) prepared by the Riverside County Transportation Commission. Given that the proposed Activity is in the same location and retains the same roadway design requirements and roadway, intersection and driveway improvements, the Activity will not create any conflicts with the CMP.

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

The IS concluded the Project would result in No Impact due to its location and the nature of the proposed uses. Given that the proposed Activity is in the same location and retains the same uses, no change in air traffic patterns or demand for air travel is anticipated as a result of the Activity.

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

Noting that the proposed Project did not include any sharp curves or dangerous intersections in its design, the FEIR concluded that this potential impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures required. Given that the proposed Activity is in the same location and retains the same roadway design requirements and roadway, intersection and driveway improvements, the Activity will not substantially increase hazards due to a design features or incompatible uses.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

On account of the existing serving the Site as well as the Project including five primary access points, the FEIR concluded the Project would provide adequate emergency access and therefore this potential Project impact would be less than significant and no mitigation measures required. Given that the proposed Activity is in the same location and retains the same primary access points, inadequate emergency access will not result from the Activity.

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Noting that the Project proposed a variety of transportation options and implemented pedestrian safety enhancing circulation improvements as well as General Plan Policies 6.4, 9.1 and AH 4.2 for the provision of bike lanes and multi-use trails, the FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Given that the proposed Activity is in the same location and retains the same options, improvements and General Plan policies, implementation of the Activity will not result in any conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the Activity 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:

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

Less than significant impact. Prior to approval of the Project, the City followed the requirements of Senate Bill 18 and requested consultation with applicable tribes regarding the Project. The tribes requesting consultation were (1) the Pechanga Cultural Resources/Temecula Band of Luiseño Indians, and (2) the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians. In response to those consultations, the City crafted mitigation measures CR-1, CR-2, CR-3 and CR-4 requiring 30 days prior notice to both tribes of any grading permit application and the retention of qualified monitors from either tribe to monitor ground disturbing activities and with authority to stop and redirect grading in order to evaluate the significance of any archeological resources discovered. The Activity retains these mitigation measures.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity likewise would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity likewise would not require or result in the construction of new water or waste water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant with the construction of storm drainage improvements proposed by the Project and no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity likewise would not require

or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity likewise would have sufficient water supplies available to serve it from existing entitlements and resources.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be significant; however, implementing the adopted mitigation measure PU-1 will reduce this impact to less than significant. The Project and the Activity are nearly identical, and the Activity will also be subject to mitigation measure PU-1.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity likewise would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate its solid waste disposal needs.

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

The FEIR concluded this potential Project impact would be less than significant and therefore no mitigation measures were required. Relative to conditions identified in the FEIR for the Project, the Activity likewise would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Based upon the FEIR, the foregoing analysis, and in comparison to the approved Project: No Impact.

- b) Does the Activity 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.)

Based upon the FEIR, the foregoing analysis, and in comparison to the approved Project: No Impact.

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

Based upon the FEIR, the foregoing analysis, and in comparison to the approved Project: No Impact.

EXHIBIT A

Map showing the general location of the Activity Site






EXHIBIT B

**Memorandum dated January 20, 2017
prepared by Linscott Law & Greenspan, Engineers**

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Ken Crawford
Castle & Cooke Alberhill Ranch

Date: January 20, 2017

From: Keil D. Maberry, P.E. *KDM*
Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers

LLG Ref: 2.10.3129.2

Subject: Alberhill Villages Specific Plan Addendum Traffic Impact Evaluation
Lake Elsinore, California

The following is a traffic impact evaluation of the proposed Alberhill Villages Specific Plan (AVSP) Addendum. The evaluation will address the potential traffic impacts associated with the land use changes proposed by the City/Developer Sponsored AVSP compared to the AVSP Environmental Impact Report (EIR) land use plan adopted by City Council. **Figure 1**, attached, presents the City/Developer Sponsored AVSP Land Use Plan.

The AVSP Environmental Impact Report adopted by the City Council on June 14, 2016 showed 8,244 Dwelling Units (DU) with 4,007,000 SF of Commercial Building over approximately 1,400 acres. The City Sponsored AVSP approved June 14, 2016 scheduled a unit count of 8,024 DU and 3,810,300 SF of Commercial Building Area over 1,375 acres. The City excluded two (2) parcels of land owned by Castle & Cooke entities; one approximately 9.1 acres and the other approximately 16.7 acres in size. This resulted in a reduction of 220 DU and 197,000 SF of Commercial Building and approximately 25.8 acres of land that was included in the Adopted EIR. The City/Developer Sponsored AVSP will perpetuate the same densities as adopted in the City approved AVSP of June 14, 2016, which includes: 8,024 DU, and 3,810,300 SF of building area over approximately 1,375 acres.

The Land Plan changes to the Specific Plan as compared to the June 14, 2016 adopted EIR include the following:

- The removal of the Castle & Cooke Commercial-CA, Inc., parcel of 9.09 acres located at the northwest corner of Lake Street and Temescal Canyon Road.
- The removal of the Castle & Cooke Alberhill Ranch Homebuilding, Inc., 16.7 acre parcel located along the southerly portion of Temescal Canyon Road and the westerly portion of Lake Street near the intersection of Temescal Canyon Road and Lake Street
- The elimination of the westerly Lake Area in the Phase 3 portion of AVSP adjacent to "C" Street, this reduces the amount of Lake Area from 39.6 acres to 26.0 acres.
- The Land Area in Phase 3, which previously occupied the 13.6 acre Lake, was reconfigured to include added SF-5, SF-10 and MF-35 Residential Areas and an

LINSCOTT
LAW &
GREENSPAN

engineers

Engineers & Planners

Traffic
Transportation
Parking

Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers

2 Executive Circle
Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92614
949.825.6175 T
949.825.6173 F
www.llgengineers.com

Pasadena
Irvine
San Diego
Woodland Hills



Philip M. Linscott, PE (1924-2000)
Jack M. Greenspan, PE (Ret.)
William A. Law, PE (Ret.)
Paul W. Wilkinson, PE
John P. Keating, PE
David S. Shender, PE
John A. Boorman, PE
Clare M. Look-Jaeger, PE
Richard E. Barretto, PE
Keil D. Maberry, PE

18.6 acre park area. A 3.2 acre Open Space Area was combined into the 18.6 acre Park Area.

- Minor clarifications of parcel line in the Commercial and Open Space Land Use Areas in and around Temescal Canyon Road and Lincoln Street have been made due to the removal of the two (2) adjacent Castle & Cooke parcels whose removal was depicted incorrectly by the City's Approved Land Use Plan.
- Identical to the City Approved AVSP, a 500' wide wildlife corridor is shown within the City/Developer Sponsored AVSP.

Although the elimination of the Lake Area provided more available land area for development, the overall project DU density within AVSP has remained the same. The removal of the 13.9 acre Lake resulted in transferring DU from other planning areas, as the total dwelling unit count for AVSP intact. This resulted in the other planning areas being reduced in intensity. The Park Area shown in the City Approved AVSP called for a combined 138 acres of Park Area and 199 acres of Open Space. The City/Developer Sponsored AVSP shows a combined 122 acres of Park Area and 195 acres of Open Space. The park acreage provided in the City/Developer Sponsored AVSP meets the project's Quimby required park dedication. For the City Developer AVSP no other land use plan modifications are proposed for the 1,375 acre project area. The Land Use densities proposed by the City Developer Sponsored AVSP are less intense than the City Approved EIR from June 14, 2016.

In addition, the City/Developer Sponsored AVSP includes a change to the park area in Planning Area (PA) 5b from active community park to a sports park.


While the proposed PA 5b Sports Park will generate greater traffic than the active community park, the reduced development in the City/Developer Sponsored AVSP will more than offset the potential traffic increase in the TIA study area caused by the proposed sports park.

As a result, based on our traffic impact evaluation of the proposed land use changes in the City/Developer Sponsored AVSP, the traffic impacts will be equal to or less than the traffic impacts identified in the City Council approved AVSP EIR.

* * * * *

We appreciate the opportunity to provide this Alberhill Villages Specific Plan Addendum Traffic Impact Evaluation. Please call us at (949) 825-6175 if you have any questions regarding this analysis.

Attachment






FIGURE 1