



**INITIAL STUDY/  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM  
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY**

1. Project Title: PA07-0035 (Master Plot Plan)  
PA07-0039 (Plot Plan)  
PA08-0021 (Tentative Parcel Map No. 35822)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Moreno Valley  
14177 Frederick Street  
Moreno Valley, CA 92553
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Jeff Bradshaw, Associate Planner  
(951) 413-3224
4. Project Location: Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208), Near the northeast corner of Heacock Street and Iris Avenue
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Rados Tenants in Common  
2002 McFadden Avenue, Ste. #200  
Santa Ana, CA 92705
6. General Plan Designation: Business Park and Commercial
7. Zoning: Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208)
  - Industrial (I) zone; and
  - Industrial Support Area (ISA) zone
8. Description of the Project:

Master Plot Plan PA07-0035 for six industrial buildings to be constructed on six separate parcels located along Revere Place and Concord Way. The buildings range in size from 23,700-square feet to 47,160-square feet and are of concrete tilt-up construction. Review and approval of building architecture will occur under separate application(s). Buildings 4, 5, and 6 are located within the 300 foot buffer area that separates this project from residential zoning. Future uses within buildings 4, 5, and 6 will be subject to review and restricted to those uses permitted within the 300 foot buffer as identified within Industrial Land Use Table of the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208). The six buildings rely on reciprocal access and shared drainage and water quality treatment facilities. The creation of a property owners association is required along with CC&R's to regulate maintenance responsibilities for the shared drainage and water quality treatment facilities. The existing Assessor's Parcel Numbers for these properties are 485-230-001 to 010.

Plot Plan PA07-0039 for Building #7, a 409,598 square feet warehouse distribution facility, to be located on 19.14-acres located at the northeast corner of Heacock Street and Iris Avenue. The proposed warehouse facility is a permitted use within the Industrial and the Industrial Support Area zones of SP #208. The building will include loading docks with roll-up doors, truck staging and parking areas, two office areas and parking for employees and visitors. The loading and truck parking areas have been placed on the northern and southern elevations and are screened by perimeter concrete tilt-up walls. The project is located outside of the 300 foot buffer area identified in the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208). The existing Assessor's Parcel Numbers for these properties are 485-230-014 to 024.

Tentative Parcel Map No. 35822 (PA08-0021) is proposed to re-configure the existing 21 parcels located within the project site and create six parcels ranging in size from 1.33 to 2.76 acres for Master Plot Plan PA07-0035 and one 19.14 acre parcel for Plot Plan PA07-0039. The project site for the parcel map is located in the Industrial (I) zone of the Industrial Area Specific Plan (SP #208).

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project is located in an area that includes a mix of industrial land uses within the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208) and existing tract homes in the RS-10 and R5 zones. Land uses to the north include vacant Business Park zoned land with the March Air Reserve Base to the west and existing tract homes in the RS-10 zone to the east. Land uses to the south include vacant Industrial zoned land located within SP #208.

The vacant 40 acre site to the north is currently proposed by the same applicant for development of a 139 single-family residential lot subdivision. The site for this subdivision (Tentative Tract Map No. 34748) is currently zoned Business Park (BP) with a Business Park General Plan designation. The applicant is proposing a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change from BP to R5.

The vacant 67 acre site immediately to the south is currently proposed for development of a 1,484,407 square foot distribution facility. This project is scheduled for City Council review in August 2009. Also within proximity to the project site is a 1,560,064 square foot distribution building located at the southwest corner of Indian Street and Iris Avenue, which was approved by the City Council in July 2008.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required.

An encroachment permit from the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District will be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

	Aesthetics		Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Agricultural Resources		Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
	Air Quality		Land Use/Planning		Transportation/Traffic
	Biological Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Cultural Resources		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance
	Geology/Soils		Population/Housing		

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

JH Bradshaw  
Signature

December 29, 2009  
Date

Printed Name

For

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (d). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - (a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - (b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - (c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The analysis of each issue should identify: (a) the significance criteria or threshold used to evaluate each question; and (b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**1. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

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

The project site is not located in an area identified in the General Plan as an aesthetic resource or a significant visual resource. The project site is located at the northern limits of the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208) in an area that is comprised of industrial land uses adjacent to residential land uses. The proposed warehouse buildings have been designed and conditioned in a manner consistent with SP #208 and the City's Municipal Code. The project as designed and conditioned will assure a design standard that will not have a substantial adverse effect on the scenic vista of the area.

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

There are no trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings on the site. There are no state scenic highways in the vicinity of the site. The site has been disked over the years for weed abatement. As designed and conditioned, the project will not substantially damage scenic resources.

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

The project is located in an area that includes a mix of industrial land uses within the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208) and existing tract homes in the RS-10 and R5 zones. Land uses to the north include vacant Business Park zoned land with the March Air Reserve Base to the west and existing tract homes in the RS-10 zone to the east. Land uses to the south include vacant Industrial zoned land located within SP #208. The vacant 67 acre site immediately to the south is currently proposed for development of a 1,484,407 square foot distribution facility. This project is scheduled for City Council review in August 2009. Also within proximity to the project site is a 1,560,064 square foot distribution building located at the southwest corner of Indian Street and Iris Avenue, which was approved by the City Council in July 2008. This project is consistent with existing land uses and as designed and conditioned will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

As the site is currently vacant, the proposed industrial project will create additional light and glare. Municipal Code requirements, including the shielding of lighting and restrictions on the intensity of exterior lighting will mitigate light and glare impacts on surrounding properties. The project appears to be located outside of the Palomar Lighting District.

**2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project?

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

The site is not designated as prime farmland on the State Important Farmland Map.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

The site is not currently in agricultural use, or under Williamson Act control. There is no existing surrounding agricultural use, or sites under Williamson Act contract. The Municipal Code allows for agricultural uses such as crops in all zoning districts, therefore, the proposed warehouse facility does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or impact sites under Williamson Act contract.

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

There is no immediate surrounding agricultural land use designation, or any proposed according to the General Plan. The proposed warehouse facility will not involve changes to the existing environment, which will result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

**3. 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. Would the project:

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

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the SCAB into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. The AQMP control measures and related emission reduction estimates are based upon emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments. Accordingly, conformance with the AQMP for development projects is determined by demonstrating compliance with local land use plans and/or population projections, or evaluation of assumed emissions.

The existing 2007 AQMP was developed based on SCAG (Southern California Association of Governments) population projections for the region. The population projections made by SCAG are based on existing and planned land uses as set forth in the various general plans of local governmental jurisdictions within the region. The proposed project is consistent with the land use designation that has been in place for the last several iterations of the regional population projections and the AQMP. Since the project will be developed in accordance with the underlying assumptions of the AQMP, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SCAQMD AQMP.

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

The project is within the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD has developed thresholds of significance for both regional and localized air quality impacts, which the project must comply with. An Air Quality Analysis was prepared for the project in April 2008 by LSA Associates, Inc. This study was updated by the consultant in December 2009 to reflect the most current modeling practices. The short-term and long-term construction emissions from the project were modeled by LSA Associates, Inc., using the URBEMIS2007 model and the EMFAC2007 model. Construction of the project was assumed to occur in three phases, beginning with Building #7, the large warehouse building on Parcel 7. Unmitigated maximum short-term daily emissions are all below applicable SCAQMD regional significance thresholds. In addition to the regional analysis, the project's emissions and impacts on a localized scale were analyzed. None of the project's emissions exceed the applicable SCAQMD localized significance thresholds.

Emissions of all criteria pollutants for the operation phase are below the SCAQMD regional thresholds. Additionally, the project's emissions were found to not cause an exceedance of the localized significance thresholds. According to the project traffic study, when project-generated traffic is added to intersections in the project vicinity, eight intersections will fall below acceptable Levels of Service. Therefore, a CO hotspots analysis was performed. As determined by the project air study, the project will not cause an exceedance of any state or federal CO standard and will not create a CO hotspot at any of the intersections in the project vicinity.

As with all construction, this project will be required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. Implementation of dust suppression techniques consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403 can reduce dust generation (and thus the PM<sub>10</sub> component).

In addition, during construction, compliance with the SCAQMD Rule 1113 on the use of architectural coatings would be considered sufficient. Emissions associated with architectural coatings should be further reduced by using pre-coated/natural-colored building materials, using water-based or low VOC coating, and using coating transfer or spray equipment with high transfer efficiency. The project has been conditioned for compliance with both Rule 403 and Rule 1113.

As a proposed warehouse facility, the project will result in an increase in diesel particulate matter (DPM) emissions from the diesel trucks serving the facility. Considering existing residential uses located immediately to the east and proposed residential uses to the north, a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) was performed for the project to determine the potential cancer risks and non-cancer risks to the residents in the project vicinity. SCAQMD recommends that a threshold of 10 in one million be used to determine the significance of cancer risks. The HRA found that the long-term operational DPM emissions from the project would result in a maximum cancer risk of 6.3 in one million for an off-site residential receptor, which is less than the SCAQMD threshold of 10 in one million; therefore, cancer risks from project-generated DPM emissions are less than significant.

For non-cancer risks, SCAQMD recommends using a Hazard Index (HI) of 1.0 to determine the significance of non-cancer risk. The project-generated DPM emissions will result in a HI of 0.004. Therefore, non-cancer risks are less than 1% of the SCAQMD recommended threshold from project operation and are less than significant.

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

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The South Coast Air Basin is in non-attainment status for ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>). CEQA Section 21100 (e) addresses evaluation of cumulative effects, allowing the use of approved land use documents in a cumulative impact analysis. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 (h)(3) further stipulates that for an impact involving a resource that is addressed by an approved plan or mitigation program, the lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution is not cumulatively considerable if the project complies with the adopted plan or program. In addressing cumulative effects for air quality, the AQMP is the most appropriate document to use because the AQMP sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the air basin, including the project area, into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards. The AQMP compliance program includes control measures and related emission reduction estimates based upon emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments.

Since the proposed project is consistent with the land use designation considered in the underlying assumptions of the most recent AQMP and the project, as conditioned, would not generate significant pollutant levels on an individual basis, it is appropriate to conclude that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutant emissions for which the basin is in non-attainment status.

The Air Quality Analysis included an evaluation of potential significant impacts to global climate change that could result from the implementation of the project. As concluded in the evaluation, project related Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and their contribution to global climate change in the State of California are less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable because the project's impacts alone would not cause or significantly contribute to global climate change and the project's contribution from construction emissions is short term and would cease after project construction is completed. The project would not result in GHG emission levels that would substantially conflict with implementation of the GHG reduction goals of AB 32 or other State regulations.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

There are sensitive receptors located directly adjacent to the project site to the east. However, according to the project-specific air quality impact analysis, with conditions of approval, construction and operational emissions from the project have been shown to be less than the applicable SCAQMD thresholds of significance on both the regional and localized level (see item 4b, above). Additionally, diesel particulate emissions generated by the project will not expose sensitive receptors to significant cancer risks (see item 4b, above).

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

The proposed project has the potential to create objectionable odors in the form of diesel exhaust from the trucks associated with the warehouse facility use. The closest areas with substantial numbers of people are the existing single-family residences located immediately to the east and to the northeast. However, these emissions would rapidly dissipate and be diluted by the atmosphere downwind of the emission sources. Recognizing the direction of the prevailing winds (northwest to southeast), dispersion and quantity of the pollutants, the project will not subject a substantial number of people to objectionable odors.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

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

The project site is comprised of six individual parcels ranging in size from 1.33 to 2.76 acres and totaling 11.54 acres along with a single 19.14 acre parcel located at and near the northeast corner of Heacock Street and Iris Avenue. The site is currently vacant and is an area that the Riverside County Integrated Plan (RCIP) has identified as having the potential for burrowing owl habitat. A habitat assessment for burrowing owl was prepared on September 25, 2006 by Ecological Sciences, Inc. No burrowing owls were observed on the site during the habitat assessment. Several potentially suitable ground squirrel burrows were noted on the site. However, monitoring of the site during peak activity times did not reveal the presence of burrowing owl on or directly adjacent to the project site. The project has been conditioned to complete a pre-construction survey for burrowing owl prior to any disturbance of the site. The project site has been disturbed in the past through disking for weed abatement and illegal dumping. Therefore, the proposed project will result in less than significant impacts to Fish and Wildlife resources.

b) Have a substantially 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. Wildlife Service?

There is no stream on the site and no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community on the site. The project site is located across the street from Line B, which is an open channel located on the west side of Heacock Street. The project also fronts along Line B-19, which is located within Iris Avenue. Improvements related to the project that would impact Line B-19, are limited to a point of connection into the existing underground storm line. Prior to completing such work, the developer is conditioned to work with the Riverside County Flood Control District to acquire any required permits. Therefore, this project will have a less than significant impact on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	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	
--	--	--	---	--

The site is vacant and has been disturbed through routine disking for weed abatement. There are no federally protected wetland areas such as a marsh or vernal pool evident at the site. In addition, a riparian area and condensed vegetation to support threatened or endangered species was not evident at the site. Therefore, the development of this project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

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

This site is an urbanized area with existing development to the north, south, east and west. Burrowing owl, which was initially identified by Riverside County as having the potential of occurring on the site was not observed during site surveys, so it is unlikely that the proposed project will directly impact sensitive species. There are no known migratory fish or wildlife species or migratory wildlife corridors, on or near the project site.

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

The proposed project will not conflict with any General Plan or local policies pertaining to the protection of biological resources. The project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the General Plan, previously approved Specific Plan and subsequent EIR under the current Industrial land use designation.

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

The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKR HCP). Also, the City is participating in the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), a comprehensive habitat conservation-planning program addressing multiple species' needs, including preservation of habitat and native vegetation in Western Riverside County. The project is not within any of the (MSHCP) criteria areas, PQP land, or any special survey areas. A burrowing owl survey assessment was completed for this site with no owls observed on the site. There is no riparian, riverine, or vernal pool (fairy shrimp) habitat on the project site. The project as designed and conditioned is consistent with the MSHCP and will have not conflict with the MSHCP or SKR HCP. The SKR Habitat plan will require a fee of \$500.00 per acre to be paid by the developer to assist in setting aside established protection areas for said habitat. This project will also be subject to fees to support the implementation of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. The fee is currently \$6,597 per acre.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?				X
---	--	--	--	---

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
---	--	--	--	---

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

(a. through c.) Based upon inspection of the project site and review of the Cultural Resources Inventory for the City of Moreno Valley, (Archeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside, October 1987), there are no known archaeological resources on the site. There are no historical structures existing on the site. There are no known paleontological or unique geological features on the site.

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

No known human remains have been identified at the project site. Conditions of approval address the issue of inadvertent discoveries. A standard condition of approval will be placed on the project to cease excavation or construction activities if archaeological, paleontological, or historical resources uncovered on the project site.

**6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

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	
---	--	--	---	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed industrial warehouse project would not have a direct impact on creating geologic concerns. The area is currently designated for Industrial uses. The proposed plan does not increase the exposure of residences that might be exposed to groundshaking, since residences are not proposed as part of the plan. In addition, the site is not within an Alquist-Priolo zone, or other designated fault hazard zone. According to the City's environmental information, the project site is not on, or close to, any known earthquake fault. There is no risk of ground rupture due to faulting at the proposed project site.			X	
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
The nearest fault is the San Jacinto fault system, which is located about 16 miles to the northeast. The San Andreas fault system is more than 25 miles from the site. The active Sierra Madre and San Gabriel fault zones lie roughly 35 and 40 miles respectively to the northwest of the site. The active Elsinore and Newport-Inglewood fault zones lie approximately 20 and 45 miles, respectively, to the southwest of the site. This faulting is not considered a significant constraint to development on the site with the use of current development codes.			X	
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
According to the City's environmental resources, the project site is not on, or close to, any known earthquake fault. However, ground-shaking intensity could possibly be moderately-high during a 100-year interval earthquake. Water table and soil conditions are not conducive of seismic related failure.			X	
(iv) Landslides?			X	
This site is not near or adjacent to the mountainside areas. The site is flat, and landslides will not be an issue. There is no potentially significant impact from landslides.			X	
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
The development of the site will likely result in the reduction of erosion with the placement of buildings and landscaping on the site. During construction, there is the potential for less than significant impacts for short-term soil erosion from minimal excavation and grading. This will be addressed as part of standard construction, such as watering to reduce dust and sandbagging, if required, during raining periods.			X	
(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?			X	
The geologic unit or soil is not known to be unstable based on current resources. As provided for in the conditions of approval, the applicant must provide a soils and geologic report to City Public Works Department. The site will not be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code.			X	
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-a-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
According to the City's environmental information, the geologic unit or soil is not known to be unstable. As provided for in the conditions of approval, the applicant must provide a soils and geologic report to City Public Works Department. The site will not be located on expansive soil as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code.			X	
(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?			X	
The project will operate on a sewer system that will be reviewed, approved and installed according to Eastern Municipal Water District requirements. The proposed project will not be introducing septic tanks or alternative water disposal systems.			X	
<b>7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project?</b>				
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 reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely 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	
(a. through c) The proposed project, a warehouse distribution facility consisting of seven buildings on seven separate parcels, will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. There will be no known hazardous materials associated with the development of the site. The project as designed and conditioned will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials.				
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
The project is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.				
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has			X	

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
---	--	--	--	--

The project site is located across the street from March Air Reserve Base but outside of the boundaries of the Air Installation Compatibility Use Overlay District (AICUZ). This is an overlay district that restricts land use on properties located to the north and south of the runway of March Air Reserve Base. The AICUZ includes elements that address noise zones and accident potential zones. The project site is not within an airport land use plan. The project as designed and conditioned will not result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area.

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

There are no private airstrips within the City of Moreno Valley. The project is not within proximity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard pertaining to proximity of a private airstrip.

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

The proposed project would not have any direct effect on an adopted emergency response plan, or emergency evacuation plan. The City's emergency plans are also consistent with the General Plan. The proposed warehouse distribution facility has been designed and conditioned to provide required circulation and required fire access to allow for ingress of emergency vehicles and egress of residents. Therefore, the proposed project would not be in conflict in any way with the emergency response or emergency evacuation plans.

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
--	--	--	--	---

The proposed project site is not adjacent to wildlands, and as such would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. In addition, the project is not located within a designated wildland area.

**8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

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

Pursuant to the requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board, a project specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) is required of certain projects involving discretionary approval. This project requires a WQMP to address pollutants of concern which include nutrients, oxygen demanding substances, and pathogens (bacteria and viruses). Site Design and Source Control best management practices (BMP) are used throughout the project. Treatment BMPs must be selected and implemented which are medium to highly effective in treating pollutants of concern. The applicant has proposed to incorporate the use of multiple filtration systems as the treatment BMP. The treatment control BMP is acceptable as the conceptual treatment subject to certain conditions including in-situ percolation/infiltration test results. Although this approach is acceptable in concept with the Preliminary WQMP, final sizing and specifications based on support calculations and design details will be provided in the Final WQMP at the post entitlement stage. Additionally, grading activities would temporarily expose soils to wind and water erosion that would contribute to downstream sedimentation. The proposed project would comply with all permits and development guidelines associated with urban water runoff and discharge set forth by the City of Moreno Valley and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. With the approval of the storm drainage facilities by the City Engineer and Riverside County Flood Control District, as well as complying with all applicable storm water discharge permits, impacts would be less than significant.

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	
---	--	--	---	--

The Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) would provide the proposed project with water supplies as opposed to utilizing individual water wells. Water supplies are adequate to serve the proposed project. Although the project would cover a majority of the site with impervious surfaces, the landscaped areas would still provide a means for groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant.

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	
--	--	--	---	--

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

During construction of the project, there is the potential for some sediments to be discharged within the storm water system. Erosion plans are required for projects prior to issuance of grading permits for prevention substantial erosion. The site is within the 100-year flood plain. However, there is no streambed or river on the project site, so the project will not cause a change in the existing drainage pattern that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, project implementation would not result in modifications that could ultimately result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off site?				X
---	--	--	--	---

A river or streambed were not evident on the site. Runoff patterns will not be altered to the result of flooding on or off-site.

e) Create or contribute runoff 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	
---	--	--	---	--

(e and f) All storm drainage improvements would be developed to the standards of the City Engineer and the Riverside County Flood Control Agency. As with any urban project, runoff entering the storm drainage system would contain minor amounts of pollutants (including pesticides, fertilizers and motor oil). This would incrementally contribute to the degradation of surface and sub-surface water quality. Additionally, grading activities would temporarily expose soils to water erosion that would contribute to downstream sedimentation. However, the project is subject to the permit requirements of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. As the site is currently unpaved and exposed, development of the proposed project would lessen the existing site contribution to sediment runoff at project completion.

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

An inspection of the site shows no evidence of concentrated drainage. The current Federal Emergency Management maps (FEMA) maps indicate that the site is in a flood zone, however, the project will not place housing within a 100-year floodplain.

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

An inspection of the site shows no evidence of concentrated drainage. The current Federal Emergency Management maps (FEMA) maps indicate that the site is in a flood zone. The project has been conditioned by Public Works delineate the flood zone limits on the grading plans and to demonstrate on the plans that any building finished floor elevation shall be a 1-foot minimum above the 100-year base flood elevation. Additionally, prior to grading plan approval, the developer shall obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the developer shall obtain a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) from FEMA.

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	
--	--	--	---	--

The site is within a 100-year flood plain as shown on the FEMA maps, but it is outside of the delineated dam inundation area for Perris Dam at Lake Perris Reservoir. The project has been conditioned by Public Works delineate the flood zone limits on the grading plans and to demonstrate on the plans that any building finished floor elevation shall be a 1-foot minimum above the 100-year base flood elevation. Additionally, prior to grading plan approval, the developer shall obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (CLOMR-F) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the developer shall obtain a Letter of Map Revision based on Fill (LOMR-F) from FEMA. As designed and conditioned, this project will 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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The site is not identified in the General Plan as a location subject to seiche, or mudflow. The project is outside of the delineated dam inundation area for Perris Dam at Lake Perris Reservoir.

**9. LAND USE AND PLANNING.** Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The project is located in an area that includes a mix of industrial land uses within the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208) and existing tract homes in the RS-10 and R5 zones. Land uses to the north include vacant Business Park zoned land with the March Air Reserve Base to the west and existing tract homes in the RS-10 zone to the east. Land uses to the south include vacant Industrial zoned land located within SP #208. The vacant 67 acre site immediately to the south is currently proposed for development of a 1,484,407 square foot distribution facility. This project is scheduled for City Council review in August 2009. Also within proximity to the project site is a 1,560,064 square foot distribution building located at the southwest corner of Indian Street and Iris Avenue, which was approved by the City Council in July 2008. The proposed warehouse facility as conditioned and designed is in conformance with the General Plan, the standards of the Industrial zone per the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208) and the City's Municipal Code. The addition of the proposed use will not physically divide an established community.

b) Conflict with an 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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

There are no conflicts associated with any land use plans. The proposed project is consistent with the site's existing Industrial zone within the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan and the City's General Plan.

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

The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKR HCP). Also, the City is participating in the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), a comprehensive habitat conservation-planning program addressing multiple species' needs, including preservation of habitat and native vegetation in Western Riverside County. The project is not within any of the (MSHCP) criteria areas, PQP land, or any special survey areas. A burrowing owl survey assessment was completed for this site with no owls observed on the site. There is no riparian, riverine, or vernal pool (fairy shrimp) habitat on the project site. The project as designed and conditioned is consistent with the MSHCP and will have not conflict with the MSHCP or SKR HCP. The SKR Habitat plan will require a fee of \$500.00 per acre to be paid by the developer to assist in setting aside established protection areas for said habitat. This project will also be subject to fees to support the implementation of the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. The fee is currently \$6,597 per acre.

**10. MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

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

The project site is located in an urbanized area with additional development occurring in the vicinity. No active mines or mineral recovery programs are currently active within the project site. No mineral deposits have been identified in the General Plan, consequently, the development of the project site would not conflict with a mineral recovery plan as adopted by the General Plan. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

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	
---	--	--	---	--

The project site is located in an urbanized area with additional development occurring in the vicinity. No active mines or mineral recovery programs are currently active within the project site. No mineral deposits have been identified in the General Plan, consequently, the development of the project site would not conflict with a mineral recovery plan as adopted by the General Plan. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

**11. NOISE.** Would the project 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	
---	--	--	---	--

While the project site is in a developing industrial district, there are existing residential uses to the east and proposed residential uses to the north. In recognition of these existing and proposed sensitive receptors, a project-specific noise analysis was conducted.

The operation phase analysis considered on-site noise associated with trucks maneuvering and idling within the dock areas, loading and unloading activities, as well as increased traffic volumes on local streets. For on-site truck activities for Building 7, the 14 foot-tall decorative screening walls required under City standards for aesthetic purposes also provide noise attenuation to reduce noise levels at the nearby residences below the City's exterior standard of 65 decibels (CNEL).

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The on-site operational activities associated with future light industrial land uses in Buildings 1 to 6 will be screened from view from existing and proposed residential land uses located to the north and east by 8 foot tall walls. The walls, which are required under City standards for aesthetic purposes, also provide noise attenuation to reduce noise levels at the nearby residences below the City's exterior standard of 65 decibels (CNEL). The installation of the screening walls noted above for Buildings 1 to 7 are conditions of approval for the project. The project has also been conditioned for consistency with the Municipal Code to ensure that loudspeakers, bells, gongs, buzzers or other noise attention devices installed on the project site are designed so that the noise level at all property lines will be at or below 55 dBA.

The analysis of the project's contribution to increased noise levels along area roadways considered major streets within an extended influence area generally defined by Heacock Street on the west, Cactus Avenue on the north, Oleander Avenue (Harley Knox Boulevard) on the south, and Perris Boulevard on the east. The analysis concluded that project traffic would increase noise levels within 50 feet of the analyzed roadways by 0.0 to 2.3 decibels. Inasmuch as the projected increases are well below the accepted significance threshold of 5 decibels, and the project would not contribute to any new exceedances of the 65 CNEL exterior standard for road segments with adjoining residential uses, project impacts in this regard are less than significant.

The project's short-term noise impacts during construction are considered less than significant through compliance with City Municipal Code limits on construction hours (grading activities are allowed between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M.; general construction is allowed between the hours of 6:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. weekdays or 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. for weekends or national holidays). Additionally, the project has been conditioned to locate equipment staging at the furthest location possible from adjacent residences as well as position stationary construction equipment so that the emitted noise is directed away from adjacent residences. All construction equipment will be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. Established City procedures for plan check, permit issuance, and construction inspection, ensure project implementation consistent with the conditions of approval.

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

Development of the project may result in groundborne vibrations or noise generated infrequently through the construction phase. However, this type of effect would be temporary and infrequent and is not expected to occur during project operation.

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

See response to item 11.a, above.

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

See response to item 11.a, above.

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?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The project is located across the street from the March Air Reserve Base but outside the boundaries of the Air Installation Compatibility Use Overlay District (AICUZ). This is an overlay district that restricts land use on properties located to the north and south of the runway of March Air Reserve Base. The AICUZ includes elements that address noise zones and accident potential zones. The project site is located outside the mapped noise contours associated with aircraft operations at the MARB airfield, indicating noise exposure due to aircraft operations in less than 60 decibels (CNEL). This is well below the accepted noise exposure level for industrial uses. March JPA identified that the project is restricted by FAA Part 77, which limits building heights in this area to 85-feet. The project as proposed has a maximum height of 36-feet and will not be in conflict with height restrictions from adjacent March Air Reserve Base.

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?				X
--	--	--	--	---

There is no private airstrip within the vicinity of the site, or within the City of Moreno Valley.

**12. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

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	
---	--	--	---	--

As the site is considered an industrial site, with population and housing growth opportunities indirectly related, the project will be planned consistent with the Citywide plan.

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

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

There are no existing residences on the site.

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

There are no existing residences on the site. The project will not displace any residents.

13. **PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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	

(a-e) There will be an incremental increase in the demand for new or altered public services including library, city hall, and city yard facilities. These facilities would be needed with or without the project. Environmental review has already been done for the proposed library as part of the future city hall complex.

14. **RECREATION.**

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

Neighborhood or regional parks are not associated with industrial projects, therefore there will be no impacts associated on these facilities from the proposed project

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?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project does not include recreational facilities.

15. **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in the 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	
--	--	--	---	--

The project-specific traffic study estimates the proposed project will generate up to 2,853 trips per day, with 572 trips attributed to trucks. The traffic study evaluated project traffic impacts for both project-level and cumulative impacts for the project opening year of 2011. The analysis evaluated 26 intersections in an area generally defined by Interstate 215 on the west, Harley Knox Boulevard/Oleander Avenue on the south, Cactus Avenue on the north, and Perris Boulevard on the east.

Eleven intersections in the project area are projected to operate at an unacceptable level of service (LOS) for the cumulative, "without project" scenario:

- Heacock Street (NS) at Cactus Avenue (EW)
- Heacock Street (NS) at Gentian Avenue (EW)
- Heacock Street (NS) at Iris Avenue (EW)
- Heacock Street (NS) at San Michele Road (EW)
- Heacock Street (NS) at Nandina Avenue (EW)
- Indian Street (NS) at Iris Avenue (EW)
- Indian Street (NS) at Nandina Avenue (EW)
- Indian Street (NS) at Oleander Avenue (EW)
- Perris Boulevard (NS) at Iris Avenue (EW)
- Perris Boulevard (NS) at San Michele Road (EW)
- Perris Boulevard (NS) at Oleander Avenue (EW)

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Fourteen intersections are identified as operating at an unacceptable level for the cumulative, "with project" scenario – consisting of the eleven above, with the addition of Heacock Street at Revere Place, Concord Way at Iris Avenue, and Perris Boulevard at Nandina Avenue. The project has been conditioned to complete street improvements at Heacock and Revere and Concord and Iris to address the unacceptable LOS at these intersections. The Perris/Oleander intersection was evaluated as an unsignalized intersection. The intersection has been signalized since the commencement of this study and operates at a satisfactory LOS. The intersection of Perris/Nandina will be reconstructed as part of a City Capital Project that will provide satisfactory LOS. The intersection of Heacock/Cactus will be addressed in a future City Capital Project.

The project has been conditioned to pay standard development impact fees (DIF) and Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF). Payment of DIF and TUMF are considered adequate to mitigate project impacts on the remaining intersections that currently operate at an unacceptable level and are not substantially worsened by the project.

Project conditions of approval require improvements to the perimeter project streets (Heacock Street and Iris Avenue), the installation of a median in Iris Avenue along the project site's frontage as well as a fair share contribution towards the installation of a signal at Perris and Suburban, which is not in any existing fee program.

The above-noted improvements specified in the project conditions of approval would be completed in accordance with established City programs to administer such conditions of approval and would provide mitigation of project-level impacts to below a level of significance. The project as designed and conditioned will reduce the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to below a level of significance. Established City procedures for plan check and permit issuance ensure collection of fees prior to building permit issuance or occupancy.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

The project is consistent with the General Plan. The project will not exceed a level of service established by an adopted regional congestion management plan.

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	
---	--	--	---	--

The project is located across the street from March Air Reserve Base but outside of the boundaries of the Air Installation Compatibility Use Overlay District (AICUZ). The proposed project is consistent with the site's existing Industrial zone and the General Plan. This project will not 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.

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

As designed, the project will not result in hazards. The project is not adjacent to any potential incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project has been designed in a manner consistent with City standards. The site will be readily accessible for emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
---	--	--	--	---

The project has provided adequate parking based on the City's Municipal Code and the requirements of the Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan.

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

The project as designed and conditioned will not conflict with adopted transportation policies.

**16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:**

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

The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The project would not exceed the existing or planned capacity of the Moreno Water Reclamation Facility.

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

The project will not exceed wastewater treatment capacity of the Moreno Water Reclamation Facility.

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	
---	--	--	---	--

The project will not require or result in the construction of unplanned storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Issues and Supporting Information	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
This project was determined to not be a project of regional significance per CEQA guidelines, so the preparation of a Water Supply Assessment was not required. However, the water purveyor, Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), prepared an Urban Water Master Plan demonstrating that it has or will have sufficient water supplies available to serve urban development on the property.				
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
EMWD, the wastewater treatment provider, has adequate capacity to serve the project in addition to the provider's existing commitments. EMWD has plans for major expansions of the Moreno Water Reclamation Facility. Source: EIR for the General Plan Update.				
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
The needs of the project for solid waste capacity would be negligible. The proposed project is expected to result in the use of utilities similar to a majority of the industrial uses in the vicinity. The project will be served by a landfill in the Badlands with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Source: EIR for the General Plan.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
The City is complying with State and Federal regulations regarding solid waste. All future projects will comply with the current policies regarding solid waste.				
<b>17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
The project would not significantly degrade the quality of the environment or 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. There are no historic structures on the site, and there will be no impact to historic resources. The project will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The analysis in this Initial Study demonstrates that project and cumulative impacts would be less than significant. Finally, the project consists of a Master Plot Plan for a six building industrial park, a Plot Plan for a warehouse distribution building and a parcel map that would result in no substantial adverse health effects on human beings.				
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
This project will not create any impacts, that when viewed in connection with existing land uses, other recently approved projects, and existing land use designations, would be considered cumulatively considerable. It is not expected that the proposed project would result in incremental effects. The analysis in this Initial Study demonstrates that the proposed project cumulative impacts would be less than significant.				
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	
The project consists of a Master Plot Plan for a six building industrial park, a Plot Plan for a warehouse distribution building and a parcel map. The project as designed and conditioned will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly for the reasons described in this checklist/initial study.				
The Air Quality Analysis included an evaluation of potential significant impacts to global climate change that could result from the implementation of the project. As concluded in the evaluation, project related Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions and their contribution to global climate change in the State of California are less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable because the project's impacts alone would not cause or significantly contribute to global climate change and the project's contribution from construction emissions is short term and would cease after project construction is completed. The project would not result in GHG emission levels that would substantially conflict with implementation of the GHG reduction goals of AB 32 or other State regulations.				

# NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**PROJECT TITLE AND FILE NUMBER:**

Master Plot Plan PA07-0035  
Plot Plan PA07-0039  
Tentative Parcel Map No. 35822 (PA08-0021)

**PROJECT APPLICANT:** Rados Tenants in Common  
**TELEPHONE NUMBER:** (714) 835-4612

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Moreno Valley Industrial Area Plan (SP #208), northeast corner of Heacock Street and Iris Avenue, Moreno Valley, Riverside County, California

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Master Plot Plan PA07-0035 for six industrial buildings to be developed along Revere Place and Concord Way. The buildings range in size from 23,700-square feet to 47,160-square feet. Plot Plan PA07-0039 for a 409,598 square feet warehouse distribution facility to be located on 19.14 acres located at the northeast corner of Heacock Street and Iris Avenue. Tentative Parcel Map No. 35822 (PA08-0021) is also proposed to re-configure the existing 21 parcels located within the project site and create six parcels ranging in size from 1.33 to 2.76 acres for Master Plot Plan PA07-0035 and one 19.14 acre parcel for Plot Plan PA07-0039.

## FINDING

The City of Moreno Valley has reviewed the above project in accordance with the City of Moreno Valley's Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, and has determined that an Environmental Impact Report need not be prepared because:

- The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because mitigation measures described in the attached Initial Study and hereby made a part of this Negative Declaration have been added to the project. The Final Conditions of Approval contain the final form and content of all mitigation measures.

This determination is based upon an Initial Study. The project file, including the Initial Study and related documents is available for review during normal business hours (7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday) at the City of Moreno Valley, Community Development Department, Planning Division, 14177 Frederick Street, Moreno Valley, California 92553, Telephone (951) 413-3206.

PREPARED BY: Jeff Bradshaw, Associate Planner

DATE: December 29, 2009

## NOTICE

The public is invited to comment on the Negative Declaration. The appropriateness and adoption of the Negative Declaration is considered at the time of project approval in light of comments received.

ADOPTED BY: City Council

DATE ADOPTED: January 26, 2010