Ivy House Residential Project

Final Addendum to the Initial Study/ Mitigated Negative Declaration (SCH No. 2007111059)

Prepared for:
Diversified Pacific Investments
10621 Civic Center Drive
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Prepared by:
HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
16485 Laguna Canyon Road, Suite 150
Irvine, CA 92618

February 2023 | 01968.00004.001

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (cont.)

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF TABLES

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AB	Assembly Bill
ADU	accessory dwelling unit
amsl	above mean sea level
APN	Assessor's Parcel Number
BMPs	best management practices
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CFGC	California Fish and Game Code
CY	cubic yard
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
GHG	greenhouse gas
HELIX	HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc.
I-	Interstate
IS/MND	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
JRMP	Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
L_{EQ}	dBA hourly equivalent
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
mgd	million gallons per day
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MSHCP	Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Program
MFD	Murrieta Fire Department
MMC	Murrieta Municipal Code
NOD	Notice of Determination
NPDES	National Pollution Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Properties

Acronyms and Abbreviations (cont.)

PRC	Public Resources Code
RCDEH	Riverside County Department of Environmental Health
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SB	Senate Bill
SCH	State Clearinghouse
SDRWQCB	San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
U.S.	United States
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WRCRCA	Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Background

The Ivy House Project (referred throughout this Addendum as the "approved project") included the Master Development Plan (MDP)-006-1884 and Tentative Tract Map (TTM)-005-1824 for the subdivision of 22 acres of land located at the southeast corner of New Clay Street and B Street (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 906-193-001, 906-200-001, 906-221-001, 906-221-002, 906-200-002, and 906-212-001) into 62 residential lots. The average lot size proposed was 6,673 gross square feet (sf), with a minimum lot size of 5,519 sf and maximum lot size of 9,545 sf. In addition, the approved project included a 2,839-sf lot for storm water drain purposes. The 22-acre site is within the Historic Murrieta Specific Plan and is zoned Village Residential-Single-Family 1 (VRS-1) with Master Plan Overlay (MPO).

The City of Murrieta (City) prepared an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) in November 2007 for the Ivy House Project (State Clearinghouse [SCH] 2007111059), which was circulated for a 30-day public review period pursuant to the requirements of Section 15105 of CEQA. The review period gave agencies, organizations, and members of the public the opportunity to review the Draft IS/MND and provide comments on the document and environmental analysis presented therein. The City considered all relevant comments in preparation of the Final IS/MND.

The Final IS/MND for the approved project was prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Administrative Code, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). The purpose of the Final IS/MND was to provide the decision-making body (Murrieta City Council [City Council]), responsible agencies, and the public with information regarding the environmental impacts of the project. The City Council certified the Final IS/MND February 19, 2008, and a Notice of Determination (NOD) was filed with the County Clerk's Office and the State Clearinghouse on November 13, 2007.

Since adoption of the 2008 Final IS/MND, the approved project has been revised to 62 single family lots and provide on-site stormwater detention to meet updated Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) standards and maintain the required 50-foot buffer from the Murietta Creek. This Addendum analyzes this revised project.

The activities addressed in this document are consistent with the types of activities envisioned in the 2008 Final IS/MND. This Addendum was prepared per Section 15162 and 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines to analyze whether the changes to the approved project would result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts. As a result of this analysis, it is found that there are not substantial changes in regard to circumstances or new information of substantial importance such that the specific activities now proposed would result in new significant impacts or impacts of substantially increased severity. Therefore, this Addendum supports the conclusion that only minor technical changes or additions are necessary and that none of the conditions described in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental environmental document has occurred.

The analysis of each CEQA topic area is discussed in Section 3.0, *Environmental Analysis*, of this Addendum. This analysis concludes that the revised project as discussed below in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, would not alter the conclusions reached in the impact analysis in the 2008 Final IS/MND. In summary, the project, with the proposed changes, would result in the following impacts, which are the same as those that would occur under the approved project analyzed in the IS/MND:

- No significant impacts on energy resources, water resources (hydrology and water quality), land use and planning (including agricultural resources), mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, utilities and service systems, and wildfire; and

- Less-than-significant impacts, with mitigation incorporated, related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources (including tribal cultural resources), geology and soils (paleontological resources), hazards and hazardous materials, and noise.

While impacts related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were not analyzed in the prior IS/MND, impacts of the revised project would be less than significant. The revised project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts under CEQA.

1.2 Purpose of Addendum to the IS/MND

When an approved project is changed or there are changes in the environmental setting, a determination must be made by the Lead Agency as to whether an Addendum, Subsequent/ Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or MND is needed. CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and 15164 set forth criteria to assess which environmental document is sufficient and appropriate. The criteria for determining whether an Addendum or Subsequent/Supplemental MND should be prepared are outlined in this section. If the following statements are true, then preparation of an Addendum is appropriate:

- There are no substantial changes proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

- Substantial changes have not occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous environmental document due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

- There is no new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous environmental document was certified as complete or was adopted, that shows any of the following:

    - The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous environmental document;

    - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous environmental document;

    - 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 measures or alternatives; or

    - Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous environmental document would substantially reduce one or more

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

- An addendum to an adopted MND may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent environmental document have occurred.

Based upon the analysis in Section 3.0, *Environmental Analysis*, of this document, the revisions to the project analyzed in the prior IS/MND would not result in new significant impacts or substantially increase the severity of significant impacts previously identified in the IS/MND. Additionally, the mitigation measures set forth in the IS/MND are still applicable, and no considerably different mitigation measures are required to mitigate the changes to the previously approved project. Therefore, the Lead Agency has determined that an Addendum to the IS/MND is sufficient and appropriate, and this environmental document has been prepared to analyze the environmental effects of the revised projects. Public review of this Addendum is not required per CEQA.

2.0 Project Description

2.1 Project Setting and Location

The project site is located at the southeast corner of New Clay Street and B Street (APNs 906-193-001, 906-200-001, 906-221-001, 906-221-002, 906-200-002, and 906-212-001) and is zoned as Residential – Single Family (RS-1) within the Downtown Murrieta Specific Plan (DMSP) Overlay with a land use designation of Single Family Residential (SFR).

The project site is relatively flat vacant land with elevations ranging from approximately 1,090 ft above mean sea level (amsl) to 1,100 ft amsl. Vegetation consists of non-native grassland and there are scattered trees throughout the site.

Surrounding land uses are designated as Civic/Institutional to the north, SFR to the northwest, south, and southeast, and Large Lot Residential to the west and southwest. Physically, the surrounding land uses are a combination of rural residential to the northwest, southeast, and east, undeveloped land to the north and south. Like the project site, the undeveloped areas support nonnative grasslands. Murietta Creek traverses the western portion of the project site and runs southwest to northeast in the project area with a channel of the creek north of the site (north of Kalma Street).

2.2 Project Description and Modifications Since IS/MND Adoption

As noted in Section 1.0, *Introduction*, in 2008 the Murietta City Council approved TTM 34439/ TTM 005-1824 and MDP 2006-1884 to subdivide 22 acres into 62 single family lots. The revised project proposes minor revisions to the currently approved entitlements that include the TTM, MDP, and CEQA documents, including the 2008 Final IS/MND. These minor revisions will also include updates to the Development Plan (Revised Permit). To meet updated WQMP standards and maintain the required 50-foot buffer from the Murietta Creek, the revised project proposes to include on-site stormwater detention. Each single-family lot is now proposed to contain a single-family home with an attached accessory dwelling unit (ADU). The proposed lot sizes are consistent with the approved lot sizes, ranging from 5,500 sf to 9,000 sf).

The approved MDP includes three architectural floor plans ranging from 2,400 sf to 2,850 sf with detached two and three car garages that were accessible via project alleyways. As proposed, the revised project includes homes that range from 2,300 sf to 3,150 sf with attached two and three car garages. The garages are either accessed via the internal public streets or private alleyways depending on lot configuration. The proposed ADUs are 750 sf in size with single- and two-story options and will have matching architecture with the main house and adhere to setback standards as required under the Murietta Municipal Code (MMC) and state law. Architecture will be updated in the revised MDP to include new elevations consisting of Craftsman, Spanish Colonial Revival, and American Mercantile. The revised MDP will also detail the use of ADUs in the Development Standard section.

The approved project took access from New Clay Street and B Street and had several internal public streets and private alleyways. The single-family homes will take vehicular access either from the public street fronting each lot or private alleyway depending on the particular lot layout. The ADUs will take vehicular access from the private alleyways. Additional circulation system revisions include shifting the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain both efficient lot design and the required 50-foot buffer for Murrieta Creek. Further, due to updated hydrological analyses showing that the previously proposed temporary intercept channel is no longer required, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street along with the outflow that entered into Murrieta Creek.

The proposed project also includes updates to the technical reports that were part of the original approval. All previous technical reports have been reviewed for adequacy and validity to the revised project. As appropriate, the technical reports have been updated and this Addendum has been prepared to address the current CEQA Appendix G Guidelines and evaluate CEQA topics not included or not included as an individual topic area in the Appendix G Guidelines at the time of the approved project (agricultural and forestry resources, GHG emissions, tribal cultural resources, and wildfire). Revised and new technical reports include the hydrology and WQMP, traffic analysis including (vehicle miles traveled [VMT]), paleontology, cultural resources, geotechnical due diligence, biological resources (including a tree survey), and an air quality and noise technical assessment. This Addendum has been prepared to address the CEQA requirements for the minor revisions to the entitlement. Lastly per the existing conditions of approval, a fully executed Tribal Monitoring Agreement with Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians has been executed which will include monitoring for future ground disturbance activities.

3.0 Environmental Impact Analysis

As described in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, a change to the previously approved project has been proposed since preparation of the IS/MND. As such, the following comparative analysis has been undertaken pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Sections 15162 and 15164 to provide the factual basis for determining whether changes in the project, change in circumstances, or new information since adoption of the IS/MND would require additional environmental review or preparation of a Subsequent IS/MND. This analysis focuses on whether the impact significance conclusions identified in the IS/MND would change under the revised project. The environmental analysis provided in the IS/MND remains current and applicable to the approved project in areas unaffected by the revised project for the environmental topics detailed in this section. An overview of the approved project impacts in relation to the previously adopted MND is provided in Table 1, *Impact Assessment Summary*.

Table 1
IMPACT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

Environmental Issues	Approved MND	Revised Project	New Mitigation?	Project Resultant Impact
3.1 Aesthetics	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts[2]	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.2 Agriculture And Forestry Resources[1]	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.3 Air Quality	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.4 Biological Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.5 Cultural Resources	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.6 Energy	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.7 Geology & Soils[2]	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No[2]	Less Than Significant with Mitigation
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Not Analyzed	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.9 Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.10 Hydrology & Water Quality[3]	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.11 Land Use & Planning	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.12 Mineral Resources	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.13 Noise	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.14 Population & Housing	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.15 Public Services	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.16 Recreation	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.17 Transportation	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant
3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources[4]	Less than Significant with Mitigation	No New Impacts	No	Less than Significant with Mitigation
3.19 Utilities & Service Systems	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less Than Significant
3.20 Wildfire[5]	Less than Significant	No New Impacts	No	Less Than Significant

[1] Agricultural and Forestry Resources were not analyzed as a separate CEQA environmental issue area in the approved IS/MND; however, agricultural resources were evaluated under land use.

[2] CEQA Appendix G Guidelines have been revised to include paleontological resources within Geology and Soils, no new significant impacts or considerably different mitigation measures have been identified as impacts to paleontological resources was discussed in Cultural Resources in the approved IS/MND.

[3] Referred to as Water Resources in the Approved IS/MND.

[4] Discussed in Cultural Resources in Approved IS/MND.

[5] Discussed in Hazards and Hazardous Materials in Approved IS/MND.

3.1 Aesthetics

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved IS/MND determined that the project would have not have a demonstrable negative aesthetic impact or impact a scenic vista or state highway. However, the approved IS/MND did identify a potential adverse aesthetic impact related to lighting. The approved IS/MND contained mitigation measure A-1 to reduce impacts to less than significant. It is noted that mitigation measure A-1 is the required regulatory compliance to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) as discussed in the Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) report prepared for the project. This is further discussed below.

A-1 In accordance with BMPs for the MSHCP and as recommended in the DBESP report lighting within the Project development will be limited to residential streets and consist of downward directed and shielded low-pressure sodium lights to ensure ambient lighting in the adjacent Murrieta Creek in not increased.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project; however, the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750-sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the

jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

According to the Conservation Element of the Murrieta Genera Plan 2035, Murrieta's natural setting offers views and vistas of features that have both scenic and ecological value (City 2011b). Prominent views of the Santa Rosa Plateau occur along the I-15 and I-215 Freeways. The project site itself if situated approximately 1.3 miles west of the I-15 within an area that has very little topographical relief (approximately 1,090 to 1,100 ft amsl). The project would introduce residences that would extend to a height of 26.4 feet, while the maximum height for the SF-1 zone is 35 feet. Moreover, due to the distance and intervening development, the project would not obstruct views of the Santa Rosa Plateau from I-215.

California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the legislature in 1963 to protect and enhance the natural scenic beauty of California highways and adjacent corridors. The State Scenic Highway System includes a list of highways that are either currently designated or eligible for designation as scenic highways. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), which oversees the program, does not identify any state scenic highways in the City of Murietta. It is noted that Caltrans identifies I-15 as eligible, however it is not officially designated.

The project does not contain any historic buildings or rock outcroppings. There are a few scattered trees throughout the site, yet as noted, these are not within a state scenic highway.

Public Resources Code 21071 defines the term "urbanized area" for the purpose of CEQA to mean an incorporated city that has a population of at least 100,000 persons or has a population of less than 100,000 persons if the population of that city and not more than two contiguous incorporated cities combined equals at least 100,000 persons. U.S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census (U.S. Census Bureau) data from 2020 indicates that the City has a population of 110,949. Thus, the project site is within an urbanized area and therefore, is evaluated relative to applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. The project site is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning. Additionally, as discussed above, the project is proposing structures with heights less than the allowable 35 feet under the RS-1 zone. There are no other land use regulations that govern scenic quality that apply to the project site (i.e., scenic corridor, scenic overlay zone, etc.).

The project site is currently vacant land, the surrounding land uses are a combination of rural residential to the northwest, southeast, and east, undeveloped land to the north and south. The project would result in the subdivision of the 22-acres into 62 single-family lots that would be constructed in the architectural style of Modern Farmhouse, Wine Country, and Spanish. As with the previously approved project, the revised project would comply with the comply with the applicable requirements for Residential Design Standards (Section 16.08.030) and Landscaping Standards (Section 16.28) as contained in the Development Code as well as Design Standards contained in the DMSP. The requirements of the Development Code and the DMSP will ensure quality architectural design, site design, and landscaping standards are accomplished. Implementation of Design Standards will reduce impacts to aesthetics below a significant level

Lighting standards are established in the Development Code, (Sections 16.18.100 and 16.18.110) which requires that the project controls light and glare on adjacent properties and minimize impacts to the

Mount Palomar Observatory. Additionally, in accordance with the BMPs of the MSHCP the project will be required to reduce lighting impacts on Murrieta Creek. In particular, lighting within the project would be limited to residential streets and consist of downward directed and shielded low-pressure sodium lights to ensure ambient lighting to reduce light impacts on Murrieta Creek (mitigation measure A-1).

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the previously approved project. The prior environmental document for the approved project identified that with mitigation there would be no impacts to aesthetics. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to aesthetic impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to aesthetic impacts than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non- forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved IS/MND did not include the discussion of agricultural resources as a separate topic and included a single threshold under Land Use. At the time of the approved IS/MND, the CEQA Appendix G

Guidelines did not include Forestry Resources as an issue area. The approved project was determined to have no impacts in relation agricultural resources.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

The project is in an urbanized area (as defined by CEQA) where there is no farmland or agricultural resources within the project area. According to the California Department of Conservation's (DOC) Riverside County Important Farmland 2018 map, the project site and surrounding area is classified as Other. Lands that are classified as Other are lands that are not included in any other mapping category. Common examples include low density rural developments; brush, timber, wetland, and riparian areas not suitable for livestock grazing; confined livestock, poultry or aquaculture facilities; strip mines, borrow pits; and water bodies smaller than forty acres. Vacant and nonagricultural land surrounded on all sides by urban development and greater than 40 acres is mapped as Other Land.

The Williamson Act applies to parcels within an established agricultural preserve consisting of at least 20 acres of Prime Farmland or at least 40 acres of land not designated as Prime Farmland. The purpose of the act is to preserve agriculture and open space lands by discouraging premature and unnecessary conversion to urban uses. The Williamson Act enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land for use as agricultural or related open space. The project site and surrounding areas are not contracted under the Williamson Act.

The project site is zoned RS-1 with the DMSP overlay and according to the Murrieta General Plan Update 2015 Environmental Impact Report (General Plan EIR) it is not subject to a Williamson Act Contract (City 2011).

Forest land is land that can support ten-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Riparian habitat can be considered forest land if it meets these criteria.

Timberland is land, other than land owned by the Federal government and designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire (CAL FIRE) Board of Forestry as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees.

The project site, which is zoned RS-1, indicating the site is intended for residential land uses has scattered trees but does not support a forest. A tree survey report was prepared by HELIX

Environmental Planning, Inc. in June 2022. As noted in the tree survey report, a total of 13 Protected Trees were located within the project site, including five arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*), one Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), one Japanese zelkova (*Zelkova serrata*), four Shamel ash (*Fraxinus uhdei*), and two silver dollar gum (*Eucalyptus polyanthemos*).

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts to agricultural resources. The approved IS/MND did not discuss forestry resources, however, there is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would result in new significant environmental effects. No new mitigation measures are required.

3.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☒	☐	☐

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved project was determined to have the potential to produce both short- and long-term air quality impacts. Short-term impacts are associated with the construction of the project, while long-term impacts are associated with emissions from the operation of the project. The IS/MND identified potential adverse impacts that would occur during all phases of construction and as a result the IS/MND contained mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-19 to reduce impacts to less than significant. These mitigation measures are presented below.

AQ-1 During construction, the contractor shall ensure all construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained in good operating condition to reduce emissions. The SCAQMD requires that fuel injection timing be retarded 2 degrees for the manufacture's recommendation and use high-pressure injectors.

AQ-2 During construction, the contractor shall ensure low emission mobile construction equipment is used (replace diesel-powered equipment with gasoline-powered equipment), where feasible, during site preparation, grading, excavation, and construction of the proposed project components.

AQ-3 During construction, the contractor shall ensure proposed project specific sites are watered and that construction trucks pass through a shaker grate to remove excess dirt prior to exiting the site.

AQ-4 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that when soil is transported, the operator (1) employs water to moisten earthen surface prior to disturbance and immediately after disturbance; (2) controls runoff so it does not saturate the surface of unpaved haul road and cause track-off; and (3) employs watering as an emergency measure during high wind events to stabilize actively dusting surface including but not limit to soil pile, unpaved road, and unpaved parking areas.

AQ-5 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that water-wetting methods and soil-binders are used on exposed soil stockpiles, unpaved roads, and unpaved parking areas. Active grading areas shall be watered at least three times each workday, as needed, to prevent visible plumes from exiting the project site.

AQ-6 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that during site preparation, grading, excavation and construction, chemical soil stabilizers are applied, according to the manufacturer's specification, to all inactive construction areas, defined as previously graded areas, which are inactive for 96 hours or more.

AQ-7 During construction, the contractor shall ensure groundcover is re-established through seeding and watering on those parts of the Project site that would not be disturbed for lengthy periods, generally defined as two or more months.

AQ-8 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that site preparation, grading, excavation and construction, public streets are swept if silt is deposited on these roads from construction activities within the project site.

AQ-9 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that site preparation; grading, excavation and construction speed limits on unpaved roads are restricted to 15 miles per hour.

AQ-10 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that site preparation; grading, excavation and construction operations are suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour.

AQ-11 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that during site preparation, grading, excavation and construction, low sulfur fuel is used for portable and stationary construction equipment.

AQ-12 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that during site preparation, grading, excavation and construction, onsite power sources are used rather than temporary diesel or gasoline ICE generators when feasible.

AQ-13 During construction, the contractor shall ensure that during site preparation, grading, excavation and construction, the contractor will establish a car-pool program for construction employees which will include incentives with the goal of achieving a 1.S persons per vehicle ridership for this project.

AQ-14 During construction, the City shall require a lunch shuttle or catering program be implemented by the during site preparation, grading, excavation and construction to reduce the number of lunch time trips to and from the site.

AQ-15 During construction, the City shall require that low volatile organic compounds (VOC) coating and solvents be used on all structures.

AQ-16 During construction, the City shall require that low VOC asphalt be used on paved portions of the project site.

AQ-17 The City shall require that sidewalks and/or pedestrian paths be provided within the development.

AQ-18 The City shall require that pedestrian safety measures such as street lighting and pedestrian signage and signals be provided.

AQ-19 The City shall require that off-site intersection traffic signals be synchronized to prevent congestion of traffic flow in the area of the project.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

In September 2021, HELIX prepared a Technical Assessment of the proposed project, that included a review of the approved project to determine if the previous air quality analysis was adequate and applicable to the revised project. The Technical Assessment is attached to this document as Appendix A.

As noted, impacts to air quality were addressed in the previous IS/MND and it was determined that air quality impacts from construction would be reduced to less than significant levels through implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-16. These mitigation measures would require low emission equipment, reduce on-site dust emissions, and reduce fuel usage. The measures would continue to be required to be implemented with the revised project. Because the number of residences would remain the same as what was analyzed for the approved project, impacts from air quality are anticipated to be at least the same as what was previously analyzed. Furthermore, because construction

would occur at a later date from what was originally proposed, emissions may be reduced because more modern and cleaner-burning construction equipment fleet mix is now available than when the previous project was analyzed in 2007. In addition, the approved project included the demolition of the onsite structures, totaling 5,000 square feet. These structures are no longer present on the project site and therefore, the project would not experience the short-term construction emissions related to demolition. Mitigation measures AQ-17 through AQ-19 requiring sidewalks and pedestrian and traffic safety measures would continue to be implemented to reduce operational air quality emissions. Impacts to air quality from operational and construction sources would be less than significant with implementation of these measures.

Due to these factors, construction and operational noise levels and air pollutant emissions are not anticipated to exceed City thresholds, and no additional impacts from implementation of the revised project are anticipated.

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. The IS/MND for the approved project identified that with mitigation impacts to air quality would be less than significant. Likewise, the revised project would not change the IS/MND's findings with respect to air quality impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to air quality than those reached in the IS/MND, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required for the revised project.

3.4 Biological Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☒	☐	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

IS/MND Conclusion

Vandermost Consulting Services, Inc. (VCS) prepared a Consistency Analysis for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan; Ivy House Project prepared by on July 17, 2006, and in response, the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority released the Joint Project Review Letter (JPR 07-05-22-04) dated October 26, 2007 (JPR Letter).

The approved IS/MND identified potential adverse biological resources impacts. The project site is within the MSHCP planning area and has suitable habitat for burrowing owls and nesting birds. In addition, the proposed project site is located inside the Stephens' Kangaroo (SKR) HCP fee area boundary. The approved IS/MND contained mitigation measures B-1 through B-4 shown below to reduce impacts to less than significant.

B-1 The project is required to pay the MSHCP mitigation fee.

B-2 A burrowing owl (BUOW) clearance survey shall be conducted 30-days prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities of the site. If the clearance survey is positive, additional actions/ mitigation may be required pursuant to the MSHCP, Fish and Game Code, and the MBTA.

B-3 For all bird species vegetation removal should be conducted outside the avian breeding season (March through July) to avoid impacts to nesting birds. If vegetation clearance is conducted during the breeding season, a preconstruction bird survey would be required less than three days from vegetation disturbance activities. If passerine birds are found to be nesting or there is evidence of nesting behavior inside or within 300 feet of the impact area, a 300-foot buffer will be required around the nest where no vegetation disturbance would be permitted; for raptors the buffer would be increased to 500 feet. A qualified biologist would closely monitor the nest until it is determined that the nest is no longer active, at which time vegetation removal could continue.

B-4 Payment of the SKR mitigation fee to the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCA) is required.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

HELIX staff reviewed the Consistency Analysis for the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan; Ivy House Project JPR Letter dated October 26, 2007 (JPR Letter), and conducted a general biological survey and jurisdictional delineation on the project site on June 24, 2021. The JPR Letter includes specific conditions related to covered biological resources under the Western Riverside County MSHCP that must be complied with including impacts to, and mitigation for, Riparian/Riverine Areas pursuant to Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP.

HELIX staff conducted biological and jurisdictional field assessments and compiled the findings into a General Biological Resources Assessment, attached to this document as Appendix B. Based on the findings of the HELIX biological and jurisdictional field assessments, existing biological conditions on the project site, including vegetation communities and jurisdictional resources, remain largely consistent with the prior biological resource mapping for the project site conducted by VCS in 2006.

The revised project has reduced the number of outlet locations discharging into Murrieta Creek from two to one, with the revised project only requiring one outlet to convey stormwater from one expanded detention basin proposed near the center of the residential development along its western limits. Due to the revision in site design, the project would likely reduce impacts to jurisdictional and MSHCP resources compared to the project design analyzed in the JPR Letter. Similar to the approved project, protocol surveys for burrowing owl were conducted by HELIX in 2020 during early due diligence efforts for the project and were negative.

Implementation of the project would likely require a Section 404 permit from the USACE, and Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the RWQCB, and a Section 1602 Lake and Streambed Agreement from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

To summarize, no new impacts to sensitive plant or animal species are anticipated as a result of the revised project. The project proponent intends to construct the residential development consistent with the terms of the existing JPR Letter approval, including remaining at, or below, the acreage of permanent construction impacts to riparian/riverine areas associated with Murrieta Creek on-site for the construction of two proposed outlets for the project. As such, impacts to riparian/riverine areas will not exceed more than 0.05 acre, and on-site compensatory mitigation for impacts to riparian/riverine areas associated with Murrieta Creek will total no less than 0.10 acre of revegetated streambed habitat.

Given that the revised project intends to further reduce permanent impacts to jurisdictional features and MSHCP riparian/riverine areas compared to the prior approved design analyzed in the JPR Letter,

the project remains consistent with the existing JPR approval, and no new JPR authorizations under the MSHCP are anticipated to be required. The project will require preparation and processing of a DBESP for impacts to riparian/riverine areas under the MSHCP, which will be submitted to the City for processing by the agencies concurrent with forthcoming processing of the regulatory permit applications for the project.

The IS/MND for the approved project identified that with mitigation impacts to biological resources would be less than significant. Likewise, the revised project would not change the IS/MND's findings with respect to impacts to biological resources. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to biological resources than those reached in the IS/MND, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. However, it is noted that due to the revised site design the project would not have increased jurisdictional impacts and impacts to MSHCP resources compared to the approved project. No new mitigation measures are required for the proposed change.

3.5 Cultural Resources

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

IS/MND Conclusion

A Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment was conducted for the proposed project site and surrounding area by Michael Brandman Associates, the results of which are contained in a report dated March 29, 2006. The Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment indicates that two previous archaeological surveys have been conducted on portions of the project site in the past. In 1992, the floodplain of Murrieta Creek and a buffer around the floodplain were surveyed by Jones & Stokes Associates. In 2003, a linear survey along a portion of the southern boundary was conducted by Peak & Associates. No cultural sites were recorded within the project site during either of these previous surveys. Additionally, 15 other surveys have been conducted within a half-mile radius of the proposed project site. These surveys recorded 45 cultural resources. The Assessment ultimately determined that there is a "moderate" probability that significant historic and prehistoric (archaeological) resources will be unearthed during development within the project site.

It is noted that the approved IS/MND cultural resources analysis also determined that there is the potential for impacts to paleontological resources. Due to changes in the CEQA Appendix G Guidelines,

impacts to paleontological resources are now discussed in Section 3.7, *Geology and Soils* of this Addendum. As shown below, the approved IS/MND contained mitigation measures C-1 and C-2, C-7, and C-8 to reduce impacts to historic, archaeological, and Native American resources to less than significant.

C-1 There is "moderate" probability that significant historic resources will be unearthed during development within the project area. An archaeological mitigation monitoring program shall be implemented within the project boundaries. Full-time monitoring shall continue until the Project archaeologist determines that the overall sensitivity of the Project Site has been reduced from moderate to low as a result of mitigation monitoring. Should the monitor determine that there are no cultural resources within the impacted areas, or should the sensitivity be reduced to low during the monitoring, all monitoring shall cease.

C-2 Should any cultural resources be discovered, the monitor is authorized to stop all grading in the immediate area of the discovery, and shall make recommendations to the Lead Agency (City) on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources, including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

If the resources are determined to be unique, historic resources as defined under section 15064.5 pf the CEQA Guidelines, mitigation measures shall be identified by the monitor and recommended to the Lead Agency (City).

Appropriate mitigation measures for significant resources could include avoidance or capping, incorporation of the site in green space, parks, or open space, or data recovery excavations of the finds. No further grading shall occur in the area of the discovery until the Lead Agency (City) approves the measures to protect these resources. Any archaeological artifacts recovered as a result of mitigation shall be donated to a qualified scientific institution approved by the Lead Agency (City) where they would be afforded long-term preservation to allow future scientific study.

C-7 A report documenting the monitoring activities shall be submitted to the City of Murrieta within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources. The artifacts shall be deposited into an accredited institution that is authorized to accept the cultural resources.

C-8 Once the project-related earthmoving excavation begins, and in the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps shall be taken:

1. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the Riverside County Coroner is contacted to determine if the remains are (either historic or) prehistoric and that no investigation of the cause of death is required. If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American, then the coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24-hours, and the NAHC shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased North American. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98; or

2. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representative shall re-bury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriated dignity either in accordance with the recommendations of the most likely descendent or on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance:

    - The NAHC is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24-hours after being notified by the commission.

    - The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation: or

    - The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Additionally, as with the previously approved project the proposed project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Specifically, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street allows the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

HELIX conducted an updated archaeological resource study to identify and address archaeological sensitivities within the project site. To assess if the cultural sensitivity has changed since the 2006 study, HELIX requested an updated records search from the Eastern Information Center (EIC), requested a Sacred Lands File search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), conducted a pedestrian field survey of the approximately 22-acre project site with a Luiseño Native American monitor, and reviewed historic maps and aerial photographs of the project area. The results of this study can be found in the Cultural Resources Assessment, attached to this document as Appendix C.

HELIX requested a records search update and an updated review of the Sacred Lands File, reviewed archival research, and conducted a pedestrian field survey of the project site. Forty-five cultural resources have been recorded within half-mile of the project. One resource, a ranch complex dating between the 1940s and 1980s, was identified within the project site during the 2006 survey. Although the 2006 survey identified multiple structures within the project site relating to the ranch complex, these structures have since been removed. However, concrete slabs, the remnants of building foundations, and a wooden shed are still extant within the project site. As previously noted, the ranch complex was assessed as not a significant resource under CEQA; therefore, impacts to these remaining features do not constitute significant effects.

Furthermore, two isolated prehistoric flake artifacts were observed during the 2021 HELIX survey of the project site. Isolates also are not significant resources under CEQA, as they do not meet the criteria for the California Register of Historic Resources. However, the potential remains for both historic and prehistoric resources to be present in a subsurface context within the project area. The Murietta Creek area is rich in cultural resources, both archaeological and tribal cultural resources, and the alluvial setting elevates the potential for buried resources. As such, it is recommended that an archaeological and Native American monitoring program be implemented during grading or other ground-disturbing activities, including brushing/grubbing, removal of existing infrastructure, and trenching for utilities.

As noted in the mitigation measures listed above for cultural resources, the monitoring program should include attendance by the archaeologist and Native American monitor at a preconstruction meeting with the grading contractor and the presence of archaeological and Native American monitors during initial ground-disturbing activities on site. Both archaeological and Native American monitors would have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect grading and other ground-disturbing activity in the event that cultural resources are encountered. If significant cultural material is encountered, the project archaeologist will coordinate with the Monitoring Tribe, the applicant, and City staff to develop and implement appropriate avoidance, preservation, or mitigation measures.

In the event that human remains are discovered, the County Coroner shall be contacted. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the NAHC, shall be contacted in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. All requirements of Health & Safety Code §7050.5 and PRC §5097.98 shall be followed.

Based on these factors, the mitigation measures implemented in the adopted 2008 IS/MND and associated adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) are recommended to ensure cultural resources are not impacted by project development. By implementing an archaeological and Native American monitoring program, the project will reduce any potential impact to cultural or tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the previously approved project. The prior environmental document for the approved project identified that with mitigation there would be no impacts to cultural resources. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to cultural resources impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to cultural resources impacts than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

3.6 Energy

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved project was determined to have less than significant impacts in relation to energy resources.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Additionally, as with the previously approved project the proposed project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Specifically, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street allows the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. In addition, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street, which would incrementally decrease the construction effort and associated energy consumption.

As is typical of any construction, the project would temporarily consume energy for the operation of construction equipment and vehicles. During construction, standard methods of earthmoving and other associated construction activities are planned. Construction activities would not include methods of construction that would result in inefficient or unnecessary use of energy resources. The project is designed to meet California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 24 CALGreen mandatory green building standards. As such, the development includes a suite of design features that assist in meeting the required energy reduction standards.

Several levels of government have implemented regulatory programs in response to reducing GHG emissions, which consequently serve to increase energy efficiency. State agencies, including California Air Resources Board, California Energy Commission, California Public Utilities Commission, California

Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), Caltrans, and the Department of Water Resources have developed regulatory and incentive programs that promote energy efficiency. Many of the measures are generally beyond the ability of any future development to implement and are implemented at the utility provider or the manufacturer level.

On a project level, the 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards include provisions applicable to all buildings, which are mandatory requirements for efficiency and design. The project would be consistent with the requirements of Title 24 through implementation of energy-reduction measures, such as energy efficient lighting and appliances, water efficient appliances and plumbing fixtures, water efficient landscaping and irrigation. Therefore, the revised project would not conflict with or obstruct with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts to energy resources. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to energy resources than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No mitigation measures are required.

3.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

IS/MND Conclusion

Harrington Geotechnical Engineering, Inc. prepared a Geotechnical Investigation for the previously approved project, dated December 15, 2004. Based on this report, the 2008 IS/MND concluded that the approved project would not result in a significant impact related to any geology and soils concerns. However, the 2008 IS/MND did identify significant impacts related to paleontological resources (which was discussed under Cultural Resources). The paleontological resources-related mitigation measures from the approved IS/MND are presented below (mitigation measures C3 through C7).

C3 Monitoring of excavation in areas identified as likely to contain paleontologic resources by a qualified paleontologic monitor is required. Based upon results of the Phase I Cultural Resources Assessment, dated 29 March 2006, areas of concern within the boundaries of this project include the sandstone components of the Pauba Formation. Monitoring is not necessary unless potentially fossiliferous units are encountered in the subsurface during excavation activities and upon examination by qualified paleontologic personnel are subsequently determined to potentially contain fossil resources.

If required, paleontological monitors should be equipped to salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and to remove samples of sediments that are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. Monitors must be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens. Monitoring may be reduced if potentially fossiliferous units as described herein are not present, or if present are determined upon exposure and examination by qualified paleontologic personnel to have a low potential to contain fossil resources.

C4 Recovered specimens must be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments, so as to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates.

C5 Significant paleontologic specimens are to be identified and curated into an established, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable storage (e.g., SBCM). The paleontologist must have a written repository agreement in hand prior to initiation of mitigation activities.

Mitigation of adverse impacts to significant paleontologic resources is not complete until such curation into an established museum repository has been fully completed and documented.

C6 A report of findings must be prepared with an appended itemized inventory of all recovered specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the appropriate Lead Agency along with confirmation of the curation of recovered specimens into an established accredited museum repository, will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.

C7 A report documenting the monitoring activities shall be submitted to the City within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources. The artifacts shall be deposited into an accredited institution that is authorized to accept the cultural resources.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

Seismic analysis procedure for liquefaction evaluation in California has changed since the prior site investigation for the approved project. Accordingly, and in respect to the most recently adopted California Building Code (CBC) (2019), Petra Geosciences, Inc. (Petra), prepared a Feasibility/Due Diligence Geotechnical Review of the project in January 2020. Based on the changes to the CBC, Petra performed a limited evaluation of the liquefaction settlement and lateral spreading potential during a major seismic event, which is discussed further below.

Development of the revised project is tentatively considered feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint. However, additional investigations are required to further characterize the potential for liquefaction settlement and lateral deformation at the site. These conditions are not new, rather due to advancement in the characterization and approach to geotechnical investigations and design, more information is available. The Geotechnical Due Diligence contains several recommendations that are designed so that the project meets the criteria set forth in the CBC, which is adopted as Chapter 15.08 of the MMC. Accordingly, these recommendations are required by the CBC and are incorporated as project design features that would be included as conditions of approval.

In 1972, the California legislature passed the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Zoning Act (Act) to help identify areas subject to severe ground shaking. The purpose of this Act is to prohibit the placement of most structures for human occupancy across the traces of active faults; thereby mitigating the hazard of fault ruptures.

A fault is classified as active and categorized as within an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Hazard Zone, if movement has occurred within the past 11,000 years. Where such zones are designated, no buildings or structures may be constructed on the trace of the fault According to Exhibit 5.8-3, Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Map of the General Plan EIR, the project site is not located within an Alquist Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No impact would occur.

According to Exhibit 5.8-4, Riverside County Fault Hazard Map of the General Plan EIR, there are no known active faults on or adjacent to the project site (City 2011a). However, there are faults near the project site that have the potential to cause moderate to intense ground shaking at the site. The project would comply with the seismic design parameters outlined in the CBC, which provide requirements for earthquake safety based on factors such as occupancy type, the types of soils onsite, and the probable strength of ground motion. Compliance with the CBC would include the incorporation of: (1) seismic safety features to minimize the potential for significant effects as a result of earthquakes; (2) proper building footings and foundations; and (3) construction of the building structure so that it would withstand the effects of strong ground shaking. In addition, the City's Building Department would review the site plans through building plan checks, issuance of a building permit, and inspection of the residences during construction, which would ensure that all required CBC seismic safety measures are incorporated into all of the homes. Adherence with construction and building safety standards would be required (as encoded in MMC Chapter 15. 08), would reduce potential impacts associated with seismic ground shaking at the project site. Impacts would be less than significant.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon where earthquake-induced ground vibrations increase the pore pressure in saturated, granular soils until it is equal to the confining, overburden pressure. When this occurs, the soil can completely lose its shear strength and enter a liquefied state. The possibility of liquefaction is dependent upon grain size, relative density, confining pressure, saturation of the soils, and intensity and duration of ground shaking. In order for liquefaction to occur, three criteria must be met: underlying loose coarse-grained (sandy) soils, a groundwater depth of less than approximately 50 feet, and a potential for seismic shaking from nearby large-magnitude earthquake. Exhibit 5.8-5, Liquefaction Susceptibility Map, of the General Plan EIR shows that the project is located in an area that is designated as having a moderate susceptibility to liquefaction (City 2011a). Further, site investigations performed by Petra identified that the site contains liquefiable soils. In particular, soils identified in the northwestern and southwestern portion of the site have a potential to liquefy, however project development could occur without significant impacts through the required adherence to the CBC. However, soils in the area of the proposed water quality basin need to be further investigated.

The project is subject to the mitigation measures in the General Plan EIR that state that prior to issuance of a grading permit, a registered geologist or soils engineer shall prepare an area-specific geologic study, which shall be submitted to the Public Works or Building and Safety Department for approval. In addition, the project is subject to the CBC as adopted into the MMC as Chapter 15.08, which provides the standards to mitigate geologic hazards such as liquefaction. In addition, the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act specifies that the lead agency may withhold development permits until geologic or soils investigations are conducted for specific sites and mitigation measures are incorporated into plans to reduce hazards associated with seismicity and unstable soils. If a geologic report concludes liquefaction

impacts cannot be reduced to less than significant with mitigation as necessary, development would not be permitted. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

Ground surface elevations on the project site range between 1,090 ft amsl and 1,100 ft amsl). Exhibit 5.8-6, State Seismic Hazards Zone Map, of the General Plan EIR shows that the project site and surrounding area is outside of any areas that are identified as subject to earthquake induces landslides (City 2011a). Additionally, construction of the proposed structures would follow existing guidelines set forth by the CBC. No impact associated with landslides would occur.

Construction of the proposed project would involve a variety of heavy equipment associated with intensive earthwork, structural, and paving phases. Soil exposed by construction activities, such as excavation, could be subject to erosion if exposed to heavy rain, winds, or other storm events. The project applicant would be required to submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) to the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB) for the preparation a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Generally, a SWPPP demonstrates how water quality during, and post construction would be maintained in accordance with mandated objectives. Often this is achieved by employing BMPs. Many BMPs designed to protect water quality also serve to reduce soil erosion and loss of topsoil.

Specific BMPs may include the following:

- Preservation of existing vegetation within staging/parking areas where feasible.
- Covering stockpiled, excavated, and/or fill materials to reduce potential off-site sediment transport.
- Use of erosion control devices, such as straw wattles, mulch, mats, and/or geotextiles.
- Use of sediment controls to protect the site perimeter and prevent off-site sediment transport, including measures such as silt fencing, fiber rolls, gravel bags, temporary sediment basins, street sweeping, stabilized construction access points and sediment stockpiles, and use of properly fitted covers for sediment transport vehicles.
- Compliance with local dust control measures.
- Daily backfill, compaction, and/or covering of excavated pipeline trenches to minimize erosion potential.
- Paving of disturbed roadway areas as soon as feasible after completion of trenching.
- Regular inspection and maintenance of all erosion control and sediment catchment facilities to ensure proper function and effectiveness.

Further, construction would also be subject to compliance with the MMC Grading Permit regulations that address erosion control. Specifically, MMC Section 16.16.070, Erosion Control and Grading, specifies that every subdivision map shall be conditioned on compliance with the requirements for grading and erosion control, including the prevention of sedimentation or damage to off-site property, as set forth in MMC Chapter 15.52, Grading Restrictions. Once operational, the project would include a combination of impermeable surfaces and landscaped areas, eliminating large areas of exposed soils that may be subject to erosion and sedimentation.

With implementation of required standard erosion control measures and storm water construction BMPs, construction-related erosion and sedimentation impacts would be less than significant. Additionally, once constructed, the project site would not include expansive areas of exposed soils that would contribute to erosion and sedimentation. Impacts would be less than significant.

Ground subsidence is the gradual settling or sinking of the ground surface with little or no horizontal movement. Most ground subsidence is induced by humans and is most commonly associated with the extraction of fluids (water and/or petroleum) from subsurface sediments. Subsidence can also occur when dry collapsible soils become saturated. Less commonly, ground subsidence can occur as a response to natural forces such as earthquake movements.

The Geotechnical Investigation includes recommendations that are designed to meet the CBC standards and have been incorporated into the project as design features that would be adopted as conditions of approval. Mandatory compliance with applicable seismic-safety development requirements as well as the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, which specifies that the lead agency may withhold development permits until a project incorporates adequate mitigation measures to reduce seismic/geologic hazards minimizes potential effects related to unstable geologic unit or soils. Impacts would be less than significant.

No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be installed as part of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

Paleo Solutions conducted both field and archival research and prepared a paleontological report for the proposed project. This report, the findings of which are summarized below, is attached as Appendix D of this Addendum.

The paleontological potential of the project site was evaluated based on an analysis of existing paleontological data and a field survey. The three components of the analysis of existing data included a geologic map review, a scientific literature search, and museum records searches. The analysis of existing data was supplemented with a pedestrian field survey. Geologic mapping indicates that the Project area is entirely underlain by Holocene- and latest Pleistocene-age young alluvial valley deposits. However, during the field survey conducted on August 18, 2021, the sandstone member of the Pleistocene-age Pauba Formation and artificial fill were also observed within the project site; therefore, these geologic units are included in the paleontological analysis. Holocene- and latest Pleistocene-age young alluvial channel deposits and the fanglomerate member of the Pauba Formation are also mapped within a half mile of the project site, but these additional geologic units are unlikely to be encountered during planned construction activities. No fossils were observed or collected during the field survey. A museum records search completed for the project site and surrounding area by the San Bernardino County Museum (SBCM) in 2006 indicated that there were no previously documented fossils within the boundaries of the project site, but that fossils have been recorded within a one-mile radius of the site and elsewhere in Murrieta. An updated records search was requested from the Western Science Center (WSC), which returned no documented paleontological localities within the boundaries of the project site; however, fossils have been recovered from older sedimentary deposits within one to two miles of the project site.

The County of Riverside (2015) paleontological sensitivity system was applied to the results of the analysis of existing data and field survey. Due to its fine-grained lithology and potential to yield a scientifically significant and diverse fossil fauna, the sandstone member of the Pauba Formation has high

paleontological potential. Holocene-age deposits, such as the young alluvial valley deposits, are considered to be too young to contain scientifically significant paleontological resources; thus, they have low paleontological potential. Lastly, unmapped recent artificial fill consists of previously disturbed sediments and any fossil found within these deposits will have lost their stratigraphic context; therefore, artificial fill also has low paleontological potential.

No fossil localities were recorded during the survey; however, sediments conducive to fossilization were observed in the southern portion of the site and paleontologically sensitive sediments are likely present at shallow depth elsewhere in the site. Construction excavations that disturb units with high paleontological sensitivity (the Pauba Formation and older alluvial sediments) should be monitored full-time by a professional paleontologist in order to reduce potential adverse impacts to scientifically important paleontological resources to a less than significant level. Artificial fill and young alluvial valley deposits should be initially spot-checked during construction to determine if older, more paleontologically sensitive deposits, the Pauba Formation, or older alluvium, are disturbed at depth. Paleontological sensitivity mapping by the County of Riverside indicates high sensitivity units may be present in the vicinity of the Project area beginning at four feet below ground surface, at which point construction monitoring of ground disturbing activities should begin.

Due to the findings of the site-specific paleontological report, mitigation measures C-3 through C-7 of the approved IS/MND are still considered relevant but would be supplemented by the following measure.

Mitigation Measure

GEO-1 Prior to construction, a paleontological resource impact mitigation program (PRIMP) shall be prepared by a Qualified Paleontologist and filed with the Riverside County Geologist. The PRIMP shall provide detailed recommended monitoring locations; a description of a paleontological resources worker environmental awareness program to inform construction personnel of the potential for fossil discoveries and of the types of fossils that may be encountered; detailed procedures for monitoring, fossil recovery, laboratory analysis, and museum curation; and notification procedures in the event of a fossil discovery by paleontological monitor or other project personnel. Prior to the start of construction, a curation agreement from the WSC, or another accredited repository in Riverside County, shall be obtained.

Construction excavations that disturb geologic units with high sensitivity (all areas that contain the Pauba Formation and areas four feet below ground surface that contain artificial fill and older alluvium) shall be monitored full-time by a professional paleontologist. Areas of artificial fill and young alluvial valley deposits shall be initially spot-checked to determine if older, more paleontologically sensitive deposits (the Pauba Formation and older alluvial sediments) are disturbed at depth. Monitoring can be reduced or ceased at the discretion of a Qualified Paleontologist in consultation with the City of Murrieta.

Implementation of GEO-1 will reduce impacts to geology and soils/paleontological resources to less than significant.

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the previously approved project. The IS/MND for the approved project identified no impacts to geology/soils and that with mitigation impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant. The revised project would not change the IS/MND's findings with respect to geology

and soils or paleontological impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project, which would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in any different conclusions than those reached in the IS/MND related to geology and soils or paleontological resources, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No considerably different mitigation measures are required for the proposed change.

3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The generation of GHG emissions was not discussed for the approved project because such analysis was not required at the time of the preparation of the IS/MND. Currently the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G requires a discussion in relation to whether a project would, either directly or indirectly, generate GHG emissions and/or or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions GHG.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Additionally, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street. These changes would incrementally reduce the construction effort necessary to build the project and the associated GHG emissions.

As discussed above in Section 3.3, in September 2021, HELIX prepared a Technical Assessment for the proposed project, that included a review of the approved project to determine if the previous air quality

analysis was adequate and applicable to the revised project. The Technical Assessment is attached to this document as Appendix A.

As is typical of any construction, the project would temporarily consume energy for the operation of construction equipment and vehicles. During construction, standard methods of earthmoving and other associated construction activities are planned. Construction activities would not include methods of construction that would result in inefficient or unnecessary use of energy resources. Post construction, energy resources would include mobile (vehicle) sources, solid waste sources, and water sources. While this was not required to be evaluated in the approved IS/MND, this does not negate the fact that the project would have generated GHGs. With technological advances in clean energy and the introduction of regulations intended to reduce the generation of GHGs (as discussed below) that has occurred since the approval of the project, the revised project would not result in increased GHG impacts compared to the approved project if it were previously constructed.

There are numerous State plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The principal overall State plan and policy is AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The quantitative goal of AB 32 is to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Additionally, SB 32 would require further reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Because the project's operational year is post-2020, the project aims to reach the quantitative goals set by SB 32. Statewide plans and regulations such as GHG emissions standards for vehicles (AB 1493), the low carbon fuel standards, and regulations requiring an increasing fraction of electricity to be generated from renewable sources are being implemented at the statewide level; as such, compliance at the project level is not addressed. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with those plans and regulations.

The project must also be constructed in accordance with the energy-efficiency standards, water reduction goals, and other standards contained in the 2019 Title 24 Part 6 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and Part 11 (CALGreen) Building Standards, including the requirement for onsite solar electricity generation. As such and as discussed in Section 3.6, *Energy*, the development includes a suite of design features that assist in meeting the required energy reduction.

The IS/MND did not include a separate analysis of GHGs as this was not part of CEQA Appendix G at the time of project approval. However, there is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project, that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No GHG impacts are identified and no mitigation measures are required.

3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

IS/MND Conclusion

According to a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment conducted by Harrington Geotechnical Engineering, Inc dated November 22, 2004, the site previously contained a gasoline underground storage tank (UST). The tank was documented as removed on June 9, 2004; however the report indicates that records of the removal are incomplete and no records could be located by Riverside County Department of Environmental Health on the status of the UST removal. As such the Phase I recommended soil boring and confirmation sampling in the former UST excavation site be completed

The approved IS/MND identified a potential adverse hazards and hazardous materials impact related to accidental release of hazardous materials. This impact is in association with the potential spill or leakage of petroleum products during construction. The approved IS/MND contained mitigation measures H-1 and H-2 to reduce impacts to less than significant. All hazardous materials related mitigation measures from the approved IS/MND are presented below.

Mitigation measure H-1 is the required regulatory compliance to the various federal, state, and local regulations. The applicant would adhere to all required regulations pertaining to the use, handling, transport and/or disposal of any hazardous materials or wastes. Additionally, in the event of an

accidental release, the applicant is required to follow the protocols outlined in the various regulations imposed at all levels of government. This is further discussed below.

H-1 All spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities shall be remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulation regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminated release. The contaminated waste shall be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility.

H-2 Conduct soil boring and confirmation sampling in the former UST excavation site and coordinate UST closure reporting with Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH) and the San Diego County Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

Petra conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the proposed project. Petra was not provided any other hazardous materials reports for review. As stated by the American Society for Testing Materials International (ASTM), the purpose of the Phase I ESA is to identify recognized environmental conditions (RECs), which are defined as "the presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products in, on, or at a property: (1) due to any release to the environment; (2) under conditions indicative of a release to the environment; or (3) under conditions that pose a material threat of a future release to the environment. *De minimis* conditions are not recognized environmental conditions." There are three categories of RECs: existing RECs (as defined above), Historical RECs (HRECs), or Controlled RECs (CRECs). An HREC is defined as "a past release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products that has occurred in connection with the property and has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority or meeting unrestricted use criteria established by a regulatory authority, without subjecting the property to any required controls." An HREC is an environmental condition that was recognized in the past but may or may not still be recognized as a current environmental condition. A CREC is defined as a "recognized environmental condition resulting from a past release of hazardous substances or petroleum products that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority, with hazardous substances or petroleum products allowed to remain in place subject to the implementation of required controls." A CREC is an active environmental concern because while the hazardous substances have been corrected to meet certain regulatory levels, the contaminants still remain and have the potential to be above regulatory levels for some types of development.

As with the approved project, construction that would be reasonably foreseeable with implementation of the proposed project would require the transport, use, and disposal of materials that are typically associated with construction activities, such as diesel fuels, hydraulic liquids, oils, solvents, and paints. This transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials is regulated by federal, state, and local agencies and regulations, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA's) Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, the U.S. Department of Transportation's Hazardous Materials Regulations, and the San Bernardino County Hazardous Materials Program's regulations. Adherence to such regulations would result in less than significant construction impacts. However, it is noted that since the approval of the 2008 IS/MND, the onsite structures have been removed. Thus, any potential disturbance to asbestos containing materials (ACMs) or lead based paint (LBP) associated with the former buildings would not occur with project implementation.

In relation to the removal of the onsite structures, the Murrieta Fire Department used the residence at the southwest corner of B Street and Clay Street for fire training. It is noted that all debris associated with the fire was removed from the property; however, structure fires can impact the environment. In addition to carbon emissions, the fire can create non-carbon contamination of surface water, air, and soil through combustion of building products. Hazardous substances that can be released during a fire include metals, poly-aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), chlorinated and brominated dioxins and furans, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) and polyfluorinated compounds. Short-term effects are typically related to surface water runoff and air emissions. Long term effects, not usually recognized during the event, may impact soils.

Operation of the revised project would include the storage and use of household hazardous materials and wastes. Typical household hazardous materials associated with the residential land uses could include cleaning products, paints, solvents, adhesives, other chemical materials used in building maintenance and interior improvements, automotive lubricants, small combustion engine fuels and lubricants, expired pharmaceuticals, mercury thermometers, sharp or used needles, and electronic wastes from household and car batteries. No special permits would be required for such limited use or disposal of common agents and products. Therefore, operation of the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

The project site is not located within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school is Murrieta Elementary School, which is approximately 0.5-mile northeast of the site. Residential land uses do not generate hazardous emissions or involve the handling of acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes.

As part of the Phase I ESA prepared for the project, a search of environmental databases, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, was conducted by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). According to the Phase I ESA, the project address was associated with the following listings:

- Frazee and Frazee Corp. (42310B Street, Murrieta, CA) onsite, near the northeastern corner of the subject property. This site is listed on the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Hazardous Waste Manifest (HAZNET) and The State Hazardous Waste Tracking System (HWTS) databases. Under HAZNET, the creation date was reported as November 1, 2004, and the Waste Code was listed as "Tank bottom waste and Still bottoms with halogenated organics." The disposal method was reported as, "recycler." The quantity was listed as 0.52 tons. Under HWTS, the create date was reported as June 3, 2004 with an inactive date of December 28, 2004. Under

EDR's Directory Search, Frazee and Frazee Ranch was listed at the address from at least 1985 to 2000. Under EDR's Building Permit Report, a permit for a "register hay house barn" was cancelled in 1964. No additional information was provided, including where on the subject property the tank was located. Based on no other database listing related to tank permits, storage and handling or violations, or an unauthorized release or spill of hazardous materials, including no leaking underground storage tank (LUST) or leaking aboveground storage tank cases reported, the potential for the UST and petroleum hydrocarbon soil residues to remain cannot be entirely precluded. This listing appears to represent a REC.

Petra recommends consistent with mitigation measure H-2, a geophysical survey be conducted in the vicinity of the former ranch buildings along B Street to locate the UST excavation. As described in the Mitigation Monitoring Report for the site (dated January 1, 2008), Petra recommends application and entry into the Riverside County Department of Environmental Health (RCDEH) voluntary cleanup program. Based upon RCDEH oversight, soil samples would be collected from borings placed in the excavation area to assess whether elevated hydrocarbon soil residues remain. Dependent upon soil residue concentrations, excavation and offsite removal of the elevated soil residues may be warranted.

The nearest airport is the French Valley Airport, which is located approximately 5.5 miles to the northeast. The project site is outside the Airport Influence Area Boundary for French Valley Airport (Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission 2012). No impact associated with this issue will occur.

Changes to the existing circulation network would be limited to improvements on New Clay Street and B Street to provide ingress/egress that would not physically interfere with emergency access.

According to Exhibit 12-8 of the General Plan the project site is not in a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (City 2011b). No impact associated with this issue will occur.

The proposed project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts hazards and hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed project would not involve the demolition of structures and therefore, potential impacts related to ACMs and LBPs would not occur with the project (as opposed to the approved project). There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to hazards and hazardous materials than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

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

IS/MND Conclusion

With the required adherence to the SWPPP, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit and BMPs, the approved project was determined to have less than significant impacts in relation water resources (hydrology and water quality). Additionally, no significant groundwater was encountered during geotechnical investigations.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the

range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

Like the approved project, the revised project would change the site through site grading and by adding impervious surfaces, such as building roofs, paved drives, and alleyways, that would alter the hydrological patterns of the site and could introduce new sources of water pollutants in site runoff. There is the potential for water pollutants to be generated in the short-term during construction activities and in the long term due to the permanent changes to the site. Construction related pollutants might include loose soils, liquid and solid construction materials and wastes, and accidental spills of concrete, fuels, and other materials. As an urban development, the revised project would add typical, non-point-source pollutants to stormwater runoff, primarily due to runoff from impervious surfaces where a variety of pollutants can collect over time, such as driveways, streets, roofs, patios, and other paved surfaces. Landscaped areas can also generate water pollutants such as fertilizers and weed control agents, as well as green waste from landscape maintenance cuttings. Several measures to protect water quality and limit discharges are directed and implemented, through both the preparation of various plans and adherence to established programs. As discussed below, the project will be required to demonstrate compliance with such plans and programs.

Murrieta is within the jurisdiction of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB), which is tasked with protecting the region's water quality objectives that meet the standards set forth in the Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) as well as the state's Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act. The SDRWQCB designates beneficial uses of surface water and groundwater, sets qualitative and quantitative water quality objectives that must be met to protect designated beneficial uses, and develops implementation programs to protect the regional water resources through its Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin.

Additionally, the NPDES program regulates point source and non-point source pollutant discharges to surface waters. Municipalities are required to obtain permits for the water pollution generated by stormwater in their jurisdictions. These permits are known as municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permits. Because the revised project's stormwater runoff would be discharged into the local municipal storm drain system, the project is required to demonstrate that it would be consistent with the standards established in the MS4 permit as encoded in Chapter 8.36 of the MMC, Stormwater and Runoff Management and Drainage Controls.

The revised project would adhere to the NPDES Construction General Permit during construction, which includes BMPs that serve to protect groundwater quality. A SWPPP would also be prepared in compliance with the Construction General Permit, which would identify erosion control and sediment control BMPs, such as desilting basins or other temporary drainage or control measures, or both, as may be necessary to control construction-related pollutants. The City will not issue a grading permit for the project until the SWPPP has been submitted to and approved by the City (MMC Section 15.52).

Post construction, the site is divided into two major drainage areas that are hydrologically connected to two proposed project basins. Drainage would be conveyed through a series of inlet catch basins in the streets and storm drains to one of two modular wetlands system. For events that are greater than the two-year storm, overflow would be directed to the two onsite basins for eventual release to Murrieta Creek either through an outlet or via the channel along New Clay Street. It is noted that currently there are flows that enter from offsite sources that mix with the onsite drainage. Under the revised project condition, a new storm drain line would convey the offsite flows to one of the two proposed basins.

Portions of the project site are within Federal Emergency Management Agency mapped flood zones. However, like the approved project, final building pad elevations would be above the 100- year flood zone. However, Exhibit 5-13.3 of the City General Plan EIR identifies the project site as within the dam inundation area of the Diamond Valley Lake Saddle Dam (City 2001a). The project is located approximately 30 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and is therefore not at risk of experiencing tsunami hazards.

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to hydrology and water quality. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to hydrology and water quality than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No mitigation measures are required.

3.11 Land Use and Planning

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The prior environmental document for the approved project identified that with mitigation there would be less than significant impacts to land use. Specifically, the project contained parcels that are listed within the planning boundaries of the MSHCP. The approved IS/MND contained mitigation measure B-1 through B-4 to reduce impacts to less than significant (see Section 3.4 above).

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a linear feature, such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge that would impact mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying area. The project site is within an area developed with primarily large lot residential uses. No new major supporting infrastructure facilities would need to be constructed and extended to the project site that could result in a physical disruption to an established land use or the local pattern of development. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community; no impacts would occur.

The RS-1 zoning district is applied to parcels appropriate for single-family subdivisions with a uniform lot pattern possessing a minimum parcel size of seven thousand two hundred (7,200) square feet. The allowable density range is from 2.1 to 5.0 units per acre. The RS-1 zoning district is consistent with the single-family residential land use designation of the general plan. The lot sizes have remained consistent between the previous and proposed entitlement with average lot sizes ranging from 5,500 sf to 9,000 sf all while being above the minimum stated by the original MDP of 5,000 sf.

The parcels that make up the proposed project are within the boundaries of the Western Riverside MSHCP. Compliance with the MSHCP is discussed in Section 3.4, *Biological Resources,* and mitigation measures B-1 through B-4 as identified in the IS/MND for the approved project are included in the revised project.

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. The prior environmental document for the approved project identified that with mitigation there would be no impacts to land use. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts to land use. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to land use and planning impacts than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

3.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved project was determined to have less than significant impacts in relation mineral resources.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Mineral resources are commonly defined as a concentration or occurrence of natural, solid, inorganic, or fossilized organic material in or on the earth's crust in such form and quantity and of such a grade or quality that it has reasonable prospects for economic extraction. Mineral resources can be categorized into three classes: fuel, metallic, and non-metallic. Fuel resources comprise coal, oil, and natural gas. Metals include such resources as gold, silver, iron, and copper. Lastly, non-metal resources include industrial minerals and construction aggregate. Industrial minerals include boron compounds, rare-earth elements, clays, limestone, gypsum, salt, and dimension stone. Construction aggregate includes sand and gravel, and crushed stone.

The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) is the primary regulator surface mining in the state. The act requires the state geologist (California Geological Survey) to identify all mineral deposits in the state and to classify them based on their significance. SMARA defines a mineral deposit as a naturally occurring concentration of minerals in amounts or arrangement that under certain conditions may constitute a mineral resource. The concentration may be of value for its chemical or physical characteristics. The classification of these mineral resources is a joint effort of the State and local governments. It is based on geologic factors and requires that the State Geologist classify the mineral resources area as one of the four Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs), Scientific Resource Zones (SZs), or Identified Resource Areas (IRAs), described below:

- MRZ-1: A Mineral Resource Zone where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present or likely to be present.
- MRZ-2: A Mineral Resource Zone where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or a likelihood of their presence and development should be controlled.

- MRZ-3: A Mineral Resource Zone where mineral resource significance is undetermined.
- MRZ-4: A Mineral Resource Zone where there is insufficient data to assign any other MRZ designation.
- SZ Areas: Containing unique or rare occurrences of rocks, minerals, or fossils that are of outstanding scientific significance shall be classified in this zone.
- IRA Areas: County or State Division of Mines and Geology Identified Areas where adequate production and information indicate that significant minerals are present.

According to the General Plan EIR, the lands west of Interstate 15 are classified as MRZ-1, indicating that no significant mineral deposits are likely to be present (City 2011). And Exhibit 5.12-1, Mineral Resources of the General Plan EIR show no mineral resource extraction sites within the project site or surrounding area (City 2011a).

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to mineral resources impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to mineral resources than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No mitigation measures are required.

3.13 Noise

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved IS/MND identified a potential adverse noise impacts. As shown below, the approved IS/MND contained mitigation measure N1 through N3 to reduce impacts to less than significant.

N-1 During construction, the contractor shall ensure all construction equipment is equipped with appropriate noise attenuation devices. (e.g., mufflers).

N-2 With the exception of emergency conditions, construction shall be limited to daylight hours or no later than 7 p.m.

N-3 If noise complaints demonstrate that a significant noise impact is affecting sensitive receptors due to construction activities (noise levels as measured at the receptor location at a level in excess of the City's noise significance thresholds), the City shall require the construction contractor to apply appropriate measures to reduce the impacts of noise on the sensitive receptor to levels within the City's significance thresholds.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

In September 2021, HELIX prepared a Technical Assessment of the proposed project, that included a review of the approved project to determine if the previous analysis was adequate and applicable to the revised project.

The IS/MND concluded that operational noise level impacts associated with the approved project's residential uses would be less than significant and that the future residential uses would be compatible with the General Plan's Noise Element. The project does not propose a change in land uses from what was previously approved, and operational noise levels are anticipated to be the same as what was analyzed in the IS/MND. Due to the currently planned ADUs that would be located within each residential lot along with the main residences, an analysis of the project's Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) system noise was conducted to ensure operational noise impacts remain less than significant. Detailed analysis for operational noise can be found in the HVAC Noise Analysis, attached to this document as Appendix E.

Because the revised project would utilize the previous project's site with the same number of residential units, construction noise is anticipated to be similar to what was identified in the previously approved project. No impulsive construction equipment such as drill rigs, rock crushers, or hoe rams would be required, and the anticipated construction equipment identified in the previous IS/MND is not expected

to change. Therefore, the prior IS/MND's conclusions that noise levels would be less than significant with mitigation measures N1, N2, and N3, would not change for the revised project. These mitigation measures would limit construction to daylight hours and require noise attenuation devices on construction equipment.

Operational noise from the project's HVAC units is subject to standards set forth in Section 16.30.090, Exterior Noise Standards, of the City's Municipal Code. Per Table 3-6 in Section 16.30.090, noise levels at residential receptor properties shall not exceed 45 A-weighted decibels (dBA) during nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) or 50 dBA during daytime hours (7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.).

The project would include ground-mounted HVAC units on the side of each residence and ADU. The analysis assumed typical to larger-sized Carrier 38HRD060 split system condensers. The Computer Aided Noise Abatement (CadnaA) model version 2021 was used to calculate noise levels at residential receptor properties generated by operation of the project's HVAC units. In the CadnaA model, HVAC units were placed on the sides of each residence and ADU. Receivers were located at residential receptor property lines to the northwest, northeast, and southeast of the project site. The highest calculated noise level was 40.4 dBA at the residential receptor property line to the southeast of the project site. Noise levels at all modeled receiver locations were below the 45-dBA nighttime noise standard and 50-dBA daytime noise standard for residential uses. As such, the project's operational HVAC noise levels are within City standards, and impacts would be less than significant, consistent with the determination in the MND.

Due to these factors, construction and operational noise levels are not anticipated to exceed City thresholds, and no additional impacts from implementation of the revised project are anticipated. The IS/MND for the approved project identified that with mitigation noise impacts would be less than significant. Likewise, the revised project would not change the IS/MND's findings with respect to noise impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to noise than those reached in the IS/MND, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required for the revised project.

3.14 Population and Housing

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved project was determined to have less than significant impacts in relation to population and housing.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot.

Growth inducing impacts are caused by those characteristics of a project that foster or encourage population and/or economic growth, such as new housing (direct) or creation of a new job center or the expansion of infrastructure to increase capacity (indirect).

The revised project would introduce 62 new residential homes and accompanying ADUs, which would directly induce growth in the project area. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the average household size in the City is 3.49 people (U.S. Census Bureau 2021). Applying this rate, an additional 62 single family homes could result in a population increase of approximately 216 people. Conservatively considering that under California law no more than two people may reside per bedroom, the ADUs would generate an additional 124 people. If all 62 homes and ADUs were occupied by new residents, the project would represent an increase in the City's population by approximately .031 percent.

The site is designated as SFR and zoned as RS-1, indicating the City's intent for the site to accommodate residential housing. Further, as part of the 2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) target for Murrieta, the City recognized the potential for the project site to accommodate a portion of the of the need calculation of 3,304 residences. Therefore, while the project would directly induce population in the area through the construction of new homes, this development is consistent with the City's intent to provide housing as expressed through its General Plan and Zoning Code and the RHNA. Direct impacts would continue to be less than significant.

The project does not involve activities or features that would indirectly induce growth. The project does not propose the installation of utility infrastructure that would expand beyond the project site. Improvements to the current site access would occur through the installation of project drives and an internal network of alleyways. However, the project does not include off-site roadway improvements. Therefore, the project would not indirectly contribute to substantial growth.

The proposed project includes the subdivision of the 22-acre project site for the construction of 62 single-family lots on undeveloped land. Therefore, the proposed project would not remove housing and would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

The proposed project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts population and housing. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant

environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to population and housing than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No mitigation measures are required.

3.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved project was determined to have no impacts in relation to public services.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. Further, the revised project would shift the street alignment of the ingress/egress access off of New Clay Street to allow the project to maintain efficient lot design while avoiding the jurisdictional delineation that is on the property boundary on the southeast portion of the site. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street.

The project would result in an increase of residents in the area; however, this increase is accounted for in the General Plan. Given that the General Plan provides the foundation for the adequate provision of services for existing and planned land uses, project-related development is accounted for in the

allocation of resources. As identified in the General Plan EIR, the Murrieta Fire Department (MFD) has indicated that the proposed General Plan buildout would not create significant changes to its services (City 2011a).

The project does not represent a unique land use or type of construction that would require additional MFD resources, would not have a significant impact involving fire response times, and would not otherwise create a substantially greater need for fire protection services than already exists. The project applicant is required to submit project plans to MFD for review and plan check approval with respect to applicable fire protection standards set forth in Chapter 15.24 of the MMC approval is required prior to the issuance of building permits. Through this routine process, MFD confirms that the project meets all of the applicable fire codes set forth by the State Fire Marshal and the City's building code, including sufficient fire flow and emergency access for fire engines and crews.

Implementation of the proposed project may result in an increase in the demand for emergency services; however the size and location of the project would not place an undue hardship on the fire department since they are presently servicing the areas surrounding the site and since the population growth associated with the project is accounted for in the General Plan. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of the Murrieta Fire Department to serve the site with existing fire protection services and resources.

Typical of residential developments, such services would be in relation to property crimes or crimes against persons, however these types of crimes are not considered unique. Yet, as described in the General Plan EIR, it is reasonably foreseeable that new or physically altered facilities within the City would be required to serve the growth associated with the buildout of the General Plan. Therefore, prior to the issuance of an Occupancy Permit for the project, the applicant would be required to contribute a fair share development impact fee to provide adequate facilities and capital to support the development.

The project includes the development of 62 single-family homes, some of which may house school-aged children. The project site is located within the boundaries of the Murrieta Unified School District (MUSD), which serves grades pre-school through 12. As discussed in Section 3.14, *Population and Housing*, using approved planning forecasts, the project could result in approximately 340 new persons in the project area, some of which may be school-age children. There would be an increase in the demand for MUSD school services if the homes are ultimately occupied by people from outside the City or County.

California Education Code Section 17620 and CCR Section 65995 allow school districts to levy fees on residential and/or commercial/industrial construction projects within a school district's boundaries. The State Allocation Board sets the per-square-foot Level I school impact fees (developer fees) every two years.

The project would be required to pay the current statutory developer fee (currently $4.08 per square foot of residential construction) as a condition of building permit approval. The Leroy Greene School Facilities Act of 1998 established the use of developer fees as mitigation for school districts in California. Developer fees may be used for multiple purposes, including to fund construction or reconstruction of school facilities, and to fund costs attributable to the increased demand for public facilities reasonably related to the development in order to refurbish existing facilities to maintain the existing level of service or achieve an adopted level of service that is consistent with a general plan. Thus, the project's

school impacts are fully mitigated through the payment of the required developer impact fee that has been adopted at the time of project approval.

With the increase in population there would be a corresponding increase in the use of parks, especially associated with residents that relocate from outside of Murrieta. The applicant is required to pay the Development Impact Fee and as stated in Chapter 16.36.010 pf the MMC, it is the intent of the City to require every person who develops land to mitigate the impacts of that development on the City's public facilities. The City will therefore require developers to pay a public facilities development impact fee that will assist in meeting the demand for public facilities caused by development. Per MMC Chapter 16.36.020, the applicant shall pay this fee prior to the issuance of a development permit.

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts to public services. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to public services than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No mitigation measures are required.

3.16 Recreation

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved project was determined to have less than significant impacts in relation to recreation.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project.

The project is consistent with the General Plan. Plan. Given that the General Plan provides the foundation for the adequate provision of services for existing and planned land uses, project-related development is accounted for in the allocation of City resources. As noted in Section 3.15, *Public Services* the project would be required to pay the Development Impact Fee; this fee would serve in part to provide improvements to parks to meet the needs of the General Plan buildout.

The project does not involve or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the approved project. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to impacts to recreation. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to recreation than those reached in the prior environmental document, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No mitigation measures are required.

3.17 Transportation

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The approved IS/MND did not identify impacts to emergency access, parking capacity, or alternative transportation. The approved project would be required to participate in the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee for Western Riverside County, a comprehensive funding source for arterial highway improvements to mitigate the cumulative regional transportation impacts of new development on regional arterial highways. The approved IS/MND identified a potential adverse transportation impact in relation to increased trips and congestion. The approved IS/MND contained the following mitigation measures T-1 and T-2 to reduce impacts to less than significant. It should be noted that the adopted IS/MND did not address potential impacts related to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), which was first included in the CEQA guidelines in December 2018.

T-1 Construct half street improvements with appropriate transitions along New Clay Street and B Street to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

T-2 Install stop signs at the project egress points and alley egress points as required by and to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot.

The revised project would not introduce any new features (in comparison to the approved project) that would conflict with the implementation of a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. As noted in Section 3.3, *Air Quality*, the revised project shall include pedestrian paths or sidewalks and install pedestrian safety measures.

Senate Bill 743, resulted in a shift in the measure of effectiveness for determining transportation impacts from level of service and vehicular delay, as was evaluated in the IS/MND, to VMT. To satisfy SB 743, Translutions prepared a VMT Screening Analysis for the revised project in January 2021. This evaluation was conducted based on the *City of Murrieta Traffic Impact Analysis Preparation Guidelines*, May 2020.

The City uses the following screening thresholds to exempt a project from a VMT analysis:

- Projects generating less than 110 daily vehicle trips regardless of whether or not consistent with the General Plan.
- Local-serving retail that primarily serves the City and/or adjacent cities.
- Office and other employment-related land uses reducing commutes outside the local area.
- Local-serving day care centers, pre-K and K-12 schools.
- Local parks and civic uses.
- Local-serving gas stations, banks, and hotels (e.g., non-destination hotels).
- Local serving community colleges that are consistent with Southern California Association of Governments Regional Transportation {Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy assumptions.
- Student housing projects.

The proposed project does not fit the screening criteria identified above. Based on the City's Guidelines, projects that are not screened out using the process above shall perform a limited analysis of the VMT expected to be generated by the project and compare that to the VMT expected to be generated by the land use assumed in the General Plan. This should result in one of two outcomes as follows:

- VMT is less than the land use assumed in the General Plan – Less than Significant VMT impact and no need for further analysis in a transportation impact analysis for VMT.

- VMT is more than the land use assumed in the General Plan - Likely Significant VMT impact and need for full analysis in a transportation impact analysis for VMT.

A significant transportation impact will be assumed to occur if the proposed project would be expected to generate more VMT than the land use assumed in the General Plan. In these cases, VMT will be analyzed and VMT mitigation will need to be considered.

The proposed project land use is consistent with the General Plan since the site is already entitled and the minor changes proposed do not alter the land uses currently approved for the project site. Therefore, the proposed land use will have the same VMT as the General Plan and the above numbers should not change. Therefore, based on the City Guidelines, there will be a less than significant VMT impact and there is no need for further VMT analysis.

There would be no hazardous design features or incompatible uses introduced as a result of the project. The project is a typical residential subdivision that is comparable to the surrounding land uses to the south and east. No unique roadway features, traffic patterns, or incompatible vehicles would be introduced as part of the development. The internal street network would be capable of providing safe and efficient access to and from each of the 62 proposed residences and is similar to that of the approved project. Additionally, the internal roadways would be designed with rights-of-way, in accordance with City standards and would have sufficient capacity to support the residential traffic. In addition, the MFD and City Public Works Department would review the circulation to ensure compliance with MFD standards (turning radii, street widths,) and traffic safety standards (line of sight, traffic calming, etc.).

3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐

IS/MND Conclusion

Subsequent to preparation of the 2008 IS/MND, the passage of AB 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes 2014) on September 27, 2016, required an update to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines to include questions related to impacts to tribal cultural resources. A tribal cultural resource may be considered significant if it is included in a local or state register of historic resources; is determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to the criteria set forth in PRC Section 5024.1; is geographically designated landscape that meets one or more of the criteria in PRC Section 21084.1; is a unique archaeological resource described in PRC Section 21083.2; or is a non-unique archaeological resource if it conforms to the above criteria. The approved IS/MND concluded that the approved project result in impacts to cultural resources because it involves and included mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant.

The approved IS/MND contained mitigation measures C-1 and C-2, C-7, and C-8 (see Section 3.5, *Cultural Resources*) relevant to tribal cultural resources.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. As discussed in Section 3.5, *Cultural Resources*, there is the potential for potential remains for both historic and prehistoric resources to be present in a subsurface context within the project area. The Murietta Creek area is rich in cultural resources, both archaeological and tribal cultural resources, and the alluvial setting elevates the potential for buried resources. As such, as required by Mitigation Measure C-1, discussed above, it is recommended that an archaeological and Native American monitoring program be implemented during grading or other ground-disturbing activities, including brushing/grubbing, removal of existing infrastructure, and trenching for utilities.

The monitoring program should include attendance by the archaeologist and Native American monitor at a preconstruction meeting with the grading contractor and the presence of archaeological and Native American monitors during initial ground-disturbing activities on site. Both archaeological and Native American monitors would have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect grading and other ground-disturbing activity in the event that cultural resources are encountered. If significant cultural material is encountered, the project archaeologist will coordinate with the Monitoring Tribe, the applicant, and City staff to develop and implement appropriate avoidance, preservation, or mitigation measures.

Based on these factors, the mitigation measures implemented in the 2008 MMRP are recommended to ensure cultural resources are not significantly impacted by the revised project. By implementing an archaeological and Native American monitoring program consistent with Mitigation Measure C-1, the project will reduce any potential impact to cultural or tribal cultural resources to a less than significant level.

The proposed project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the previously approved project. The prior environmental document for the approved project identified that with mitigation there would be no impacts to cultural resources (including those to Native American resources). As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to cultural (tribal cultural) impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to tribal cultural resources impacts than those reached in the prior environmental documents for archaeological and Native American resources, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

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

IS/MND Conclusion

The project involves localized infrastructure improvements and connections to accommodate site development. The project would be required to pay fees to accommodate infrastructure improvements for water and sewer. Due to an increase in capacity in the County to accommodate planning projections, the additional solid waste generated by the approved project (and within the General Plan planning projections) could be accommodated. The approved project was determined to have no impacts in relation utility and service systems.

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. Further, due to the findings of updated hydrological analysis that indicated that the temporary intercept channel was no longer required as a result of project area improvements, the project has been revised to remove the temporary intercept channel located adjacent to B Street. Similar to the approved project, there would be various upgrades and connections to the existing infrastructure that occurs within and surrounding the site, the extent of impacts has been examined in the context of the project as a whole (i.e., grading for utility trenches would be considered in overall grading plan). The project would not result in the need for new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities.

Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) would provide water and sewer service to the site. To calculate future water demands, the WMWD relies upon projected population and growth rate projections as determined by land use policies in the general plans, thereby ensuring that adequate supplies are being planned for existing and future water users. Like the approved project, the revised project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore has been accounted for in water and sewer planning documents. Likewise, as with the approved project, the applicant would be required to pay development connection fees to provide for current and future infrastructure to support proposed projects.

The General Plan EIR determined that the combined remaining capacities of landfills serving the City would be adequate to accommodate the buildout of the proposed General Plan 2035 (City 2011a). The project would be consistent with General Plan and would not generate additional solid waste beyond what was anticipated in the General Plan. The City participates in a number of programs that promote recycling that are intended to help achieve the goal to divert solid waste from landfills. Solid waste and debris generated by the project would be disposed of consistent with City standards

The proposed project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the previously approved project. The prior environmental document for the approved project identified that with mitigation there would be no impacts to utilities and service systems. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to utility and service systems impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to utilities and service system impacts than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No mitigation measures are required.

3.20 Wildfire

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

IS/MND Conclusion

In December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency adopted a comprehensive update to the state's CEQA Guidelines that incorporated a new category, wildfire impacts, into Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, the prior IS/MND for the approved project did not contain a discussion of wildfire related issues in its own topical category but did address fire hazard within its Hazards section. The analysis in the IS/MND concluded the project would not increase the fire hazard characteristics of any project site because the project is outside of areas designated as Wildland areas which may contain substantial forest fire risks and hazards and very high fire hazard severity zones according to the CAL FIRE fire hazards map and Exhibit VI-7 of the City's General Plan (City 2011b).

Revised Project Conclusion

Implementation of the revised project would occur within the same parcels evaluated in the prior environmental documents. The revised project would develop 62 single family lots with the general street layout of the previously approved project. Additionally, the lot sizes would remain within the range of the approved project, however the homes would vary in size from 2,300 to 3,150 sf (as opposed to 2,400 to 2,850 sf) and have attached (as opposed to detached) garages with a single 750 sf ADU on each lot. The project site is level and does not contain any significant slopes. The surrounding area does not support the common characteristics identified as a wildfire risk, such as difficult terrain, inadequate access, and unmaintained vegetation.

As discussed in Section 3.9, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials,* according to Exhibit 12-8 of the General Plan, the project site is not in a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (City 2011). Like the approved project, the revised project would adhere to the California Fire Code.

During construction of the project, heavy construction vehicles could interfere with emergency response to the site or emergency evacuation procedures in the event of an emergency (e.g., vehicles traveling behind the slow-moving truck). However, such trips would be brief and infrequent. Additionally, although traffic would temporarily need to be directed around the construction when making utility tie-ins, the project construction would not require road closures. Public roadways would remain open for standard traffic and emergency response vehicles for the duration of construction

The revised project is within the parameters of the types of actions envisioned to occur with implementation of the previously approved project. The prior environmental document for the approved project identified that with mitigation there would be no wildfire impacts. As such, the revised project would not change any of the findings with respect to wildfire impacts. There is no new information, such as new regulations, a change of circumstances, or changes to the project that would give rise to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. This analysis does not result in different conclusions related to aesthetic impacts than those reached in the prior environmental documents, either on a project-related or cumulative basis. No new mitigation measures are required.

4.0 Conclusions

The purpose of this Addendum was to address and analyze the environmental effects associated with changes to the approved project that occurred since the adoption of the IS/MND. Based on the foregoing analysis, it is concluded that the analysis conducted, and the conclusions reached in the IS/MND adopted February 19, 2008, remain valid. The proposed change to the project would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the IS/MND, and no considerably different mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce said environmental impacts. Therefore, no further environmental documentation or review beyond this Addendum is required.

5.0 References Used in the Completion of the Addendum

California Department of Conservation (DOC)

2022 California Important Farmland Finder. Available at: https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

2022 California State Scenic Highway System Map. Available at: https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aacaa.

David Evans and Associates, Inc.

2021 Preliminary Hydrology and Hydraulics Report. December.

HELIX Environmental Planning Inc., (HELIX)

2021 Biological Constraints Technical Memorandum for the Tentative Tract 34439 Ivy House Residential Development. September.

2021 Cultural Resources Assessment for the Ivy House Project. September

2021 Technical Assessment of the Ivy House Project. September

Murietta, City of (City)

2011a Final Environmental Impact Report for the Murrieta General Plan 2035. Available at: https://www.murrietaca.gov/303/General-Plan-2035.

2011b Murrieta General Plan 2035. Available at: https://www.murrietaca.gov/303/General-Plan-2035.

Petra Geosciences (Petra)

2020 Feasibility/Due-Diligence Geotechnical Review, Ivy House Project, 58 Proposed Lots on 22-Acre Site, Located South-Southwest of New Clay Street and B Street, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California. November.

2020 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment; *Ivy House Project*, Vacant Land Southwest Corner of B Street and New Clay Avenue, City of Murrieta, Riverside County, California 92562. November.

2012 Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Available at: https://rcaluc.org/.

2020 Translutions. Vehicle Miles Traveled Screening Memorandum. January.

United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau)

2021 U.S. Census Bureau Quick Facts. Available at: https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/murrietacitycalifornia.