

**Ethanac Travel Center Project
CUP 22-05002 and CUP 22-05003
Environmental Impact Report**

**FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF
OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

**LEAD AGENCY: CITY OF PERRIS
101 North D Street
Perris, CA 92376
Contact: Lupita Garcia
City of Perris Planning Division
lgarcia@cityofperris.org**

**PREPARED BY: DE NOVO PLANNING GROUP
180 E. Main Street, Suite 108
Tustin, California 92780**

September 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.....	4
1.2	Records of Proceedings.....	5
1.3	Custodian and Location of Records.....	6
2.0	Project Summary.....	7
2.1	Project Location.....	7
2.2	Project Description.....	7
2.3	Statement of Objectives.....	7
2.4	Required Discretionary Actions and Permits.....	8
2.5	Other CEQA Documents Referenced.....	8
3.0	Environmental Review and Public Participation.....	9
4.0	Findings Regarding Impacts.....	10
4.1	Potential Environmental Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant.....	10
4.1.1	Aesthetics.....	10
4.1.2	Agriculture and Forestry Resources.....	11
4.1.3	Air Quality.....	12
4.1.4	Biological Resources.....	15
4.1.5	Cultural Resources.....	16
4.1.6	Energy.....	16
4.1.7	Geology and Soils.....	17
4.1.8	Greenhouse Gas.....	19
4.1.9	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	19
4.1.10	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	22
4.1.11	Land Use and Planning.....	24
4.1.12	Mineral Resources.....	25
4.1.13	Noise.....	25
4.1.14	Population and Housing.....	27
4.1.15	Public Services.....	28
4.1.16	Recreation.....	29
4.1.17	Transportation.....	30
4.1.18	Utilities and Service Systems.....	32
4.1.19	Wildfire.....	35

4.2	Potential Environmental Impacts that will be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance	36
4.2.1	Aesthetics	36
4.2.2	Biological Resources	36
4.2.3	Cultural Resources	41
4.2.4	Geology and Soils	44
4.2.5	Tribal Cultural Resources	45
4.3	Potential Environmental Impacts Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable.....	46
4.3.1	Air Quality	46
4.3.2	Greenhouse Gas	47
4.4	Cumulative Impacts.....	48
4.4.1	Cumulative Air Quality.....	48
4.4.2	Cumulative Greenhouse Gases	50
4.4.3	Cumulative Noise.....	51
4.4.4	Cumulative Transportation	53
4.5	Findings Regarding Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	54
4.6	Growth-Inducing Impacts	55
4.7	Alternatives to the Proposed Project	57
4.7.1	No Project/No Development Alternative.....	58
4.7.2	Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative.....	59
4.7.3	Shopping Center Alternative.....	61
4.7.4	Discount Superstore and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative	63
4.8	Recirculation	65
5.0	Statement of Overriding Considerations.....	65
5.1	Findings for Statement of Overriding Considerations	67
5.2	Conclusion.....	68

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The following Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations are made for the Ethanac Travel Center Project (herein referred to as “Project”). The environmental effects of the Project are addressed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), State Clearinghouse (SCH) No. 2024010850 dated July 2024, which is incorporated by reference herein.

1.1 Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21081, and the CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations. Section 15091 (collectively, CEQA) require that a public agency consider the environmental impacts of a project before a project is approved and make specific findings. CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

- a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 - 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
 - 2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can or should be adopted by such other agency.
 - 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.
- b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subsection (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.
- d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.
- e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 further provides:

- a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposal project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”
- b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the Final EIR, as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the following Findings of Fact (Findings) are made, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Statement) is adopted by the City of Perris (City) in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency. These Findings and Statement set forth the environmental basis for current and subsequent discretionary actions to be undertaken by the City and responsible agencies for the implementation of the project.

1.2 Records of Proceedings

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings and Statement, the Record of Proceedings for the proposed Project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

- The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the proposed Project;
- The responses to the NOP received by the City;
- The Final EIR;
- The Draft EIR, including technical reports;
- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All responses to the written comments included in the Final EIR;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- The technical reports and analyses included or referenced in any response to comments in the Final EIR;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in, or otherwise relied upon during preparation of, the Draft EIR and the Final EIR;
- Matters of common knowledge, including, but not limited to, federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings and Statement; and
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by PRC Section 21167.6(e).

1.3 Custodian and Location of Records

The documents and other materials which constitute the administrative record for the City's actions related to the Project are located at the City of Perris Planning Division, 135 North D Street, Perris, CA 92570. The City Planning Division is the custodian of the administrative record for the Project. Copies of these documents, which constitute the Record of Proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available upon request at the offices of the City Planning Division. The EIR is located on the City of Perris's website, at

https://www.cityofperris.org/departments/development-services/planning/environmental-documents-for-public-review/-/folder-418#docan1206_1313_479

The contact for this material is:

City of Perris Planning Department
ATTN: Lupita Garcia
135 South D Street,
Perris CA 92570
Phone: (951) 943-5003
E-mail: lgarcia@cityofperris.com

The information is provided in compliance with PRC Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).

2.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

2.1 Project Location

The Ethanac Travel Center Project (Project) site is located in the City of Perris within the County of Riverside. The Project site is located in the southeast portion of the City, at the northwest corner of Trumble Road and Ethanac Road. The Project site is comprised of two parcels (APNs 329-250-011 and 329-250-012) totaling approximately 14.4 acres.

2.2 Project Description

The Ethanac Travel Center Project involves the proposed construction and operation of a travel center facility at the Project site for regional and local highway traveling users. Implementation of the Project would involve the development of fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. Project implementation would require consideration of the following entitlements: 1) Conditional Use Permit for a travel center consisting of a 2,228 square foot drive-thru restaurant, an 11,752 square foot convenience store, and fueling facilities for trucks and passenger vehicles; 2) Conditional Use Permit for an 8,452 square foot truck shop; and 3) Variance to allow a freeway-oriented sign. Associated facilities and improvements of the Project include on-site landscaping, signage, parking, infrastructure/utilities improvements, and off-site roadway/right-of-way improvements.

Refer to Section 3.0, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR for a more comprehensive description of the details of the proposed Project.

2.3 Statement of Objectives

The following Project objectives are established for the proposed Project:

- Provide a travel center/fueling station adjacent to and visible from the regional highway system.
- Generate additional revenues to the City in the form of increased sales and property tax revenues.
- Design a project that is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site, and is compatible with surrounding land uses.
- Locate a travel center in an area serviced by adequate existing infrastructure, including roadways and utilities.
- Provide one-stop travel-related amenities and services to professional drivers and motorists traveling on the I-215 Freeway and within the local area.
- Support revitalization of the area and provide economic benefits to the City through the development of an undeveloped/underutilized site with a commercial use consistent with the General Plan and zoning and supported by market conditions.
- Provide a mixture of on-site uses that reduces vehicle miles traveled through internal capture and serves existing truck trips and motorists on the I-215 Freeway.

2.4 Required Discretionary Actions and Permits

The City of Perris, as the Lead Agency, has discretionary authority over the proposed Project. Implementation of the Project would require consideration of the following entitlements: 1) Conditional Use Permit for a travel center consisting of a 2,228 square foot drive-thru restaurant, an 11,752 square foot convenience store, and fueling facilities for trucks and passenger vehicles; 2) Conditional Use Permit for an 8,452 square foot truck shop; and 3) Variance to allow a freeway-oriented sign. Associated facilities and improvements of the Project include on-site landscaping, signage, parking, infrastructure/utilities improvements, and offsite roadway/right-of-way improvements.

Additional permits may be required upon review of construction documents. Other permits required for the Project may include, but are not limited to, building permits; grading permits; water quality and air quality permits; and permits for new utility connections.

Other agencies whose approval may be required include:

- California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Santa Ana Region (RWQCB) – Santa Ana Region, General Construction Permit, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) Permit to Operate
- Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) water and sewer improvement plans

2.5 Other CEQA Documents Referenced

In accordance with Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document that is a part of public record or is available to the public. The previously prepared EIRs and environmental analyses listed below were relied upon or consulted in the preparation of this EIR, and are hereby incorporated by reference:

- *City of Perris Comprehensive General Plan 2030*, originally approved April 26, 2005, and subsequently amended.
- *Environmental Impact Report City of Perris General Plan 2030 SCH No. 2004031135*, certified April 26, 2005.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 2022090073) was distributed to various responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and interested parties, including the Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse. Hardcopies of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study were made available for review at the City of Perris Development Services Department. An electronic copy of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study were also made available on the City's website. The Notice of Preparation was distributed on January 26, 2024, with the 30-day public review period concluding on February 26, 2024. Additionally, the Notice of Preparation was posted by the Riverside County Clerk on January 25, 2024. The purpose of the Notice of Preparation was to formally announce the preparation of a Draft EIR for the proposed Project and, that, as the Lead Agency, the City was soliciting input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR. The Notice of Preparation provided preliminary information regarding the anticipated range of impacts to be analyzed within the EIR. In addition, notice of a Draft EIR Scoping Meeting for the Project was included in the Notice of Preparation.

A Draft EIR Scoping Meeting was held on February 21, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. with the City of Perris Planning Commission in the Perris City Council Chambers. The intent of the meeting was to provide background information on environmental impact reports, provide a brief overview of the Project, and solicit public input on environmental issues to be addressed in the Draft EIR and on items of public concern. After the presentation, attendees were provided the opportunity to provide comments on the scope and content of the Draft EIR.

Comments received during the public scoping process were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR was made available for review by the public and interested parties, agencies, and organizations for a 45-day comment period beginning on July 5, 2024. The public review period was subsequently extended to September 20, 2024. During the comment period, the public was invited to submit written or email comments on the Draft EIR to the City of Perris Planning Division.

Following the conclusion of the public review period for the Draft EIR, the City reviewed comments received and prepared written responses to comments on environmental issues. A Final EIR has been prepared, which contains the comments received, responses to comments raising environmental issues, and minor changes to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR will be presented to the City of Perris Planning Commission and City Council for consideration and certification. Agencies, organizations, and/or individuals who commented on the Draft EIR shall be notified of the availability of the Final EIR and the date of the public hearings before the City of Perris City Council.

Responses to comments submitted on the Draft EIR by public agencies shall be provided to those agencies at least 10 days prior to certification of the EIR. Public input is encouraged at all public hearings before the City. The City Council would also make findings regarding each significant environmental impact of the proposed Project as identified in the Final EIR.

4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING IMPACTS

The Findings Regarding Impacts are organized as follows:

- Environmental impacts determined to be less than significant;
- Environmental impacts that will be mitigated to below a level of significance; and,
- Environmental impacts determined to be significant and unavoidable after mitigation.

4.1 Potential Environmental Impacts Determined to be Less Than Significant

This section of the Findings summarizes the potential effects evaluated in the EIR that were determined to be less than significant with no mitigation required.

4.1.1 Aesthetics

A. *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-1)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The structures proposed as part of the Project would be similar to the scale and heights of buildings within the immediate area and long-range views of the surrounding foothills and the San Bernadino Mountains would continue to be available within the area. Thus, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and potential impacts would be less than significant.

B. *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-1)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not located within or adjacent to a scenic highway corridor. Thus, implementation of the proposed Project would not have an effect on scenic resources within a State scenic highway corridor. No impact would occur.

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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-2)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would alter, but not substantially degrade, the visual character and quality of public views of the site. The Project would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning for the site, with approval of the Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) to allow for the proposed passenger/truck fueling station and drive-thru restaurant and Variance for the freeway pole sign. Compliance with the General Plan and Municipal Code would further ensure the Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings and potential impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-2 through 8.0-3)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is identified by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as "Urban Land" and "Farmland of Local Importance." The Project site is not currently being used for agricultural purposes. Thus, the Project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance at a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur in this regard.

- B. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-3)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not being used for any agricultural purposes, nor is the site under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract and no impact would occur in this regard.

- 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))? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-3)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not zoned for forest land, timberland, or for timberland production. No forest land, timberland, or timberland production areas are located within or adjacent to the Project site. Thus, the proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; no impact would occur in this regard.

- D. *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-3)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: No forest land is located within the City of Perris. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land into non-forest use; no impact would occur in this regard.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-3)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: No farmland or forest land is located within the Project site or surrounding area. Thus, the Project would not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; no impact would occur in this regard.

4.1.3 Air Quality

- A. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-23 through 5.1-25)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast AQMD. The South Coast AQMD is required, pursuant to the Federal Clean Air Act, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is in non-attainment. To reduce such emissions, the South Coast AQMD prepared the 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which establishes a program of rules and regulations directed at reducing air pollutant emissions and achieving State and national ambient air quality standards. The South Coast AQMD considers projects that are consistent with the 2022 AQMP, which is intended to bring the South Coast Air Basin into attainment for all criteria pollutants, to also have less than significant cumulative impacts. The proposed Project is subject to the South Coast AQMD's 2022 AQMP.

Criteria for determining consistency with the AQMP are defined by the following indicators:

Consistency Criterion No. 1: A proposed project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of the AQMP's air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions.

Consistency Criterion No. 2: A proposed project would not exceed the AQMP's assumptions or increments based on the years of the project build-out phase.

Consistency Criterion No. 1 refers to the California Ambient Air Quality Standards and National Ambient Air Quality Standards. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the proposed Project maximum daily construction and operational emissions would be below the South Coast AQMD's thresholds of significance, except for regional nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions during Project operation. Although the Project would generate regional NO_x emissions during Project operation that would exceed the South Coast AQMD threshold of significance, the Project would not violate air quality standards at nearby sensitive receptor locations. Thus, the Project would be consistent with the first criterion, and therefore a less than significant impact would occur.

Consistency Criterion No. 2 refers to the Southern California Association of Governments' (SCAG's) growth forecasts and associated assumptions included in the AQMP. The future air quality levels projected in the AQMP are based on SCAG's growth projections, which are based, in part, on the general plans of cities located within the SCAG region. Therefore, projects that are consistent with the applicable assumptions used in the development of the

AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the South Coast AQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds.

The Project involves the development of a travel center, which would not induce direct population or housing growth in the City. However, the Project would induce employment growth of up to approximately 70 employees. The Project would be within the population, housing, and employment projections anticipated and planned for by the City's General Plan and would not increase growth beyond the AQMP's projections.

The proposed Project would result in less than significant air quality impacts with the exception of NO_x, as operational NO_x is anticipated to exceed the South Coast AQMD's regional threshold of significance. Compliance with all feasible emission reduction measures identified by South Coast AQMD would be required. As such, the proposed Project meets this 2022 AQMP consistency criterion.

Land use planning strategies set forth in the 2022 AQMP are primarily based on Connect SoCal: the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (Connect SoCal 2020). As discussed in the Draft EIR, the Project would be consistent with the actions and strategies of Connect SoCal 2020.

In conclusion, the determination of 2022 AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of a project on air quality in the air basin. The proposed Project would not result in a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet State and federal air quality standards. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan and this impact would be less than significant.

- C. *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-29 through 5.1-36)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The nearest sensitive receptors to the Project site are located approximately 400 feet to the north of the Project site, along Tumble Road and Illinois Avenue. As shown in Table 5.1-6 of the Draft EIR, localized emissions during proposed Project construction would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. Further, Project development would be subject to compliance with South Coast AQMD Rules 402, 403, and 1113, which would further reduce specific construction-related emissions. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact concerning localized emissions during construction activities.

Table 5.1-7 of the Draft EIR shows that the maximum daily on-site operational emissions would not result in significant concentrations of pollutants at nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact concerning localized emissions during operational activities.

As discussed in the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would not be expected to exceed the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards for emissions of Carbon Monoxide (CO), NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. As the Project's emissions would comply with federal, State, and local air quality standards, the proposed Project's emissions are not

sufficiently high enough to use a regional modeling program to correlate health effects on a basin-wide level and would not provide a reliable indicator of health effects if modeled.

The proposed Project has the potential to impact nearby sensitive receptors due to the nature of the proposed travel center operations, which provide services and amenities, such as fueling facilities, to passing motorists, including commercial truck operators. Heavy-duty diesel trucks are emitters of diesel particulate matter, which is emitted from on-site truck vehicle circulation and idling and off-site mobile travel, as well as from the off-gassing of benzene vapor from various on-site refueling activities. Combined, these sources have the potential to generate substantial toxic air contaminants on nearby sensitive receptors, including those located nearest to the Project site. As shown in Table 5.1-8 of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project would not exceed the maximum risk values established by the South Coast AQMD for toxic air contaminants. All receptor types would be below the applicable South Coast AQMD significance thresholds and potential impacts would be less than significant.

Project construction would generate diesel particulate matter emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required. Construction is temporary and would be transient throughout the site (i.e., move from location to location) and would not generate emissions in a fixed location for extended periods of time. Construction activities would be subject to and would comply with California regulations limiting the idling of heavy-duty construction equipment to no more than five minutes to further reduce nearby sensitive receptors' exposure to temporary and variable diesel particulate matter emissions. For these reasons, diesel particulate matter generated by Project construction activities, in and of itself, would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial amounts of air toxins and the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact.

An analysis of carbon monoxide "hot spots" is often used to determine whether the change in the level of service of an intersection resulting from the proposed Project would have the potential to result in exceedances of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards or National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The proposed Project would not produce the volume of traffic required to generate a carbon monoxide hot spot in the context of the South Coast AQMD's Carbon Monoxide Hotspot Analysis. As the carbon monoxide hotspots were not experienced at the Wilshire Boulevard/Veteran Avenue intersection even as it accommodates 100,000 average daily traffic, it can be reasonably inferred that carbon monoxide hotspots would not be experienced at any Project area intersections from the 2,869 net daily new passenger car and truck trips attributable to the proposed Project. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

- D. *Would the project result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-36)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project Applicant proposes to develop a travel center, which would not involve the types of uses that would emit objectionable odors affecting substantial numbers of people. Although the proposed Project would generate heavy-duty vehicle trips that would generate localized exhaust odors, sensitive receptors are located sufficiently away from the Project site that there is limited to no potential for such emissions to lead to odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people.

Moreover, the Project would not include any of the land uses that have been identified by the South Coast AQMD as odor sources and operational impacts would be less than significant.

Construction activities associated with the Project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. However, construction-related odors would be short-term in nature and cease upon Project completion. In addition, Project construction would be required to comply with the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485, which minimizes the idling time of construction equipment either by shutting it off when not in use or by reducing the time of idling to no more than five minutes. This would further reduce the detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. The Project would also be required to comply with South Coast AQMD Regulation XI, *Rule 1113 – Architectural Coating*, which would minimize odor impacts from VOC emissions during architectural coating. Additionally, the Project would include exterior architectural coating finishes that are pre-finished, further reducing the potential for odors. Any potential impacts to existing adjacent land uses would be short-term and less than significant

4.1.4 Biological Resources

- B. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-8)*
- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-8)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site consists of disturbed non-native grassland and does not support any sensitive natural communities. No impacts to sensitive natural communities are anticipated as a result of this Project.

No State or federally protected wetlands or waters of the U.S. were identified on the Project site; therefore, no impacts to these resources are expected to occur. An isolated roadside ditch outside of the Project site to the northwest may be jurisdictional; however, because this feature is outside the Project site, impacts are not expected to occur. Three drainage culverts exist outside the Project site to the west and southwest; however, impacts to these culverts are also not expected as a result of the Project due to their location outside of the Project boundaries. The Project does not include any offsite improvements that would affect either the drainage culverts or the isolated roadside ditch. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

- E. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-8 through 8.0-9)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Nine non-native eucalyptus trees are located along the Project site's southern boundary. Compliance with the City's Municipal Code, including a tree removal permit and/or conditions imposed by the Director of Public Works, would ensure

that the proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, with adherence to existing regulations, the Project would have a less than significant impact relative to this topic.

4.1.5 Cultural Resources

- A. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-9)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: As discussed in the Draft EIR, the Cultural Resources Survey determined that no historic or potentially historic built environment resources are located within the Project site or surrounding area, and previous property ownership is not historically significant. As such, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and no impact would occur.

4.1.6 Energy

- A. *Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-12 through 8.0-13)*
- B. *Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-12 through 8.0-13)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would use energy resources for the operation of the buildings (e.g., electricity), for on-road vehicle trips (e.g. gasoline and diesel fuel) generated by the Project (both during Project construction and operation), and from off-road construction activities associated with the Project (e.g. diesel fuel). The Project would be responsible for conserving energy, to the extent feasible, and would be required to comply with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations regulating energy usage. As a result, the Project would not result in any significant adverse impacts related to Project energy requirements, energy use inefficiencies, and/or the energy intensiveness of materials by amount and fuel type for each stage of the Project including construction, operations, maintenance, and/or removal. Southern California Edison (SCE), the electricity provider to the site, maintain sufficient capacity to serve the proposed Project. The Project would be required to comply with all existing energy efficiency standards, and would not result in significant adverse impacts on energy resources. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary of energy resources during Project construction or operation, or conflict with or obstruct any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.7 Geology and Soils

A. *Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

1. *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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-13)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone as defined by the State of California in the Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. Additionally, the Geotechnical Report conducted as part of the Initial Study determined that the potential for direct surface fault rupture in the Project area is considered very low. Therefore, the Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault. No impact would occur in this regard.

2. *Strong seismic ground shaking? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-13)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: As discussed in the Draft EIR, the Geotechnical Report found that the most significant geologic hazard to the Project is the potential for moderate to severe ground shaking resulting from earthquakes generated on the faults close to the site. The Project would be required to comply with the California Building Standards Code (CBSC), which includes design requirements to mitigate the effects of potential hazards associated with seismic ground shaking. The Perris Building Inspector and Building Department, would review construction plans for compliance with the CBSC and Perris Municipal Code, as well as the Geotechnical Report's recommendations. Thus, compliance with the City's established regulatory framework and standard engineering practices and design criteria, which would be verified through the City's construction plan review process, would ensure that potential impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking at the Project site would be reduced to a less than significant level.

3. *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-13 through 8.0-14)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The City's General Plan Safety Element Figure S-6 identifies the Project site as being located outside of areas considered susceptible to liquefaction. Additionally, the Project site is not located within a zone mapped as requiring evaluation of earthquake-induced liquefaction according to California Geological Survey. Groundwater is not anticipated to affect the site adversely. The Project would be required to comply with the CBSC, as amended by the Perris Municipal Code, as well as the recommendations provided in the Geotechnical Report. The Perris Building Inspector and Building Department, would review construction plans for compliance with the CBSC and Perris Municipal Code, as well as the Geotechnical Report's recommendations. Thus, compliance with the established regulatory framework and standard engineering practices and design criteria, which would be verified through the City's construction plan review

process, would ensure that potential impacts associated with liquefaction at the Project site would be reduced to a less than significant level.

4. *Landslides? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-14)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not located within an area susceptible to landsliding, as identified in the City's General Plan Safety Element. Geologic hazards associated with landsliding are not anticipated; the Geotechnical Report found geologic hazards associated with landsliding are unlikely as the Project site is far from steep slopes. Further, the Project site and surrounding area are relatively flat and do not contain any landforms capable of experiencing landslides. Therefore, no impact would occur.

B. *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-14)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Grading and earthwork activities associated with proposed development of the Project site could expose soils to potential short-term erosion by wind and water. The proposed Project is subject to the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity (Construction General Permit). The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to avoid and minimize soil erosion. Adherence to BMPs would ensure that the Proposed Project does not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Following compliance with the established regulatory framework identified in the Perris Municipal Code, including but not limited to Chapter 14.22, *Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Control*, the SWRCB, and the Clean Water Act regarding stormwater and runoff pollution control, potential impacts associated with soil erosion and the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-14 through 8.0-15)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Refer to above responses regarding the potential for liquefaction and landslides, respectively.

According to the Geotechnical Report, the Project site is in an area of stable soil conditions with low shrink-swell potential. Thus, the Project site has not been identified as having the potential for lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. Further, the Geotechnical Report notes that the Project would not be subject to geologic hazard from settlement, slippage, or landslide provided the recommendations of the Geotechnical Report are incorporated into the proposed construction. Compliance with the established regulatory framework and standard engineering practices and design criteria, which would be verified through the City's construction plan review process, would ensure that potential impacts associated with a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable at the Project site would be reduced to a less than significant level.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-15)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: According to the Geotechnical Report, the Project site is an area of stable soil conditions with low to moderate shrink-swell potential. The Project would be required to comply with CBSC seismic design standards, including requirements related to hazards involving potentially expansive soils. Implementation of the Project is not anticipated to increase the potential for expansive soils to create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. This potential impact would be less than significant.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-15)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Any development within the Project site would be required to connect to the City's existing sewer system and would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; no impact would occur.

4.1.8 Greenhouse Gas

- B. *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Draft EIR, page 5.2-18 through 5.2-24)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: As discussed in Section 5.2, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, of the Draft EIR, the proposed Project is generally consistent with or would not conflict with strategies outlined in the Perris Climate Action Plan, the 2022 Scoping Plan, and Connect SoCal 2020. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- A. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-16 through 8.0-17)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Project construction could expose construction workers and the public to temporary hazards related to the transport, use, and maintenance of construction equipment and/or materials (i.e., oil, diesel fuel, and transmission fluids). These activities would be short-term in nature, and the materials used would not be in such quantities or stored in such a manner as to pose a significant safety hazard. Compliance with the applicable laws and regulations governing the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials would ensure that all potentially hazardous materials are used and handled in an appropriate manner. Therefore, impacts concerning the routine transport, use,

or disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction would be less than significant.

The proposed Project would involve typical activities associated with gas and diesel fueling stations, convenience stores, and restaurants, which would include diesel and gasoline fuels to be stored and dispensed on-site and the use of commercially available cleaning products and the occasional use of pesticides and herbicides for landscape maintenance. There is a risk of release of these materials into the environment if they are not stored and handled in accordance with best management practices. Hazardous materials would be required to be stored, used, and disposed of in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. Additionally, the Project would involve the transport of hazardous materials to the site associated with the proposed travel center's fueling operations. The transport of fuel and tank filling operations would be conducted in compliance with applicable federal and State regulatory requirements that regulate the transportation of hazardous materials. Consistency with local, State, and federal regulations related to the transport, storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials would ensure that the potential risk associated with the routine transport, use, emission or disposal of hazardous materials would be minimized to the extent practical and impacts would be less than significant.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-17)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: A Phase I ESA conducted as part of the Initial Study did not identify any recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled recognized environmental conditions (CRECs), historical recognized environmental conditions (HRECs), and/or *de minimis* conditions relative to the proposed Project site and surrounding area with the potential to impact the site. Thus, development of the proposed Project would not 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-17)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not located within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school. Thus, the Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school; no impact would occur in this regard.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-17)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site was not identified as being listed on any regulatory databases reviewed as part of the Phase I ESA. Additionally, a search of databases that comprise the Cortese List indicates the Project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the Project site has not been included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No impact would occur.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-17 through 8.0-18)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not located within the Airport Influence Area Boundary of Perris Valley Airport. Thus, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise associated with Perris Valley Airport.

March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport (March ARB/IPA) is located approximately 10 miles northwest of the Project site. The Project site is located within the MARB/IPA Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) area. According to the MARB/IPA ALUCP, the Project site is located within Compatibility Zone D, Flight Corridor Buffer. The City of Perris has adopted Airport Overlay Zones (AOZ) to ensure that the policies in the MARB/IPA ALUCP are adhered to when new development projects are brought before the City. The safety zone boundaries within the AOZ are codified into Chapter 19.51 of the City's Development Code and are consistent with the adopted MARB/IPA ALUCP. The City's General Plan describes Zone D as having potential for aircraft noise that may be loud enough to be disruptive; having at least occasional direct overflights; and having a low accident potential risk. Zone D is identified as existing mostly within the 55 dBA CNEL contour. The proposed Project does not include habitable structures or noise sensitive receptors. As such, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people working on the Project site. Potential impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

- F. *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-18)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: During construction activities associated with the proposed on- and off-site improvements, traffic lanes located immediately adjacent to the Project site may be temporarily closed or controlled by construction personnel. However, this would be temporary and emergency access to the Project site and surrounding area would be required to be maintained at all times. Additionally, all construction staging would occur within the boundaries of the Project site and would not interfere with circulation along Ethanac Road, Trumble Road, or any other nearby roadways. The proposed improvements would not impede or interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, the Project would be required to comply with all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements, including access requirements, minimum roadway widths, fire

apparatus access roads, fire lanes, signage, and access walkways, and would submit construction plans to the Riverside County Fire Department (RCFD) for review and approval prior to issuance of any building permit. Approval by the RCFD would ensure that construction and operation of the proposed travel center would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the City's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) or emergency evacuation plan and potential impacts would be less than significant.

- G. *Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-18)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: According to the City's General Plan and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps, the Project site is not located within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Therefore, potential impacts related to exposure of people or structure to wildland fire hazards would not occur.

4.1.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

- A. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-19)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Potential construction-related water quality impacts would be addressed through compliance with Perris Municipal Code Section 14.22, *Stormwater/Urban Runoff Management and Discharge Control*, which establishes the regulations for control of excavation, grading, and earthwork construction for the control of grading site runoff, including erosion, sediments and construction related pollutants, and the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program's Construction General Permit. The Project Applicant would be required to prepare and submit a SWPPP to the SWRCB demonstrating compliance with the General Permit. Mandatory compliance with the Perris Municipal Code, Construction General Permit, and SWPPP would ensure that the proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements during construction activities. Therefore, potential water quality impacts associated with construction activities would be less than significant.

As indicated in the Preliminary WQMP, the proposed Project includes BMPs to protect water quality associated with Project operations, including an on-site bioretention system. The proposed on-site stormwater drainage facilities and water quality measures would ensure the proposed Project would not impact water quality. As part of the permit review and approval process, the City of Perris Public Works Department would review the proposed drainage improvements and water quality measures, including the final WQMP, to ensure the proposed measures are in compliance with the City storm drain and water quality requirements. Therefore, the proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality; potential impacts would be less than significant.

- B. *Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-19 through 8.0-20)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Refer to above responses for a discussion concerning the Project's water supplies/demand, including groundwater.

The Project site is located within the San Jacinto Groundwater Basin. The San Jacinto Basin is partially adjudicated; the Project site lies within the West San Jacinto Groundwater Sustainability Agency (West San Jacinto GSA) Area, which remains unadjudicated. The Groundwater Sustainability Plan provides for ongoing, long-term, sustainable management of the groundwater resources within the West San Jacinto GSA Area.

As indicated in the Preliminary WQMP, infiltration at the Project site is limited under existing conditions. As a result, the Project design proposes to convey runoff from the proposed travel center site by a proposed storm drain system into a proposed bioretention basin west of the Project site. Infiltration could still occur within landscaped areas; the proposed development would result in approximately 33 percent pervious area. Thus, the Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge and potential impacts would be less than significant.

- C. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:*

- 1) *Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
- 2) *Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?*
- 3) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*
- 4) *Impede or redirect flood flows? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-20)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Refer to above responses regarding potential impacts involving erosion and water quality.

The Project would not alter the course of a stream or river, as there are no streams or rivers located within or around the Project site. On-site flows would predominately be intercepted by four proposed grated inlets with filter inserts, which will screen trash prior to entering the bio-retention system. The bio-retention basin is proposed for stormwater quality treatment and mitigation of flows. The volume of storage provided in the basin along with the size of the outflow riser structure is intended to restrict peak flows in the proposed condition to levels equal to or less than existing flows. Thus, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site resulting in an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding, create or

contribute runoff that would exceed the capacity of the existing drainage system, or impede or redirect flood flows. Potential impacts would be less than significant.

- D. *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-20)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: As indicated in the Preliminary Hydrology Report, per the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the Project site is located within Zone X, defined as areas determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. Thus, the Project site is not located within a flood hazard area. Due to the Project site's inland location, tsunamis do not pose hazards to the Project site. While the Project site is within the dam inundation zone for the Perris Dam, seiches do not pose hazards due to the seismic retrofits of the Perris Dam and lack of other nearby bodies of standing water. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in impacts associated with the release of pollutants due to project inundation from flood, tsunami, or seiche. Potential impacts would be less than significant in this regard

- E. *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-21)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: In addition to complying with the SWPPP during Project construction activities, the Project design proposes on-site drainage improvements that include water quality measures to ensure the proposed travel center operations would not impact water quality. On-site flows would predominately be intercepted by four proposed grated inlets with filter inserts which would screen trash prior to entering the bio-retention basin. The bioretention basin would provide stormwater quality treatment and stormwater mitigation. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan; potential impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.11 Land Use and Planning

- A. *Physically divide an established community? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-21)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The approximately 14-acre Project site is currently undeveloped. The surrounding area is comprised of a mix of developed and undeveloped land. The Project would not involve any roadways or significant infrastructure systems that would physically divide the site or separate the site from surrounding uses. Project implementation would not result in residential uses being removed or divided. The proposed use would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation of Community Commercial. Thus, no impact would occur in this regard.

- B. *Physically divide an established community? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-21)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would be consistent with the City's General Plan land use designation and no amendments to the General Plan land use map would be required. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with the policies of the Perris General Plan that have been adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and that are applicable to the proposed Project. Thus, the proposed Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect and impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.12 Mineral Resources

- A. *Physically divide an established community? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-22)*
- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-22)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: According to the Perris General Plan EIR, the City of Perris and its Sphere of Influence are designated Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 3 and MRZ 4, which are not defined as significant resource areas. In addition, the General Plan EIR states that no areas within the City are designated for mineral resources extraction. Development of the site with a travel center, as proposed, would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource considered of value to the region. No impact to mineral resources would occur.

4.1.13 Noise

- A. *Would the Project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Draft EIR, page 5.3-13 through 5.3-16)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Project construction activities would occur in four phases: site preparation, grading, building construction, and paving. Project construction noise would range between 42 to 56 dBA Leq and 56 to 61 dBA Lmax at the nearest sensitive receptor. Sensitive receptors northeast and east of the Project site are within the City of Menifee. However, the City of Menifee does not have quantitative thresholds for noise levels due to construction. Perris Municipal Code Section 7.34.060 states that construction cannot exceed 80 dBA in residential zones. The calculated noise levels due to construction at the nearest residential property would reach a maximum of 61 dBA Lmax and therefore would meet the standard. Additionally, the Project would be required to adhere to the allowed times for construction outlined in the Perris Municipal Code. Therefore, noise impacts related to construction activities would be less than significant.

The potential off-site noise impacts caused by the increase in vehicular traffic as a result of the proposed Project were calculated from affected road segments. Ethanac Road east of Trumble Road is the only roadway segment with sensitive receptors and anticipated

Project trips. Trucks are anticipated to travel to and from I-215. The noise level at 50 feet both with and without Project-generated vehicle traffic was compared and the increase calculated. As shown in Table 5.3-7 of the Draft EIR, the addition of Project-generated vehicle traffic to Ethanac Road would result in negligible increases in ambient noise levels and would not be significant.

The Project site is currently within the normally unacceptable noise level range for commercial uses. This would not change due to the increase in traffic levels associated with the Project. The Project's proposed use is not noise sensitive as there are no proposed outdoor uses for employees or patrons. Therefore, impacts from on-site traffic noise would be less than significant.

Worst-case operational noise modeling conducted as part of the Draft EIR concluded that operational noise levels are expected to be 56 to 64 dBA at commercial receptors and 53 dBA at the nearest residential receptor. This is below the residential nighttime limit of 60 dBA established in Perris Municipal Code Sections 7.34.040 and 7.34.050. Existing with proposed Project noise level projections are anticipated to be 63 to 66 dBA Leq at commercial receptors and 63 dBA at the residential receptor. Project-generated operational noise is expected to result in a 1 dB increase in ambient noise levels at the northeast residential uses and a 1 to 4 dB increase at the property line of the Project site. A change in 1 dB is not perceptible, and a change of 3 dB is just perceptible. Since the existing with the proposed Project noise level would not increase the ambient noise level by more than 1.0 decibel at the residential receptor, the impact would be less than significant.

Based on the foregoing, the Project would not generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of standards established by the City and impacts would be less than significant.

- B. *Would the Project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Draft EIR, page 5.3-16 through 5.3-17)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction of the proposed Project would not require the use of equipment such as pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The nearest existing building is approximately 180 feet south of the Project site. At this distance, a large bulldozer would yield a worst-case 0.010 peak particle velocity (in/sec) which would not be perceptible or result in architectural damage. Therefore, the Project would not result in the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impacts would be less than significant.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 5.3-18)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Perris Valley Airport is located approximately two miles northwest of the Project site. The Project site is not located within the Airport Influence

Area Boundary of Perris Valley Airport. Thus, the Project would not result in excessive noise associated with the Perris Valley Airport.

MARB/IPA is located approximately 10 miles northwest of the Project site. According to the 2018 Final Air Installations Compatible Use Zones Study (AICUZ) for MARB, the City of Perris is located along the southern end of Runway 14/32 where the majority of aircraft arrivals and closed patterns occur, which results in the City Perris having the largest amount of acreage exposed to noise levels above 60 dB CNEL. The 60 dB, 65 dB, and 70 dB CNEL noise zones all extend inside the City of Perris boundary, with the largest anticipated cumulative noise level being 73 dB CNEL. The Project site is not located within the 2018 Noise Contour noise zones. Therefore, the proposed Project would not expose people working at the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airport activities. No significant adverse impacts are identified or are anticipated.

4.1.14 Population and Housing

- 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)? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-22)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth directly through new homes or indirectly through the extension of roads or other infrastructure. Development of the site with the proposed commercial use would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site. Further, the Project site and surrounding area are currently served by adjacent roadways and utility infrastructure is located within the area for extension to the Project site. The proposed travel center is anticipated to have a total of 70 employees. Employment growth associated with the Project could result in population growth within the City and vicinity, as employees (and their families) may choose to relocate to the area. Conservatively assuming all 70 new employees (and their families) relocate to Perris, Project implementation could result in a potential population increase of approximately 287 persons based on an average household size of 4.1 persons per the California Department of Finance's 2022 population and housing estimate. The Project would be within the population projections anticipated and planned for by the General Plan and the Southern California Association of Government's 2020-2045 RTP/SCS demographics forecasts and would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- B. *Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-23)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is currently undeveloped and does not contain any housing. Thus, the proposed Project would not displace existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would occur.

4.1.15 Public Services

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

1. *Fire protection? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-23)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The City contracts with the Riverside County Fire Department to provide fire protection and emergency medical services to the City. The introduction of the proposed travel center to the site could increase the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services to the site when compared to existing conditions. However, Project implementation is not expected to result in the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities in order to maintain response times. Development of the site with commercial uses has been anticipated by the General Plan. In compliance with Perris Municipal Code Section 19.68.020, *Development Impact Fees*, the Project would be required to pay a development impact fee to fund the acquisition, design, and construction of public facilities, including fire facilities, necessary to serve new development within the City. Payment of the development impact fee would provide for the Project's fair share cost contribution to facilities and equipment due to the increased demand for fire protection services. The proposed development would be required to comply with all applicable City, County, and State codes and ordinance requirements for fire protection, which would further reduce potential impacts concerning fire protection services. The Project would not require the need for new or physically altered fire station facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives and impacts would be less than significant.

2. *Police protection? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-23 through 8.0-24)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Police protection services in the City are provided by contract with the Riverside County Sheriff's Department. The introduction of the proposed travel center to the site could increase the demand for police services to the site when compared to existing conditions. However, Project implementation is not expected to result in the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities in order to maintain response times. Development of the site with commercial uses has been anticipated by the General Plan. The Project would be required to pay a development impact fee to fund the acquisition, design, and construction of public facilities, including police protection facilities, necessary to serve new development within the City. Payment of the development impact fee would provide for the Project's fair share cost contribution to facilities and equipment due to the increased demand for police protection services. Further, as part of the development review process, Riverside County Sheriff's Department would review the Project and provide comments regarding risks to security and ways to minimize those risks. The Project would not require the need for new or physically altered

police facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives and impacts would be less than significant.

3. *Schools? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-24)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project proposes the development of a travel center, which would not directly generate new students to the local school districts. The Project Applicant would be subject to payment of school impact fees in accordance with Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) and demonstrate proof of payment to the City. Pursuant to Government Code §65995(3)(h), payment of statutory fees is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of impacts. As such, impacts to schools would be less than significant.

4. *Parks? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-24)*

Finding: No Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is currently undeveloped and does not provide public park or recreation opportunities. Further, there are no public parks or recreational facilities within the surrounding area and the development of new park or recreation facilities is not proposed as part of the Project. The Project would not result in direct population growth or significant indirect population growth resulting in the need for new or physically altered park facilities. Therefore, no impacts to parks would occur.

5. *Other Public Facilities? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-24)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in direct population growth that would significantly increase the use of libraries or other public facilities resulting in the need for new or physically altered public facilities that could result in substantial adverse physical impacts. The Project would also be required to adhere to the Perris Municipal Code Section 19.68.020, *Development Impact Fees*, which implements a unified development impact fee program to fund the acquisition, design, and construction of certain public facilities necessary to serve new development within the City. Potential impacts to public facilities would be considered less than significant.

4.1.16 Recreation

A. *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-25)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project proposes the development of a travel center. The Project would not result in direct substantial population growth or significant indirect population growth resulting in the need for new or physically altered recreational facilities to adequately serve the community. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site and development of the Project site with commercial uses has been anticipated by the General Plan. Thus, no impact would occur in this regard.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-25)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Refer to above response regarding recreation. The Project proposes the development of a travel center that does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; no impacts would occur in this regard.

4.1.17 Transportation

- A. *Would the Project conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-7 through 5.4-8)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: As part of the Project, the existing median on Ethanac Road would be removed and a new raised median would be constructed extending from Trumble Road to just west of Encanto Drive and new striping would be provided. A second westbound through lane would be added to Ethanac Road along the Project frontage. The existing unsignalized intersection of Encanto Drive and Ethanac Road would change from a full access to a right-in-right-out only unsignalized intersection. New striping would also be provided along Trumble Road. The Project would include a dedicated northbound left turn lane/two-way left-turn lane at both Trumble Road driveway intersections to accommodate left turns into the Project site. The Project does not propose any other modifications to existing roadway facilities. Three new driveways would be constructed. The proposed driveway on Ethanac Road would provide right-in-right-out only access. The southern driveway on Trumble Road would be full access for passenger vehicles. The northern driveway on Trumble Road would provide truck ingress and egress access to the Project site. All Project driveways would be unsignalized. The three driveways would not interfere with the operation of roadways or the ability of vehicles to access existing properties to the south of Ethanac Road. Thus, the Project would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including roadway facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

The Project would not conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing transit facilities, bicycle facilities, or pedestrian facilities. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

- B. *Would the Project conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-9)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The City's Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines provides screening criteria that can be used to determine whether a project would be expected to cause a less than significant impact without having to conduct a detailed study. The screening criteria adopted by the City of Perris are based on the recommendations from the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and Western Riverside Council of

Governments for setting screening thresholds for land use projects. A project is presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT under CEQA pursuant to SB 743 if the project satisfies at least one of the VMT screening criteria. According to the Transportation Analysis, the Project is a local serving land use and thus satisfies at least one of the VMT screening criteria.

The Technical Advisory on Evaluating transportation Impacts in CEQA (December 2018), prepared by the Office of Planning and Research, identifies that by adding retail opportunities into the urban fabric and thereby improving retail destination proximity, local-serving retail development tends to shorten trips and reduce VMT. Generally, retail development including stores less than 50,000 square feet might be considered local serving. The proposed Project would be less than 50,000 square feet and is not anticipated to lead to substitution of longer trips for shorter ones. Therefore, the City may presume such development creates a less than significant transportation impact.

In determining if a project is a local serving land use, the City's TIA Guidelines contains a list of eligible local serving uses in the City of Perris, including general retail less than 50,000 square feet, supermarket, restaurant/cafe/bar, gas service station, and auto repair/tire shop. The Project is less than 50,000 square feet and proposes to provide a travel center facility with fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. Therefore, the Project would be considered a local serving use under the City's TIA Guidelines.

The Project meets the local serving land use screening threshold and is not anticipated to result in a significant impact under CEQA pursuant to SB 743. Therefore, the Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1) and impacts would be less than significant.

- C. *Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-10)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project does not include any incompatible uses, as the Project Applicant proposes a travel center, which is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site with approval of conditional use permit. As part of the Project, the existing median on Ethanac Road would be removed and a new raised median would be constructed extending from Trumble Road to just west of Encanto Drive and new striping would be provided. A second westbound through lane would be added to Ethanac Road along the Project frontage. The existing unsignalized intersection of Encanto Drive and Ethanac Road would change from a full access to a right-in-right-out only unsignalized intersection. New striping would also be provided along Trumble Road. The Project would include a dedicated northbound left turn lane/two-way left-turn lane at both Trumble Road driveway intersections to accommodate left turns into the Project site.

All proposed roadway improvements would be reviewed by the City of Perris as part of the development review process to ensure standard roadway engineering practices and design requirements, including site distance, are met. The proposed improvements would be required to be designed and constructed in conformance with all applicable City design

standards. The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses and impacts would be less than significant.

- D. *Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-10 through 5.4-11)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Ethanac Road and I-215 would provide primary access to the Project site and would continue to serve as the primary evacuation and emergency access route within the area, as designated in the City's General Plan Safety Element (Figure S-1, Potential Evacuation Routes). SR-74 and Sherman Road would also provide access to and out of the Project area. During construction activities associated with the proposed on- and off-site improvements, traffic lanes located immediately adjacent to the Project site may be temporarily closed or controlled by construction personnel. However, this would be temporary and emergency access to the Project site and surrounding area would be required to be maintained at all times. Additionally, all construction staging would occur within the boundaries of the Project site and would not interfere with circulation along Ethanac Road, Trumble Road, or any other nearby roadways. The proposed improvements would not impede or interfere with the evacuation plan.

Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Project Applicant would be required to submit appropriate plans for plan review to ensure compliance with zoning, building, and fire codes. The Riverside County Fire Department would review the Project for access requirements, minimum roadway widths, fire apparatus access roads, fire lanes, signage, access walkways, among other requirements to ensure adequate emergency access would be provided to and within the Project site. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements and would submit construction plans to the Perris Building Inspector and Building Department for review and approval prior to issuance of any building permit. Approval by the City and County Fire Department would ensure that Project construction and operation would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant.

4.1.18 Utilities and Service Systems

- A. *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, or wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-26 through 8.0-27)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is located within the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) service area. The Project site is currently undeveloped and does not generate water demand. The Project Applicant would install a new water service line on-site to serve the proposed development, which would connect to existing water lines within Trumble and Ethanac Roads. The potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the Project, including the proposed water lines to serve the development are analyzed within the Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of

mitigation measures. Thus, the proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of water facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Wastewater collection services within most of the City, including the Project site, are provided by the EMWD. The Project site is undeveloped and does not currently generate wastewater requiring treatment. Development of the travel center would require installation of a new sewer line within the Project site, which would connect to the existing sewer line within Trumble Road. The potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the Project, including the proposed sewer line to serve the development are analyzed within the Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures. Thus, the proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of wastewater facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

The Project would include on-site stormwater drainage facilities, including a bioretention basin. The potential environmental effects associated with construction and operation of the Project, including the proposed drainage facilities are analyzed within the Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant with compliance with regulatory requirements and implementation of mitigation measures. Thus, the proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of stormwater drainage facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects.

The Project would receive electrical service from SCE and natural gas service from the Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). Telecommunication services are provided by a variety of companies including AT&T, DirecTV, Spectrum, and Verizon, and are typically selected by the individual customer. Transmission lines/infrastructure for these services are provided within the Project area. The Project Applicant would install new underground electric lines, telephone lines, and natural gas lines from the proposed travel center and shop buildings and connect to facilities within Ethanac Road. The potential environmental effects associated with the proposed travel center's energy demand are analyzed within the Initial Study and impacts have been determined to be less than significant. The proposed Project would not require or result in relocation or construction of 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-27)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is located within the EMWD service area and would connect to existing EMWD water facilities to serve the proposed travel center. The EMWD's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) show that the EMWD anticipates sufficient supply capabilities to meet the expected demands through 2045 under normal, historic single-dry, and historic multiple-dry year conditions. Therefore, it is anticipated that existing supplies in combination with identified future and potential water supply opportunities will enable the EMWD to meet all future water demands under all hydrologic

conditions through the end of the planning period. The Project would be within the population projections anticipated and planned for by the General Plan and would not increase growth beyond what was anticipated in the UWMP. Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the proposed Project and impacts would be less than significant.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-27)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Wastewater collection services within most of the City, including the Project site, are provided by the EMWD. Wastewater generated by the proposed Project would be conveyed to the Perris Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (PVRWRF) for treatment. The PVRWRF has a current treatment capacity of 22 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater, with an ultimate capacity to treat 100 mgd, and has a current flow of 15.5 mgd as of 2021. The Project would be within the population projections anticipated and planned for by the General Plan and SCAG. Additionally, the City charges wastewater connection and service fees on behalf of the EMWD to collect revenue to fund shared costs for necessary infrastructure and infrastructure maintenance. Sufficient treatment capacity would be available to serve the proposed travel center and impacts would be less than significant.

- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-28)*
- E. *Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-28)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would generate solid waste requiring collection and disposal at landfill facilities. The Perris General Plan EIR determined that solid waste associated with buildout of the General Plan would not exceed regional forecasted demand and would be accommodated at the Badlands Sanitary Landfill and El Sobrante Landfills. The proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation for the Project site and development of the site with commercial uses has been anticipated by the General Plan. Based on existing facility capacity and consistency with the General Plan, it is anticipated that solid waste generated from the proposed travel center could be accommodated at the El Sobrante Landfill and the Badlands Sanitary Landfill. The City would continue to implement its diversion programs and require compliance with all federal, State and local statutes and regulations for solid waste, including those identified under the most current CALGreen standards and in compliance with AB 939. Thus, the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts concerning solid waste.

4.1.19 Wildfire

- A. *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-28)*
- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-28)*
- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-28)*
- 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? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-28)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. Thus, the proposed Project would not result in potential impacts associated with wildfire.

4.2 Potential Environmental Impacts that will be Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance

Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Perris finds that for each of the following significant effects as identified in the Draft EIR, changes or alterations (mitigation measures) have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen each of the significant environmental effects as identified in the Draft EIR. The following discussion includes all issue areas of potentially significant effects for which mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Project which avoid or substantially lessen each of the significant environmental effects to below a level of significance, as identified in the Draft EIR.

4.2.1 Aesthetics

- D. *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-2)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project's proposed lighting introduces lighting where it does not already occur; however, light spillover and glare would be avoided by requiring that light be designed to project downward and not create glare on adjacent properties and the public right of way. Thus, the Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area and operational impacts would be less than significant. During Project construction, nighttime lighting may be used within the construction staging areas to provide security for construction equipment. Due to the distance between the construction area and the adjacent roadways and highway, such security lights may result in glare to motorists. However, this potential impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation measure AES-1.

Mitigation Measure(s):

AES-1 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project developer shall provide evidence to the City of Perris that any temporary nighttime lighting installed for security purposes shall be downward facing and hooded or shielded to prevent security light spillage by one foot candle to surrounding roadways and highway outside of the staging area or direct broadcast of security light into the sky.

4.2.2 Biological Resources

- A. *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-4 through 8.0-8)*

Finding: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site consists of disturbed land and is largely devoid of native vegetation. Two special-status plant species were found to have a moderate potential to occur (San Diego ambrosia and thread-leaved brodiaea) on the Project site.

Within the Western Riverside Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), San Diego ambrosia is a Narrow Endemic Plant Species and smooth tarplant is a Criteria Area species. Impacts to these species have already been contemplated and addressed under the MSHCP. Furthermore, the Project site is neither located in an MSHCP-designated Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area nor a Criteria Area. The Project is a covered activity under the MSHCP; additional focused surveys and implementation of mitigation for these two species are not required. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on special-status plants.

Two special-status wildlife species were determined to have a high or moderate potential to occur on the Project site: burrowing owl and Crotch bumble bee. Due to the presence of open, marginally suitable grassland habitat and the recent documented occurrence of the species within five miles of the Project site, burrowing owl was determined to have a high potential to occur. Burrowing owl is an MSHCP Covered Species and a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern (SSC). The Project site is located within a designated survey area under the MSHCP for burrowing owl. Surveys and burrowing owl habitat assessments conducted as part of the Initial Study identified numerous suitable burrows on the Project site and within the survey buffer, although no burrowing owls or burrowing owl sign were observed during the survey. However, due to the mobile nature of the species, it is possible that burrowing owl could use the site prior to the start of Project activities. In order to avoid potentially significant impacts to burrowing owl, mitigation measure BIO-1 would be required, which requires a pre-construction survey for burrowing owls be completed prior to construction activities in accordance with the Western Riverside MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions and implementation of mitigation measures in the event burrowing owls are observed.

There is moderate potential for the Crotch bumble bee to occur within the Project site. In order to avoid potentially significant impacts to Crotch bumble bee, mitigation measure BIO-2 would be implemented, which requires preconstruction surveys for Crotch bumble bee be completed prior to construction activities in accordance with CDFW's Survey Considerations for California Endangered Species Act Candidate Bumble Bee Species and implementation of mitigation measures in the event Crotch bumble bees are detected.

In addition, six species were determined to have a low potential to occur on the Project site. Special-status wildlife species with a low potential to occur include: Coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), Northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*), Stephens' kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*), Southern grasshopper mouse (*Onychomys torridus ramona*), Los Angeles pocket mouse (*Perognathus longimembris brevinasus*), and American badger (*Taxidea taxus*). If present, these species are not expected to occur at high densities due to the highly disturbed nature of the Project site and recent mechanical disturbances to the soil affecting habitat or prey base for these species. The loss of the SSC individuals (all species except Stephens' kangaroo rat), if present, on the site would not contribute to the decline in regional populations and would therefore not be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

The Project site is located within the Stephens' kangaroo rat fee assessment area that requires the payment of the appropriate fee set forth in Riverside County Ordinance No. 663 as mitigation for loss of habitat for the species. Stephens' kangaroo rat has a low potential to occur on the Project site due to the marginally suitable habitat present in the

grassland habitat and loose friable soils; however, the relatively isolated nature of the site being surrounded by urban development and the recent and ongoing mechanical disturbances to soils on the Project site likely preclude this species from occurring. To offset impacts to the species to less than significant, all applicants for development permits within the fee assessment area must pay a mitigation fee as set forth in Riverside County Ordinance No. 663.

The trees on and immediately adjacent to the Project site as well as a few isolated shrubs adjacent to the site could provide nesting habitat for nesting birds and raptors protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code. Furthermore, the Project site could provide nesting habitat for ground-nesting bird species. Impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measure BIO-3, which would require a preconstruction nesting bird survey if activities with the potential to disrupt nesting birds are scheduled to occur during the bird nesting season and implementation of mitigation measures in the event nesting birds are observed.

Given the absence of observations, or appropriate habitat for, special-status wildlife, and with implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on special-status wildlife species.

Mitigation Measure(s):

BIO-1 Pre-Construction Surveys for Burrowing Owl. The Project proponent shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for resident burrowing owls within 30 days prior to commencement of grading and construction activities on the Project site. The survey shall include the Project site and all suitable burrowing owl habitat within a 500-foot buffer. The results of the survey shall be submitted to the City prior to obtaining a grading permit. In addition, if burrowing owls are observed during the MBTA nesting bird survey, to be conducted within three days prior to ground disturbance or vegetation clearance, the observation shall be reported to the Wildlife Agencies. If ground disturbing activities in these areas are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the pre-construction survey, the area shall be resurveyed for owls. The pre-construction survey and any relocation activity will be conducted in accordance with the current Burrowing Owl Survey Instructions for the Western Riverside MSHCP.

If burrowing owl are detected, the CDFW shall be sent written notification by the City, within three days of detection of burrowing owls. If active nests are identified during the pre-construction survey, the nests shall be avoided and the qualified biologist and Project Applicant shall coordinate with the City of Perris Planning Division, the USFWS, and the CDFW to develop a Burrowing Owl Plan to be approved by the City in consultation with the CDFW and the USFWS prior to commencing Project activities. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall be prepared in accordance with guidelines in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl (CDFW 2012) and MSHCP. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall describe proposed avoidance, minimization, relocation, and monitoring as applicable. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall include the number and location of occupied burrow sites and details on proposed buffers if avoiding the burrowing owls and/or information on the adjacent or nearby suitable habitat available to owls for relocation. If no suitable habitat is

available nearby for relocation, details regarding the creation and funding of artificial burrows (numbers, location, and type of burrows) and management activities for relocated owls may also be required in the Burrowing Owl Plan. The Permittee shall implement the Burrowing Owl Plan following CDFW and USFWS review and concurrence. A final letter report shall be prepared by the qualified biologist documenting the results of the Burrowing Owl Plan. The letter shall be submitted to the CDFW prior to the start of Project activities. When a qualified biologist determines that burrowing owls are no longer occupying the Project site per the criteria in the Burrowing Owl Plan, Project activities may begin.

If burrowing owls occupy the Project site after Project activities have started, then construction activities shall be halted immediately. The Project proponent shall notify the City and the City shall notify the CDFW and the USFWS within 48 hours of detection. A Burrowing Owl Plan, as detailed above, shall be implemented.

BIO-2 Preconstruction Surveys for Crotch Bumble Bee. If the Crotch bumble bee is no longer a Candidate or formally Listed species under the California ESA at the time ground-disturbing activities occur, then no additional protection measures are proposed for the species.

If the Crotch bumble bee is legally protected under the California ESA as a Candidate or Listed species at the time ground-disturbing activities are scheduled to begin, preconstruction surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the CDFW's Survey Considerations for CESA Candidate Bumble Bee Species (CDFW 2023) the season immediately prior to Project implementation. A minimum of three Crotch bumble bee preconstruction surveys shall be conducted at two- to four-week intervals during the colony active period (April through August) when Crotch bumble bee is most likely to be detected. Non-lethal, photo voucher surveys shall be completed by a biologist who holds a Memorandum of Understanding to capture and handle Crotch bumble bee (if nesting and chilling protocol is to be utilized) or by a CDFW-approved biologist experienced in identifying native bumble bee species (if surveys are restricted to visual surveys that will provide high-resolution photo documentation for species verification). The surveyor shall walk through all areas of suitable habitat focusing on areas with floral resources. Surveys shall be completed at a minimum of one person-hour of searching per three acres of suitable habitat during suitable weather conditions (sustained winds less than 8 mph, mostly sunny to full sun, temperatures between 65 and 90 degrees Fahrenheit) at an appropriate time of day for detection (at least an hour after sunrise and at least two hours before sunset, though ideally between 9:00 AM and 1:00 PM).

If Crotch bumble bees are detected, the CDFW shall be notified by the Project biologist as further coordination may be required to avoid or mitigate certain impacts. At a minimum, two nesting surveys shall be conducted with focus on detecting active nesting colonies within one week and 24 hours immediately prior to ground disturbing activities that are scheduled to occur during the flight season (February through October). If an active Crotch bumble bee nest is detected, an appropriately sized no disturbance buffer zone (including foraging resources and flight corridors essential for supporting the colony) shall be established around the nest to reduce the risk of disturbance or accidental take and the designated biologist

shall coordinate with CDFW to determine if an Incidental Take Permit under Section 2081 of the California ESA will be required. Nest avoidance buffers may be removed at the completion of the flight season and/or once the qualified biologist deems the nesting colony is no longer active. If no nests are found but the species is present, a full-time qualified biological monitor who is experienced in surveying for and identifying the species shall be present during vegetation or ground disturbing activities that are scheduled to occur during the queen flight period (February through March), colony active period (March through September), and/or gyne flight period (September through October). Because bumble bees move nest sites each year, two pre-construction nesting surveys shall be required during each subsequent year of construction, regardless of the previous year's findings, whenever vegetation and ground disturbing activities are scheduled to occur during the flight season if nesting and foraging habitat is still present or has re-established.

BIO-3 Preconstruction Survey for Nesting Birds. In order to avoid violation of the MBTA and the California Fish and Game Code, site preparation activities (ground disturbance, construction activities, staging equipment, and/or removal of trees and vegetation) for the Project shall be avoided, to the greatest extent possible, during the nesting season of potentially occurring native and migratory bird species.

If active nests are not located within the Project site and an appropriate buffer of 500 feet of an active listed species or raptor nest, 300 feet of other sensitive or protected bird nests (non-listed), or 100 feet of sensitive or protected songbird nests, construction may be conducted during the nesting/breeding season. However, if active nests are located during the pre-activity field survey, the Biologist shall immediately establish a conservative avoidance buffer surrounding the nest based on their best professional judgement and experience. The Biologist shall monitor the nest at the onset of Project activities, and at the onset of any changes in such Project activities (e.g., increase in number or type of equipment, change in equipment usage, etc.) to determine the efficacy of the buffer. If the Biologist determines that such Project activities may be causing an adverse reaction, the Biologist shall adjust the buffer accordingly or implement alternative avoidance and minimization measures, such as redirecting or rescheduling construction or erecting sound barriers. All work within these buffers will be halted until the nesting effort is finished (i.e., the juveniles are surviving independent from the nest). The on-site qualified biologist will review and verify compliance with these nesting avoidance buffers and will verify the nesting effort has finished. Work can resume within these avoidance areas when no other active nests are found. Upon completion of the survey and nesting bird monitoring, a report shall be prepared and submitted to City for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.

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? (Draft EIR, 8.0-8)*

Finding: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: No migratory wildlife corridors or native wildlife nursery sites were identified within the Project site. As previously discussed, the trees on and

immediately adjacent to the Project site as well as a few isolated shrubs adjacent to the site could provide nesting habitat for nesting birds and raptors protected by the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code. Furthermore, the Project site could provide nesting habitat for ground-nesting bird species and suitable burrowing habitat with the potential to provide nesting opportunities. In order to reduce potential impacts to wildlife species potentially nesting within the Project site, the Project would be required to comply with mitigation measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3, which would ensure protection of any birds and active nests and reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s): Refer to Mitigation Measures BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3.

- F. *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-4 through 8.0-8)*

Finding: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site is located within the planning area for the MSHCP, but is outside of any Cell Groups, Criteria Cells, and Subunit designations. Further, Stephens' kangaroo rat is not expected within the area due to surrounding urban development, high level of disturbance, and lack of suitable habitat. The Project would comply with MSHCP requirements. As the Project site is located within the Stephens' kangaroo rat fee assessment area, the Project Applicant would be required to pay a mitigation fee as set forth in Riverside County Ordinance No. 663. Further, preconstruction surveys following the protocols set forth in the MSHCP burrowing owl survey guidelines would be conducted prior to the start of Project construction, as described in mitigation measure BIO-1. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved plan and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): Refer to Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

4.2.3 Cultural Resources

- B. *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-9 through 8.0-11)*

Finding: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: Based on the assessment conducted as part of the Cultural Resources Report, the archaeological sensitivity of the Project site is considered low. However, while highly unlikely, there is the potential for accidental discovery of archaeological resources during ground-disturbing activities, which could result in potential impacts. Mitigation measure CUL-1 has been incorporated to reduce potentially significant impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources that may be encountered during Project implementation. With implementation of mitigation measure CUL-1, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s):

CUL-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project proponent/developer shall retain a professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Standards for Archaeology (U.S. Department of Interior, 2012; Registered Professional Archaeologist preferred). The primary task of the consulting archaeologist shall be to monitor the initial ground-disturbing activities at both the Project site and any off-site Project-related improvement areas for the identification of any previously unknown archaeological and/or cultural resources. Selection of the archaeologist shall be subject to the approval of the City of Perris Director of Development Services and no ground-disturbing activities shall occur at the Project site or within the off-site Project improvement areas until the archaeologist has been approved by the City.

The archaeologist shall be responsible for monitoring ground-disturbing activities, including initial vegetation removal, maintaining daily field notes and a photographic record, and for reporting all finds to the developer and the City of Perris in a timely manner. The archaeologist shall be prepared and equipped to record and salvage cultural resources that may be unearthed during ground-disturbing activities and shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert ground-disturbing equipment to allow time for the recording and removal of the resources.

In the event that archaeological resources are discovered at the Project site or within the off-site Project improvement areas, the handling of the discovered resource(s) will differ, depending on the nature of the find. Consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(b) and Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), avoidance shall be the preferred method of preservation for Native American/tribal cultural/archaeological resources. However, it is understood that all artifacts, with the exception of human remains and related grave goods or sacred/ceremonial/religious objects, belong to the property owner. The property owner shall commit to the relinquishing and curation of all artifacts identified as being of Native American origin. All artifacts, Native American or otherwise, discovered during the monitoring program shall be recorded and inventoried by the consulting archaeologist.

If any artifacts of Native American origin are discovered, all activities in the immediate vicinity of the find (within a 50-foot radius) shall stop and the Project proponent and Project archaeologist shall notify the City of Perris Planning Division, the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, and the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians. A designated Native American representative from either the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, or the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be retained to assist the Project archaeologist in the significance determination of the Native American as deemed possible. The designated tribal representative will be given ample time to examine the find. The significance of Native American resources shall be evaluated in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and shall consider the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the tribe. If the find is determined to be of sacred or religious value, the tribal representative will work with the City and consulting archaeologist to protect the resource in accordance

with tribal requirements. All analysis will be undertaken in a manner that avoids destruction or other adverse impacts.

In the event that human remains are discovered at the Project site or within the off-site Project improvement areas, mitigation measure CUL-2 shall immediately apply, and all items found in association with Native American human remains shall be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling.

Native American artifacts that are relocated/reburied at the Project site would be subject to a fully executed relocation/reburial agreement with the assisting tribe. This shall include, but not be limited to, an agreement that artifacts will be reburied on-site and in an area of permanent protection, and that reburial shall not occur until all cataloging and basic recordation have been completed by the consulting archaeologist.

Native American artifacts that cannot be avoided or relocated at the Project site shall be prepared for curation at an accredited curation facility in Riverside County that meets federal standards (per 36 CFR Part 79) and available to archaeologists/researchers for further study. The Project archaeologist shall deliver the Native American artifacts, including title, to the identified curation facility within a reasonable amount of time, along with applicable fees for permanent curation.

Non-Native American artifacts shall be inventoried, assessed, and analyzed for cultural affiliation, personal affiliation (prior ownership), function, and temporal placement. Subsequent to analysis and reporting, these artifacts will be subjected to curation, as deemed appropriate, or returned to the property owner.

Once grading activities have ceased and/or the archaeologist, in consultation with the designated Luiseño representative, determines that monitoring is no longer warranted, monitoring activities can be discontinued following notification to the City of Perris Planning Division.

A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of artifacts, shall be prepared upon completion of the tasks outlined above. The report shall include all data outlined by the Office of Historic Preservation guidelines, including a conclusion of the significance of all recovered, relocated, and reburied artifacts. A copy of the report shall also be filed with the City of Perris Planning Division, the University of California, Riverside, Eastern Information Center (EIC) and the tribe(s) involved with the Project.

- C. *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-11 through 8.0-12)*

Finding: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: While the potential for the proposed Project to disturb previously undiscovered human remains is unlikely, previously undiscovered human remains could be located within the Project site and could be disturbed by construction activities, resulting in a potentially significant impact. If human remains are found, the remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws, including State

of California Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5-7055 and Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Section 5097.99. Implementation of mitigation measure CUL-2 would ensure that if human remains are found during excavation, excavation would be halted near the find until the County Coroner has investigated, and appropriate recommendations have been made for treatment and disposition of the remains. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner would notify the NAHC. Following compliance with mitigation measure CUL-2, the Project's potential impacts concerning human remains would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s):

CUL-2 In the event that human remains (or remains that may be human) are discovered at the Project site or within the off-site Project improvement areas during ground-disturbing activities, the construction contractors, Project archaeologist, and/or designated Luiseño tribal representative shall immediately stop all activities within 100 feet of the find. The Project proponent shall then inform the Riverside County Coroner and the City of Perris Planning Division immediately, and the coroner shall be permitted to examine the remains as required by California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b).

If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will identify the "Most Likely Descendent" (MLD). Despite the affiliation with any Luiseño tribal representative(s) at the site, the NAHC's identification of the MLD will stand. The MLD shall be granted access to inspect the site of the discovery of Native American human remains and may recommend to the Project proponent means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete his or her inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The disposition of the remains will be determined in consultation between the Project proponent and the MLD. In the event that there is disagreement regarding the disposition of the remains, State law will apply and median with the NAHC will make the applicable determination (see Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(e) and 5097.94(k)).

The specific locations of Native American burials and reburials will be proprietary and not disclosed to the general public. The locations will be documented by the consulting archaeologist in conjunction with the various stakeholders and a report of findings will be filed with the Eastern Information Center (EIC).

4.2.4 Geology and Soils

F. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-15 through 8.0-16)

Finding: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project site and surrounding area are largely undeveloped. The Cultural Resources Report identifies the Project site as being considered sensitive for buried paleontological resources. With implementation of mitigation measure GEO-1,

which includes retaining a paleontologist and preparing and implementing a paleontological resource impact mitigation monitoring program that includes a program for salvage, preparation and curation of recovered fossils, potential impacts to undiscovered paleontological resources would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure(s):

GEO-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall submit to and receive approval from the City of Perris Planning Division, a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Monitoring Program (PRIMMP). The PRIMMP shall include the provision of a qualified professional paleontologist (or his or her trained paleontological monitor representative) during onsite and offsite subsurface excavation. Selection of the paleontologist shall be subject to approval of the City of Perris Planning Manager and no grading activities shall occur at the Project site or within offsite Project improvement areas until the paleontologist has been approved by the City.

Monitoring shall be restricted to undisturbed subsurface areas of older Quaternary alluvium, which might be present below the surface. The paleontologist shall be prepared to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays. The paleontologist shall also remove samples of sediments which are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. The paleontologist shall have the power to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for removal of abundant or large specimens.

Collected samples of sediments shall be washed to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils. Recovered specimens shall be prepared so that they can be identified and permanently preserved. Specimens shall be identified and curated and placed into an accredited repository (such as the Western Science Center or the Riverside Metropolitan Museum) with permanent curation and retrievable storage.

A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered specimens, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report shall include a discussion of the significance of all recovered specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City of Perris Planning Division, will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.

4.2.5 Tribal Cultural Resources

A. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

1. *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-25)*
2. *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision*

(c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? (Draft EIR, page 8.0-25)

Finding: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

Facts in Support of Finding: In compliance with AB 52, the City provided formal notification to those California Native American Tribal representatives requesting notification in accordance with AB 52. With implementation of mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2, the Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure(s): Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2.

4.3 Potential Environmental Impacts Determined to be Significant and Unavoidable

Pursuant to Section 15091(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Perris finds that, for each of the following significant effects identified in the Draft EIR, specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or Project alternatives infeasible:

4.3.1 Air Quality

B. Would the project 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? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-26 through 5.1-29)

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Project construction activities would generate short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. The pollutants of primary concern within the Project site include ozone-precursor pollutants (i.e., VOC and NO_x) and PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Construction-generated emissions are short term and temporary, lasting only while construction activities occur, but would be considered a significant air quality impact if the volume of pollutants generated exceeds the South Coast AQMD's thresholds of significance.

The Project's predicted maximum daily construction-related emissions are summarized in Table 5.1-4 of the Draft EIR. As shown in Table 5.1-4 of the Draft EIR, all criteria pollutant emissions would remain below their respective thresholds. While impacts would be considered to be less than significant, Project development would be subject to compliance with South Coast AQMD Rules 402 (Nuisance), 403 (Fugitive Dust), and 1113 (Architectural Coatings), which would further reduce specific construction-related emissions. Project construction emissions would not worsen ambient air quality, create additional violations of federal and state standards, or delay the South Coast AQMD's goal for meeting attainment standards in the South Coast Air Basin. Project cumulative air quality impacts associated with construction emissions would be less than significant.

The Project's operational emissions would be associated with motor vehicle use and area sources. Mobile sources emissions are generated from vehicle operations associated with Project operations. Typically, area sources are small sources that contribute very minor

emissions individually, but when combined may generate substantial amounts of pollutants. Area specific defaults in CalEEMod were used to calculate area source emissions. As shown in Table 5.1-5 of the Draft EIR, emission calculations generated from CalEEMod demonstrate that Project operations would not exceed the South Coast AQMD thresholds for any criteria air pollutants, except for NOx. Therefore, Project cumulative operational impacts have the potential to be significant. The proposed Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3, which would provide for reduced operational air quality emissions. However, even with implementation of the identified mitigation measures, the proposed Project would still cause an exceedance of South Coast AQMD threshold of significance for NOx. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact

Mitigation Measure(s):

- AQ-1 The Project Applicant/Facility Owner or Operator shall ensure that upon Project operation, for trucks owned or operated by the Project Applicant/Facility Owner or Operator that access the site, only ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel or biodiesel blended with sulfur content of 15 ppm or less shall be used, so long as such fuel is commercially available.
- AQ-2 The Project Applicant shall install and maintain perimeter landscaping that includes vegetation and a tree canopy (which may include structural solar canopies).
- AQ-3 The Project Applicant shall ensure that the Project building(s) exceeds applicable Title 24 Building Envelope Energy Efficiency Standards by at least 1 percent.
- AQ-4 The Project Applicant shall devise and implement a property maintenance plan during Project operation that includes sweeping parking lots regularly to remove road dust, tire wear, brake dust, and other contaminants.

4.3.2 Greenhouse Gas

- A. *Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Draft EIR, page 5.2-16 through 5.2-18)*

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would generate greenhouse gasses (GHGs) during the construction and operational phases of the Project. The Project's primary source of construction-related GHGs would result from emissions of carbon dioxide associated with Project construction and worker vehicle trips. Additionally, the Project would require grading, and would also include site preparation, building construction, and paving phases.

Project construction-related activities would generate a maximum of approximately 267 MTCO_{2e} of GHG emissions in a single year. Construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the Project's lifetime (assumed to be 30 years), then added to the operational emissions. The amortized Project emissions would be approximately 9 MTCO_{2e} per year. Once construction is complete, the generation of construction-related GHG emissions would cease.

The operational phase of the Project would generate GHGs primarily from the Project's operational vehicle trips and building energy (i.e. electricity) usage. Other sources of GHG emissions would be minimal.

Project operational GHG emissions would total approximately 31,129 MTCO₂e annually, and combined with construction-related GHG emissions, would total approximately 31,138 MTCO₂e annually. The vast majority of these emissions (i.e. over 99%) are from the heavy-duty trucks traveling to and from the Project site to engage in customer refueling. It should be noted that with continued implementation of various Statewide measures, such as the required increase of electric vehicles, the Project's operational energy and mobile source emissions would continue to decline in the future. In addition, the Project would implement Mitigation Measure GHG-1 and GHG-2. However, these emissions are anticipated to exceed the 3,000 MTCO₂e threshold of significance for non-industrial projects, and this would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact. No additional feasible mitigation measures are available.

Mitigation Measure(s):

GHG-1 The Project Applicant shall implement water-efficient irrigation systems, such as "smart" irrigation control systems, to automatically adjust watering schedules in response to environmental and climate changes (e.g., changes in temperature or precipitation levels).

GHG-2 The Project Applicant shall only plant native or drought-resistant trees and vegetation.

4.4 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts were analyzed for potentially significant effects of the Project in Sections 5.1 through 5.4 of the Draft EIR. This section of the Findings summarizes the potential for significant cumulative effects, as evaluated in the EIR.

4.4.1 Cumulative Air Quality

A. *Would the project, combined with other related projects, conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-37)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would not result in a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet State and federal air quality standards. Therefore, the proposed Project's incremental effects involving potential conflict with or obstructing implementation of the 2022 AQMP would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

B. *Would the project, combined with other related projects, 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? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-37)*

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Emission calculations generated from CalEEMod demonstrate that Project operations would not exceed the South Coast AQMD thresholds for any criteria air pollutants, except for NOx. Therefore, Project cumulative operational impacts have the potential to be significant. The proposed Project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1 through AQ-3. However, even with implementation of these mitigation measures, the proposed Project would still cause an exceedance of South Coast AQMD's threshold for NOx under Project operational conditions, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. As a result, the Project's incremental effects associated with a net increase of any nonattainment criteria pollutant or exposure of sensitive receptors to potentially significant health risk impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3.

- C. *Would the project, combined with other related projects, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-37 through 5.1-38)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Carbon monoxide hotspots would not be experienced at any intersections near the Project site. A health risk assessment was prepared for the proposed Project. The proposed Project would not exceed the maximum risk values established by the South Coast AQMD for toxic air contaminants. All receptor types would be below the applicable South Coast AQMD significance thresholds and potential impacts would be less than significant.

The LST methodology assists lead agencies in analyzing localized air quality impacts. The South Coast AQMD provides the LST screening lookup tables for one-, two-, and five-acre projects. Because the disturbed acreages for each related project site can vary, the LST thresholds utilized vary on a project-by-project basis. Localized emissions also only affect the areas immediately adjacent to a project site. Thus, construction localized emissions associated with the proposed Project would not cumulatively contribute pollutant concentrations to the same sensitive receptors as other related projects. Thus, the Project's incremental effects associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

- D. *Would the project, combined with other related projects, result in other emissions such as those leading to odors adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (Draft EIR, page 5.1-38)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project proposes construction and operation of a travel center, which would not involve the types of uses that would emit objectionable odors affecting substantial numbers of people. Although the proposed Project would generate heavy-duty vehicle trips that would generate localized exhaust odors, sensitive receptors are located sufficiently away from the Project site that there is limited to no potential for such emissions to lead to odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people.

Construction activities associated with the Project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust and architectural coatings. However, construction-related

odors would be short-term in nature and cease upon Project completion. In addition, the Project would be required to comply with the California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Sections 2449(d)(3) and 2485, which minimizes the idling time of construction equipment either by shutting it off when not in use or by reducing the time of idling to no more than five minutes. This would further reduce the detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. The Project would also be required to comply with South Coast AQMD Regulation XI, *Rule 1113 – Architectural Coating*, which would minimize odor impacts from VOC emissions during architectural coating. Additionally, the Project would include exterior architectural coating finishes that are pre-finished, further reducing the potential for odors. Any potential impacts to existing adjacent land uses would be short-term and less than significant. Thus, the Project’s incremental effect related to emissions leading to odors affecting a substantial number of people would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

4.4.2 Cumulative Greenhouse Gases

- A. *Would the project, combined with other related projects, generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Draft EIR, page 5.2-25)*

Finding: Significant and Unavoidable Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Project-related GHG emissions are not confined to a particular air basin; instead, GHG emissions are dispersed worldwide. No single project is large enough to result in a measurable increase in global concentrations of GHG emissions. The California Natural Resources Agency has also clarified that the CEQA Guidelines amendments focus on the effects of GHG emissions as cumulative impacts, and therefore GHG emissions should be analyzed in the context of CEQA’s requirements for cumulative impact analyses (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3)). A project’s incremental contribution to a cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements to avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the area of the project.

Project operational GHG emissions are anticipated to exceed the threshold of significance for non-industrial projects, and would be considered a significant and unavoidable impact. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 would require the Project Applicant to implement features in the Project that would contribute to reduce GHG emissions, including trucks owned or operated by the Project Applicant/Facility Owner or Operator that access the site being comprised of clean-fuel vehicles fleet for the proposed Project, and exceeding Title 24 by one percent. However, even with the implementation of GHG reducing mitigation measures, Project-related GHG impacts would still exceed the threshold and result in a significant and unavoidable impact. As such, the Project’s incremental effects to greenhouse gas emissions would be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative GHG impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure(s): Refer to Mitigation Measures GHG-1, GHG-2, and AQ-1 through AQ-4.

- B. *Would the Project, combined with other related cumulative projects, conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Draft EIR, page 5.2-26)*

Finding: Less than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Similar to the Project, cumulative development projects would be evaluated for consistency with applicable plans, policies or regulations specific to greenhouse gas emissions. As the Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gas emissions, the Project's incremental effects would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

4.4.3 Cumulative Noise

- A. *Would the Project, combined with other related projects, result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Draft EIR, page 5.3-18 through 5.3-20)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction activities associated with the proposed Project and related projects may overlap, resulting in construction noise in the area. However, cumulative construction noise impacts would affect only the areas immediately adjacent to the construction site. The closest related project occurs east of the Project site, east of Trumble Road. Construction of this related project may occur at the same time as the proposed Project. The City of Perris has discretionary authority over this related project. Construction noise impacts for the related projects would be reduced through compliance with the City's standards and ordinances, and any necessary mitigation measures would be identified through the City's development review process. In addition, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact regarding short-term construction noise upon compliance with the City's noise standards and ordinances. Therefore, the Project's incremental effects associated with a temporary increase in ambient noise would be less than cumulatively considerable.

A project's contribution to a cumulative traffic noise increase would be considered significant when the combined effect exceeds perception level threshold. The combined effect accounts for the traffic noise increase generated by a project combined with the traffic noise increase generated by related projects. In addition, although there may be a significant noise increase due to the proposed Project in combination with other related projects (combined effects), it must also be demonstrated that the proposed Project has an incremental effect. In other words, a significant portion of the noise increase must be due to the proposed Project. A significant impact would result only if both the combined (including an exceedance of the applicable exterior standard at a sensitive use) and incremental effects criteria have been exceeded. Noise by definition is a localized

phenomenon and reduces as distance from the source increases. Consequently, only the proposed Project and growth due to occur in the Project site's general vicinity would contribute to cumulative noise impacts.

According to the Traffic Impact Analysis, related projects would generate a total of 196,081 average daily trips. The Project would generate approximately 8,608 daily trips, which would be approximately 4.4 percent of the total cumulative projects' daily trips. Due to the level of Project-generated daily trips compared to the related projects' daily trips, the Project would not cause an audible (3-dBA) increase to traffic noise levels, and an incremental effect would not occur. Related project trips would be distributed throughout the cities of Perris and Menifee. As demonstrated with the Project-related trip distribution, Project-generated trips would primarily combine with related projects in the immediate area, along Ethanac Road, west of Trumble Road, and with vehicles traveling on I-215. The Project's maximum contribution to traffic volumes under opening year cumulative plus project traffic volumes would be 17.4 percent at Trumble Road and Ethanac Road. Overall, the Project would not result in a doubling of trips, which would be necessary to have an incremental effect on cumulative mobile source noise impacts.

Although related projects have been identified within the Project study area, the noise generated by stationary equipment at each project site cannot be adequately quantified due to the conceptual nature of most of the projects. However, each related project would require separate discretionary approval and CEQA assessment that would address potential noise impacts and identify necessary attenuation measures, where appropriate. Additionally, as noise dissipates as it travels away from its source, noise impacts from stationary sources would be limited to each of the respective sites and their vicinities. The closest related project occurs immediately east of the Project site, at the northeast corner of Ethanac and Trumble Roads. Existing and planned development in the Project area currently operate, or would operate, mechanical equipment and other stationary noise sources throughout the Project area. As noted above, the proposed Project would not result in significant stationary noise impacts to sensitive receptors and would not combine with related project to the extent that a cumulative stationary noise impact would occur.

As demonstrated above, the Project's incremental effects associated with a permanent increase in ambient noise would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

- B. *Would the Project, combined with other related projects, result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Draft EIR, page 5.3-20)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: Construction activities associated with the proposed Project and related projects may overlap. Despite the potential for overlap, groundborne vibration generated at the Project site during construction would not be in exceedance of the Federal Transit Administration threshold of 0.3 inches per second peak particle velocity for engineered concrete and masonry buildings. In addition, there would be no vibration impacts associated with operations at the Project site. The closest related project is located east of the Project site, east of Trumble Road. Although construction of the related project may occur at the same time as the proposed Project, cumulatively significant construction

vibration would generally only occur when construction activities on the sites occur in close proximity to one another in a way that concentrates the vibration. The farther construction activities occur from one another on each respective project site, the quicker the vibration dissipates by the time it reaches a sensitive receptor. Additionally, because heavy construction equipment moves around a project site and would only occur for limited durations, average vibration levels at the nearest structures would diminish with increasing distance between the structures and construction activities. As such, cumulative construction vibration impacts would not occur. Both the proposed Project and related project would be required to comply with the limitations on allowable hours of construction and mitigate their respective construction vibration impacts, as required. Therefore, the Project's incremental effects associated with the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

- 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, combined with other related projects, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Draft EIR, page 5.3-20)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would not expose people working at the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airport activities. Therefore, the Project's incremental effects related to the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

4.4.4 Cumulative Transportation

- A. *Would the Project, combined with other related cumulative projects, conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-11)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would not conflict with any program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities during construction or Project operation. Similar to the proposed Project, related projects would be reviewed to determine whether the development being proposed would be consistent with plans, ordinances, and policies addressing the circulation system, including the Municipal Code and General Plan. As such, the Project's incremental effects relative to potential conflicts with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

- B. *Would the Project, combined with other related cumulative projects, conflict or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-12)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project would not result in an impact to VMT. Similar to the proposed Project, related projects would be evaluated to determine their potential to increase the City's average VMT per capita/employee and total VMT in accordance with the City's adopted guidance. For cumulative conditions, a project that is below the VMT impact thresholds and does not have a VMT impact under baseline conditions would also not have a cumulative impact as long as it is aligned with long-term State environmental goals and relevant plans. Thus, the Project's incremental effects relative to VMT would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

- C. *Would the Project, combined with other related cumulative projects, substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-12)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The Project does not include any incompatible uses and proposed roadway improvements would be reviewed by the City of Perris as part of the development review process to ensure City design standards are met. Similar to the proposed Project, any related projects would be reviewed by the City or agency of jurisdiction to ensure adequate ingress and egress would be provided, site distance standards would be implemented and roadway conditions would be adequate to serve the development. Any proposed roadway modifications or new roadways would be required to comply with applicable design standards and other local regulations. The Project's incremental effects relative to increased hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

- D. *Would the Project, combined with other related cumulative projects, result in inadequate emergency access? (Draft EIR, page 5.4-12)*

Finding: Less Than Significant Impact

Facts in Support of Finding: The proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Increased traffic volumes under cumulative conditions are not expected to affect emergency vehicle access, resulting in inadequate emergency access to cumulative project locations. Similar to the proposed Project, any related projects would be reviewed by the City or agency of jurisdiction to ensure adequate emergency access is maintained during project construction and operation. As such, the Project's incremental effects relative to emergency access is less than cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation Measure(s): No mitigation measures are required.

4.5 Findings Regarding Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the project be implemented. Determining whether the proposed Project would result in significant irreversible effects requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed such

that there would be little possibility of restoring them. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

The Project would consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. Consumption would occur during the Project's construction phase and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. Project development would require a commitment of resources that would include (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the Project site. Project construction would require the consumption of resources that are not renewable/replenishable or which may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include the following construction supplies: lumber and other forest products, aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt, metals, and water. Fossil fuels, such as gasoline and oil, would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment. The resources that would be committed during Project operation would be similar to those currently consumed within the City of Perris. Project operations would involve consumption of energy resources, such as electricity and natural gas, petroleum-based fuels required for vehicle-trips, fossil fuels, and water.

Fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source associated with both construction and ongoing operation of the Project, and the existing, finite supplies of these natural resources would be incrementally reduced. Project operation would occur in accordance with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, which sets forth conservation practices that would limit the Project's energy consumption. Nonetheless, the Project's energy requirements would represent a long-term commitment of essentially non-renewable resources.

Use of potentially hazardous materials typical of commercial uses, including minor amounts of cleaning products, paint for maintenance, and fuel for landscape equipment, along with the occasional use of pesticides and herbicides for landscape maintenance would be used within the site. Additionally, hazardous materials associated with the fueling facilities and activities that would occur within the Shop Building, including tire replacement, rotation, and repair and oil changes would be used; no major mechanical work or body work would be performed. The use of these materials would be used, handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and applicable government regulations and standards. Compliance with these regulations and standards would serve to protect against significant and irreversible environmental change resulting from the accidental release of hazardous materials.

In summary, Project construction and operation would result in the irretrievable commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and nonrenewable resources that would limit the availability of these resource quantities for future generations or for other uses during the life of the Project. However, continued use of such resources would be on a relatively small scale and consistent with regional and local growth forecasts in the area. As such, although irreversible environmental changes would result from the Project, such changes would not be considered significant.

4.6 Growth-Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a Draft EIR to evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action. Growth can be induced in many ways, including the elimination of obstacles to growth, or through the stimulation of economic activity within the region. The discussion of removal of obstacles to growth relates directly to the removal of infrastructure limitations or regulatory constraints that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project

approval. Under CEQA, induced growth is not considered necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

In general, a project may foster spatial, economic, or population growth in a geographic area if it results in any of the following:

- Removal of an impediment to growth (e.g., establishment of an essential public service and provision of new access to an area);
- Fostering of economic expansion or growth (e.g., changes in revenue base and employment expansion);
- Fostering of population growth (e.g., construction of additional housing), either directly or indirectly;
- Establishment of a precedent-setting action (e.g., an innovation, a change in zoning and general plan amendment approval); or
- Development of or encroachment on an isolated or adjacent area of open space (being distinct from an infill project).

Should a project meet any one of the above-listed criteria, it may be considered growth-inducing.

The Project Applicant proposes to develop a travel center facility with fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators on the currently undeveloped site. The Project would connect to existing utilities within adjacent rights-of-way; these facilities can be readily upgraded and/or extended to serve the proposed development. Project demands for utilities would not reduce or impair any existing or future levels of utility services, either locally or regionally, as required improvements to serve the proposed development would occur as a result of the Project and costs for increased demand in utility and service systems would be provided through cooperative agreements between the proposed development and servicing agencies. As infrastructure services and facilities are readily available with improvements to accommodate the proposed Project, the Project would not remove an impediment to growth associated with the establishment of an essential public service and is not considered growth-inducing in this regard. Further, the Project would be consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site.

The Project site is served by existing roadways and transportation systems. Project implementation would not provide new access to an area. Thus, the proposed Project would not remove an impediment to growth associated with the provision of new access to an area and is not considered growth-inducing in this regard.

The Project would foster construction-related jobs during Project construction; however, these jobs would be temporary and would not be growth-inducing. The proposed travel center is anticipated to have a total of 70 employees during long-term operations. The forecast employment growth would slightly increase the City's revenue base resulting from increased employment. The proposed travel center would provide economic growth due to the long-term revenue associated with sales and property taxes. Additional economic growth opportunities within the City are a beneficial impact, and the proposed Project would not conflict with the City of Perris General Plan.

A project could induce population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure). The Project would not involve the development of new residential uses. The Project would be served by existing transportation systems within the Project vicinity and does not involve the extension of

roads or other infrastructure into undeveloped areas. The Project is anticipated to have a total of 70 employees during long-term operations. While it is likely that future employees already live in the City or would commute in from neighboring jurisdictions, this analysis conservatively assumes all 70 new employees (and their families) would relocate to Perris for employment. Project implementation could result in a potential population increase of approximately 279 persons based on an average household size of 3.98 persons per the California Department of Finance's 2024 population and housing estimate, a 0.35 percent increase over existing conditions.

Potential growth-inducing impacts are assessed based on a project's consistency with adopted plans that have addressed growth management from a local and regional standpoint. As discussed in Section 6.3, *Growth Inducing Impacts*, the proposed Project would not cause the City's buildout population forecast to be exceeded. Therefore, Project implementation would not be considered growth-inducing since it would be within the population growth anticipated by Perris General Plan population forecasts. In addition, Project implementation would not be considered growth-inducing since it would be within the population growth anticipated by SCAG's population forecasts.

The Perris General Plan Land Use Map designates the Project site as Community Commercial. The Community Commercial designation provides for professional offices, department stores, discount stores, and furniture or appliance outlets. It also allows for home improvement centers, entertainment centers and regional shopping centers. The Community Commercial land use designation is generally found along major thoroughfares throughout the City, including centered around the Ethanac Road interchange on I-215, the Redlands Avenue interchange on I-215, and Nuevo Road interchange on I-215.

The Project Applicant proposes to develop a travel center facility with fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators, which is consistent with the Community Commercial land use designation for the site; thus, the proposed Project would not be considered growth inducing with respect to a precedent setting action.

The Project site is currently vacant and undeveloped. However, the Perris General Plan Land Use Map designates the Project site as Community Commercial. The Project site is not designated as Open Space, nor are there open space areas within the vicinity of the Project site. Thus, the proposed Project would not be growth inducing with respect to development or encroachment into an isolated or adjacent area of open space.

Overall, Project implementation could foster economic expansion and limited population growth. However, it would not be growth inducing since it would not remove an impediment to growth, would not establish a precedent setting action, and would not develop or encroach into an isolated or adjacent area of open space. The proposed Project would not foster significant unanticipated growth in the Project area or region and would be consistent with the Perris General Plan and development anticipated for the site. Development within the Project would not require substantial development of unplanned and unforeseen support uses and services. Therefore, potential direct and indirect growth-inducing impacts would be less than significant.

4.7 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6) require that a discussion of project alternatives be part of any EIR. Any such identified alternatives must significantly meet project objectives, or they cannot be

said to be true project alternatives. Further, CEQA Guidelines 15091(a)(3) and 15091(b) require an explanation and analysis of why project alternatives are infeasible. As a result, Section 7.0 of the Draft EIR discusses the following alternatives: No Project/No Development Alternative; Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative; Shopping Center Alternative; and Discount Superstore and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative.

In addition, a reduced project alternative was considered but not carried forward for additional analysis. In order to eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts associated with air quality and greenhouse gas emissions to a less than significant level, the number of trips would need to be reduced to a maximum of 465 trips per day, which would represent less than 10% of the trips anticipated for the proposed Project. Based on ITE trip generation rates, a truck stop generates approximately 256 daily trips per fueling position and the convenience store/gas station/drive-thru restaurant generates approximately 270 daily trips per fueling position. Therefore, a reduced project alternative that would result in less than significant air quality and greenhouse gas emissions would generally require elimination of the fueling station components of the Project. As the purpose of the proposed Project is to provide a travel center with fueling station and travel-related amenities, elimination of the fueling station components would not be economically feasible and would not meet the Project's objectives. Therefore, the Reduced Project Alternative was considered, but rejected from further analysis.

4.7.1 No Project/No Development Alternative

Description: The No Project/No Development Alternative would retain the site in its current condition. The proposed travel center, which would involve the development of fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators, would not be developed.

Finding and Rationale: The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any construction activities; thus, short-term construction emissions would not occur. Additionally, operational emissions, including volatile organic compounds (VOC), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO_x), and particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) generated by mobile, area, and energy sources and localized emissions would not occur, as the site would remain undeveloped and would not involve on-site activities resulting in trips or people to the site. This Alternative would not expose people to toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter emissions, as the site would remain undeveloped and would not generate new trips. The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior when compared to the proposed Project regarding air quality emissions, given it would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable air quality impact specific to NO_x emissions generated during Project operation.

Under this Alternative, the site would remain undeveloped, and therefore, would not generate new GHG emissions from direct sources (i.e., construction emissions and area and mobile sources) and indirect sources (i.e., energy consumption, solid waste, and water demand). The Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact associated primarily with mobile-source emissions would not occur under the No Project/No Development Alternative, as the site would not be developed as a travel center and passenger vehicles and heavy-duty trucks would not access the site to utilize travel amenities or for refueling. The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior when compared to the proposed Project, given it would avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas emissions impact.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not involve the generation of new construction or operational noise since the site would remain undeveloped. Similar to the Project, this Alternative would not expose people working in the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airport activities. Although the Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with noise, the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior, as no new noise sources would be developed when compared to the proposed Project.

The site would remain undeveloped under this Alternative and no new trips to the site would occur. Although the Project would not conflict with or be inconsistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), this Alternative would involve no new trips or result in a change in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Additionally, no new roadway improvements would occur, as the site would remain undeveloped. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would not conflict with plans, guidelines, policies, or standards related to roadways, transit, or the bicycle or pedestrian network and would not result in an increase in hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. However, since no development would occur under this Alternative, and Project-generated VMT would not occur, the No Project/No Development Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the Project in regard to transportation.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet any of the objectives for the proposed Project. The site would remain in its current undeveloped condition and would not provide a travel center/fueling station adjacent to and visible from the regional highway system; generate additional revenues to the City in the form of increased sales and property tax revenues; provide a project that is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site, and is compatible with surrounding land uses; locate a travel center in an area serviced by adequate existing infrastructure, including roadways and utilities; provide one-stop travel-related amenities and services to professional drivers and motorists traveling on the I-215 Freeway and within the local area; support revitalization of the area and provide economic benefits to the City through the development of an undeveloped/underutilized site with a commercial use consistent with the General Plan and zoning and supported by market conditions; or provide a mixture of on-site uses that reduces vehicle miles traveled through internal capture and serves existing truck trips and motorists on the I-215 Freeway.

4.7.2 Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative

Description: The Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would involve development of the site with a 150-room hotel and a gas station with 24 fueling positions and a convenience store; travel amenities and truck fueling facilities would not be provided. The convenience store and gas station would generally be located within the eastern portion of the site and the hotel would be located within the western portion of the site. Access would occur from Ethanac Road and Trumble Road. This Alternative assumes landscaping, fencing, signage, including an illuminated hi-rise pylon sign, and bioretention basin would occur similar to the proposed Project. Additionally, this Alternative would provide offsite roadway and right-of-way improvements, including right-of-way dedications along the eastern, southern, and western property lines, striping, median improvements, and intersection improvements on Ethanac Road and Trumble Road.

Finding and Rationale: The Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would involve more extensive construction activities and the length of construction would be greater when compared to the proposed Project. It is anticipated that similar to the Project, construction activities

would be less than significant. Although this Alternative's maximum NOx emissions of approximately 93.4 pounds per day would be reduced when compared to the Project's maximum NOx emissions of approximately 170.0 pounds per day, operational emissions specific to NOx would continue to be significant and unavoidable with this Alternative due to the heavy-duty truck trips. Therefore, this Alternative would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. Since NOx emissions would be reduced when compared to the Project, the Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project regarding air quality emissions.

Under this Alternative, the site would generate new GHG emissions from direct sources (i.e., construction emissions and area and mobile sources) and indirect sources (i.e., energy consumption, solid waste, and water demand), similar to the Project. Although when compared to the proposed Project's annual GHG emissions of approximately 31,129 MTCO₂e, this Alternative would result in fewer GHG emissions of approximately 19,191 MTCO₂e per year due to reduced trips, the Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would also have a significant and unavoidable impact associated with GHG emissions. Therefore, this Alternative would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact. Since GHG emissions would be reduced when compared to the Project, the Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project regarding GHG emissions.

The Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would introduce construction and operational noise to the site, similar to the Project. Although construction noise would be less than significant, surrounding uses would be exposed to construction noise for a greater time period when compared to the Project due to the longer construction schedule associated with development of this Alternative. As with the Project, this Alternative would not expose people working in the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airport activities. Both the Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would generate similar operational noise activities associated with on-site activities, which would be less than significant. This Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed Project relative to noise.

This Alternative would result in approximately 4,600 new daily trips to the site. When compared to the Project, the Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would potentially conflict with or be inconsistent with State Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). The City of Perris Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for CEQA identify local serving uses that may be presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT. The convenience store/gas station component of this Alternative would be considered a local serving use and meet the VMT screening criteria. The hotel component may not meet the VMT screening criteria and, therefore, cannot be assumed to have a less than significant VMT impact, as with the Project. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would not conflict with plans, guidelines, policies, or standards related to roadways, transit, or the bicycle or pedestrian network and would not result in an increase in hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. However, since this Alternative would not meet the VMT screening criteria, when compared to the Project, the Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would be considered environmentally inferior to the Project in regard to transportation.

The Hotel and Convenience Store/Gas Station Alternative would partially meet the objectives for the proposed Project. The site would be developed with a hotel and convenience store/gas station and although it would provide a fueling station adjacent to and visible from the regional highway

system, it would not provide a travel center and associated amenities. Therefore, it would not provide these specific services to professional drivers and motorists traveling on the I-215 Freeway and within the local area. This Alternative would generate additional revenues to the City in the form of increased sales and property tax revenues, as well as transit occupancy tax; provide a project that is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning for the site, and is compatible with surrounding land uses; provide a development in an area serviced by adequate existing infrastructure; and support revitalization of the area and provide economic benefits to the City through the development of an undeveloped/underutilized site with a commercial use consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations and supported by market conditions. Although this Alternative would provide a mixture of on-site uses, it would not reduce vehicle miles traveled through internal capture and serves existing truck trips and motorists on the I-215 Freeway to the extent of the Project.

However, in regard to the potential for a hotel use, the Project site is located between markets that have several hotels that are being considered in both the City of Perris (to the north) and the City of Menifee to the south. The demand for hotels is driven by Class A offices, concentration of medical facilities, universities, and resort destinations paired with retail amenities. These uses do not occur at Ethanac Road and the I-215 Freeway. Without having Class A offices, medical facilities, universities, or resort destinations in this trade area, and competition from nearby hotels in superior locations, a hotel at the Project site is not feasible at this time.

4.7.3 Shopping Center Alternative

Description: The Shopping Center Alternative would involve development of the site with a 200,000-square-foot shopping center. Access would occur from Ethanac Road and Trumble Road. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations for the site and would comply with municipal code requirements regarding setbacks, heights, landscaping, etc. Similar to the Project, a variance would be required for an illuminated hi-rise pylon sign to advertise on-site commercial uses. Due to the nature of the shopping center, the size of the sign would likely be greater than proposed by the Project to accommodate the various tenants. This Alternative assumes a bioretention basin would occur similar to the proposed Project. Additionally, this Alternative would provide offsite roadway and right-of-way improvements, including right-of-way dedications along the eastern, southern, and western property lines, striping, median improvements, and intersection improvements on Ethanac Road and Trumble Road.

Finding and Rationale: The Shopping Center Alternative would involve more extensive construction activities and the length of construction would be greater when compared to the proposed Project. It is anticipated that similar to the Project, construction activity emissions would be less than significant. Overall, air quality emissions would be reduced under this Alternative when compared to the proposed Project. This Alternative would not expose people to toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter emissions, as the site would not involve uses that generate significant diesel truck trips. Under this Alternative, operational emissions specific to NOx would be approximately 42.6 pounds per day, which is below the 55 pounds per day threshold of significance. Therefore, this Alternative would eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. The Shopping Center Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project regarding air quality emissions.

Under this Alternative, the site would generate new GHG emissions from direct sources (i.e., construction emissions and area and mobile sources) and indirect sources (i.e., energy consumption, solid waste, and water demand), similar to the Project. When compared to the proposed Project's annual GHG emissions of approximately 31,129 MTCO₂e, this Alternative would result in fewer GHG emissions of approximately 16,442 MTCO₂e per year due to reduced trips, and specifically, reduced heavy-duty truck trips. Although this Alternative's GHG emissions would be reduced, the Shopping Center Alternative would also have a significant and unavoidable impact associated with GHG emissions. Therefore, this Alternative would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impacts. Since GHG emissions would be reduced when compared to the Project, the Shopping Center Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project regarding GHG emissions.

The Shopping Center Alternative would introduce construction and operational noise to the site, similar to the Project. Although construction noise would be less than significant, surrounding uses would be exposed to construction noise for a greater time period when compared to the Project, due to the longer construction schedule associated with development of this Alternative. As with the Project, this Alternative would not expose people working in the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airport activities. The Shopping Center Alternative would generate similar operational noise activities associated with on-site activities, which would be less than significant. This Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed Project relative to noise.

This Alternative would result in approximately 7,400 new daily trips to the site. When compared to the Project, the Shopping Center Alternative would potentially conflict with or be inconsistent with Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). The City of Perris Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for CEQA identify local serving uses that may be presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT. General retail less than 50,000 square feet is considered a local serving use. The Shopping Center Alternative would be comprised of an approximately 200,000-square-foot shopping center, which would not meet the VMT screening criteria and, therefore, cannot be assumed to have a less than significant VMT impact, as with the Project. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would not conflict with plans, guidelines, policies, or standards related to roadways, transit, or the bicycle or pedestrian network and would not result in an increase in hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. However, since this Alternative would not meet the VMT screening criteria, when compared to the Project, the Shopping Center Alternative would be considered environmentally inferior to the Project in regard to transportation.

The Shopping Center Alternative would partially meet the proposed Project objectives. The site would be developed with an approximately 200,000-square-foot shopping center, and therefore, would generate additional revenues to the City in the form of increased sales and property tax revenues; provide a project that is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning for the site, and is compatible with surrounding land uses; provide a development in an area serviced by adequate existing infrastructure; and support revitalization of the area and provide economic benefits to the City through the development of an undeveloped/underutilized site with a commercial use consistent with the General Plan and zoning. However, this Alternative does not meet the Project's objectives to provide a fueling station adjacent to and visible from the regional highway system, nor would it provide a travel center and associated amenities. Therefore, it would not provide these specific services to professional drivers and motorists traveling on the I-215 Freeway and within the local area. Further, this Alternative would not reduce vehicle miles traveled

through internal capture and would not serve existing truck trips and motorists on the I-215 Freeway.

Although a shopping center would be consistent with the land use and zoning for the site, due to the size of the site, a successful shopping center would require multiple big box tenants to serve as an anchor for the shopping center. Big box retail destinations are typically located at retail hubs with the densest populations in the market easily accessible to the population base. Ethanac Road is located in between the two markets of Perris and Menifee. Both cities have their population base to the north and south of the Ethanac location with many other options currently on the market or under development. The existing retail locations would need to be significantly absorbed, and more residential growth would need to occur before a new retail hub is created. As these conditions do not occur at the site, a shopping center at the Project site is not feasible at this time.

4.7.4 Discount Superstore and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative

Description: Alternative 4 would involve development of the site with an approximately 120,000-square-foot discount superstore and 10,000 square feet of fast-food restaurant space with drive-thru, with the potential for up to three tenants. Access would occur from Ethanac Road and Trumble Road. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would be consistent with the General Plan and zoning designations for the site and would comply with municipal code requirements regarding setbacks, heights, landscaping, etc. Similar to the Project, a variance would be required for an illuminated hi-rise pylon sign to advertise on-site commercial uses. This Alternative assumes a bioretention basin would occur similar to the proposed Project. Additionally, this Alternative would provide offsite roadway and right-of-way improvements, including right-of-way dedications along the eastern, southern, and western property lines, striping, median improvements, and intersection improvements on Ethanac Road and Trumble Road.

Finding and Rationale: The Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would involve more extensive construction activities and the length of construction would be greater when compared to the proposed Project. It is anticipated that similar to the Project, construction activities would be less than significant. Overall, air quality emissions would be reduced under this Alternative when compared to the proposed Project. This Alternative would not expose people to toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter emissions, as the site would not involve uses that generate significant diesel truck trips. Under this Alternative, operational emissions specific to NOx would be approximately 48.5 pounds per day, which is below the 55 pounds per day threshold of significance. Therefore, this Alternative would eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. The Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project regarding air quality emissions.

Under this Alternative, the site would generate new GHG emissions from direct sources (i.e., construction emissions and area and mobile sources) and indirect sources (i.e., energy consumption, solid waste, and water demand), similar to the Project. When compared to the proposed Project's annual GHG emissions of approximately 31,129 MTCO_{2e}, this Alternative would result in fewer GHG emissions of approximately 16,199 MTCO_{2e} per year, due to reduced trips, and specifically, reduced heavy-duty truck trips. Although this Alternative's GHG emissions would be reduced, the Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would also have a significant and unavoidable impact associated with GHG emissions. Therefore, this Alternative

would not eliminate the Project's significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impacts. Since GHG emissions would be reduced when compared to the Project, the Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project regarding GHG emissions.

The Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would introduce construction and operational noise to the site, similar to the Project. Although construction noise would be less than significant, surrounding uses would be exposed to construction noise for a greater time period when compared to the Project, due to the longer construction schedule associated with development of this Alternative. As with the Project, this Alternative would not expose people working in the Project site to excessive noise levels associated with airport activities. The Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would generate similar operational noise activities associated with on-site activities, which would be less than significant. This Alternative would be neither environmentally superior nor inferior to the proposed Project relative to noise.

This Alternative would result in approximately 8,400 new daily trips to the site. However, when compared to the Project, the Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would potentially conflict with or be inconsistent with State Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). The City of Perris Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for CEQA identify local serving uses that may be presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT. General retail less than 50,000 square feet is considered a local serving use. The Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would be comprised of an approximately 120,000-square-foot discount superstore and 10,000 square feet of fast-food restaurant space with drive-thru, which would not meet the VMT screening criteria and, therefore, cannot be assumed to have a less than significant VMT impact, as with the Project. Similar to the proposed Project, this Alternative would not conflict with plans, guidelines, policies, or standards related to roadways, transit, or the bicycle or pedestrian network and would not result in an increase in hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses. However, since this Alternative would not meet the VMT screening criteria, when compared to the Project, the Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would be considered environmentally inferior to the Project in regard to transportation.

The Discount Store and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would partially meet the proposed Project objectives. The site would be developed with an approximately 120,000-square-foot discount superstore and 10,000 square feet of fast food restaurant space with drive-thru, with the potential for up to three tenants, and therefore, would generate additional revenues to the City in the form of increased sales and property tax revenues; provide a project that is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site, and is compatible with surrounding land uses; provide a development in an area serviced by adequate existing infrastructure; and support revitalization of the area and provide economic benefits to the City through the development of an undeveloped/underutilized site with a commercial use consistent with the General Plan and zoning. However, this Alternative does not meet the Project's objectives to provide a fueling station adjacent to and visible from the regional highway system, nor would it provide a travel center and associated amenities. Therefore, it would not provide these specific services to professional drivers and motorists traveling on the I-215 Freeway and within the local area. Further, this Alternative would not reduce vehicle miles traveled through internal capture and would not serve existing truck trips and motorists on the I-215 Freeway.

Although a discount superstore and fast-food restaurants would be consistent with the land use and zoning designations for the site, discount superstores are typically located at retail hubs with the

densest populations in the market easily accessible to the population base, similar to shopping centers. Ethanac Road is located in between the two markets of Perris and Menifee. Both cities have their population base to the north and south of the Ethanac location with many other options currently on the market or under development. The existing retail locations would need to be significantly absorbed, and residential growth would need to occur before a new retail hub is created. Additionally, the economics for a ground-up development of a discount superstore are not realistic at this location. Development of the Project site requires significant off-site improvements along Ethanac Road and Trumble Road, as well as the extension of a drainage channel, that adds extensive costs onto the development. It is likely that development of the site with a discount superstore would require subsidies from the City or improvements to be completed by others in order to make its development an economically viable option.

4.8 Recirculation

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR but before certification of the Final EIR. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the project proponent declines to implement. CEQA Guidelines provide the following examples of significant new information under this standard (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5[a]).

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded (*Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com.* [1989] 214 Cal.App.3d 1043).

Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5, subd. (b)).

Because none of the criteria outlined above have been met, the EIR is not changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project and, therefore, recirculation of the EIR is not required.

5.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

As set forth in the preceding sections, City approval of the proposed Project would potentially result in significant environmental impacts to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 would reduce potential air quality impacts and Mitigation Measures GHG-1 and GHG-2 would reduce potential greenhouse gas impacts, however, would not reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant. There are no

other feasible mitigation measures that have been identified that could reduce the potential air quality and greenhouse gas emissions to less than significant. Consequently, the EIR reaches the conclusion that impacts air quality and greenhouse gas impacts would remain potentially significant and unavoidable.

Whenever a lead agency adopts a project that will result in a significant and unavoidable impact, the agency must, pursuant to PRC Section 21002 and 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the administrative record.

Pursuant to PRC Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City has balanced the benefits of the Project against its unavoidable adverse impacts to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The City, having considered all of the foregoing, finds that there are specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, and/or other benefits associated with the proposed Project that outweigh unavoidable direct and/or cumulative impacts related to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

The City has examined alternatives to the proposed Project and found that the Shopping Center Alternative, Discount Superstore and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternatives, and No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed Project. The No Project/No Development Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid or lessen most the impacts associated with development of the proposed Project; however, the No Project/No Development Alternative would not meet the objectives of the proposed Project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), if the environmentally superior alternative is the “No Project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Accordingly, both the Shopping Center Alternative and Discount Superstore and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternatives would be the environmentally superior alternatives among the other alternatives.

In comparison to the proposed Project, both the Shopping Center Alternative and Discount Superstore and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternatives would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact associated with air quality. Although neither Alternative would eliminate the Project’s significant and unavoidable GHG emissions impact, GHG emissions would be reduced under both Alternatives compared to the proposed Project. Neither, the Shopping Center Alternative, nor the Discount Superstore and Fast-Food Restaurants Alternative would meet all the Project objectives. Neither Alternative would provide a fueling station adjacent to and visible from the regional highway system, nor provide a travel center and associated amenities. Therefore, the Alternatives would not provide these specific services to professional drivers and motorists traveling on the I-215 Freeway and within the local area. Further, the Alternatives would not reduce vehicle miles traveled through internal capture and would not serve existing truck trips and motorists on the I-215 Freeway.

The City, (i) having independently reviewed the information in the Final EIR and the record of proceedings; (ii) having made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts resulting from the Project to the extent feasible by adopting the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR; and (iii) having balanced the benefits of the Project against the significant environmental impacts, chooses to approve the Project, despite its significant environmental impacts, because, in its view, specific economic, legal, social,

technological, and other benefits of the Project render the significant environmental impacts acceptable.

The following statement identifies why, in the City's judgment, the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable significant impacts. Each of the benefits described below serves as an independent basis that justifies approval of the Project and for overriding all significant and unavoidable impacts. Any one of the reasons set forth below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Therefore, the City expressly finds in accordance with PRC Section 21081, the following benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of the Project.

5.1 Findings for Statement of Overriding Considerations

1. Provide a travel center/fueling station adjacent to and visible from the regional highway system.

The Project involves the proposed construction and operation of a travel center facility at the Project site for regional and local highway traveling users. Implementation of the Project would involve the development of fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators. The proposed Project would meet this objective.

2. Generate additional revenues to the City in the form of increased sales and property tax revenues.

The proposed travel center facility would generate tax revenue for the City of Perris. This would include property taxes and sales tax associated with all goods/services purchased. The proposed Project would meet this objective.

3. Design a project that is consistent with the City's General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site, and is compatible with surrounding land uses.

The Project proposes a travel center, which is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site with approval of conditional use permit. The proposed Project would meet this objective.

4. Locate a travel center in an area serviced by adequate existing infrastructure, including roadways and utilities.

The Project proposes the development of a travel center facility on the currently undeveloped site. The Project would connect to existing utilities within adjacent rights-of-way; these facilities can be readily upgraded and/or extended to serve the proposed development. Project demands for utilities would not reduce or impair any existing or future levels of utility services, either locally or regionally, as required improvements to serve the proposed development would occur as a result of the Project and costs for increased demand in utility and service systems would be provided through cooperative agreements between the proposed development and servicing agencies. The Project site is served by existing roadways and transportation systems. The proposed Project would meet this objective.

5. Provide one-stop travel-related amenities and services to professional drivers and motorists traveling on the I-215 Freeway and within the local area.

The Project proposes the development of a travel center facility with fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial

truck operators. These amenities and services would be provided to professional drivers and motorists traveling on I-215 and within the local area. The proposed Project would meet this objective.

6. Support revitalization of the area and provide economic benefits to the City through the development of an undeveloped/underutilized site with a commercial use consistent with the General Plan and zoning and supported by market conditions.

The Project proposes the development of a travel center facility with fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators on the currently undeveloped site. The Project proposes a travel center, which is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and zoning for the site with approval of conditional use permit. The proposed Project would meet this objective.

7. Provide a mixture of on-site uses that reduces vehicle miles traveled through internal capture and serves existing truck trips and motorists on the I-215 Freeway.

The Project proposes to provide a travel center facility with fueling facilities, travel amenities, a drive-thru restaurant, and parking facilities for passing motorists and commercial truck operators traveling on I-215 and within the local area. The Technical Advisory on Evaluating transportation Impacts in CEQA (December 2018), prepared by the Office of Planning and Research, identifies that by adding retail opportunities into the urban fabric and thereby improving retail destination proximity, local-serving retail development tends to shorten trips and reduce vehicle miles traveled. The Project would be considered a local serving use under the City's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines and is not anticipated to lead to substitution of longer trips for shorter ones. The proposed Project would meet this objective.

5.2 Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the City finds that the Project's adverse, unavoidable environmental impacts are outweighed by the above-referenced benefits, any one of which individually would be sufficient to outweigh the adverse environmental effects of the Project. Therefore, the City has adopted these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.