Initial Study & Categorical Exemption Report

I-215 Interchange Project

Lead Agency:

City of Perris
135 N. “D” Street
Perris, CA 92570

Prepared by:
Albert A. Webb Associates
3788 McCray Street
Riverside, CA 92506

January 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures

Appendices

SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA, *California Public Resources Code,* Sections 21000, et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (State CEQA Guidelines, *California Code of Regulations,* Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.), this Initial Study (IS) has been prepared in order to determine whether implementation of the proposed Interstate 215 (I-215) Interchange Project (proposed Project) is eligible for a Class 1 – Existing Facilities Categorical Exemption (CE) under CEQA. This Initial Study has evaluated each of the issue areas contained in the checklist provided in Section 5.0 of this document. The objective of this environmental document is to inform City of Perris decision makers, representatives of other affected/responsible agencies, and other interested parties of the potential environmental effects that may be associated with implementation of the proposed Project.

The Project involves the proposed improvement of the I-215/State Route 74 (SR-74) interchange southbound ramps near Case Road to accommodate the increased traffic flow generation by the development of the nearby South Perris Industrial Project Site 3 (Tentative Parcel Maps 35877 and 35886), which was assessed under a previous CEQA process (South Perris Industrial Project Environmental Impact Report, August 31, 2010) and approved by the City of Perris in 2010. Subsequently, in June of 2020, the City approved Major Modification 19-05332, Tentative Parcel Map 35877 and Environmental Impact Report Addendum 20-0562. On June 9, 2020 as part of that approval, the City of Perris conditioned IDI Logistics (IDI) to prepare a separate CEQA document to cover the proposed I-215 Interchange Project.

The City of Perris proposes to adopt a Class 1 CE for the proposed Project. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301, a Class 1 CE "consists of the operation, repair, maintenance, permitting, leasing, licensing, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, facilities, mechanical equipment, or topographical features, involving negligible or no expansion of existing or former use…[t]he key consideration is whether the project involves negligible or no expansion of use." State CEQA Guidelines Section 15301. One such type of "existing facility" includes alterations to "[e]xisting highways and streets, sidewalks, gutters, bicycle and pedestrian trails, and similar facilities (this includes road grading for the purpose of public safety)." Section 15301(c).

Additionally, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 outlines exceptions to the applicability of a CE, including circumstances where a project would cause significant cumulative impacts, significant effects due to unusual circumstances, damage to scenic highways, construction at hazardous waste sites, and adverse changes to the significance of historical resources. Section 15300.2(c). As provided in detail herein, none of these exceptional circumstances are present.

The interchange improvements are located within Caltrans right-of-way and will be processed through the Caltrans Streamlined Oversight Process (SOP). Pursuant to the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Perris will act as the Lead Agency for the

CEQA document and Caltrans SOP to obtain the Caltrans encroachment permits necessary for IDI to construct the proposed Project.

1.2 FINDINGS OF THIS INITIAL STUDY

This IS is based on an Environmental Checklist Form (Form), as suggested in Section 15063(d)(3) and Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. The Form is found in Section 5.0 of this Initial Study. It contains a series of questions about the proposed Project for each of the listed environmental topics. The Form is used to evaluate whether or not there are any significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed Project, even with implementation of mitigation measures. The explanation for each answer is also included in Section 5.0.

The Form is used to review the potential environmental effects of the proposed Project for each of the following areas:

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

As identified through the analysis presented in this IS, the proposed Project would have no potentially significant impacts and a Notice of Exemption (NOE) is justified.

1.3 CONTACT PERSON

The Lead Agency for the proposed Project is the City of Perris. Any questions about the preparation of the IS, its assumptions, or its conclusions should be referred to the following:

Nathan Perez, Senior Planner
City of Perris Planning Division
135 North “D” Street Perris, California 92570
(951) 943-5003 Ext 279
NPerez@cityofperris.org

SECTION 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The I-215 Interchange Project (the “Project” or “proposed Project”) site is located in the City of Perris, Riverside County, California. Specifically, the Project site is the existing I-215/Case Road/ State Route 74 (SR-74) Interchange, which is located within the northeast quarter of Section 9 and the northwest quarter of Section 10 in Township 5 South, Range 3 West as shown on the Perris, California 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangle map. The Project site is located within existing Caltrans right-of-way. Land uses in the vicinity of the Project site includes vacant land to the northwest, the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) main office to the northeast, vacant land and commercial uses to the east, industrial uses to the southeast, and the EMWD’s Perris Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility to the southwest.

2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The City of Perris approved three industrial warehouses in 2010 as part of the project known as the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3 (Tentative Parcel Maps 35877 and 35886) and an Environmental Impact Report Addendum prepared in June 2021. To accommodate the increased traffic flow generated by the industrial warehouse development approved in the City of Perris, the purpose of the Interchange Project is to implement the City of Perris Condition of Approval of the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3 Project which required improvements to the I-215/Case Road/SR-74 Interchange southbound ramps as shown on **Figure 1 – Project Improvements Map**.

The existing I-215 is a 6-lane highway with three lanes of travel in each direction. The I-215/Case Road/SR-74 Interchange consists of two "diagonal" ramps and two “loop” ramps with the intersections being signalized. Each of the four ramps is a single lane of travel with an 8-foot shoulder on the right side of the travel lane. There are no pedestrian facilities (curb ramps, sidewalks, bicycle lanes) within the project limits. There is an existing drainage culvert structure located beneath the southbound offramp that will not be impacted by the proposed project.

The existing southbound offramp has one through-lane and one free right turn lane with a channelized median. The southbound offramp will be widened up to approximately 16-feet to accommodate two (2) through lanes, a dedicated right turn lane, and an 8-foot shoulder. The channelized median will be removed, which will improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.

The existing southbound onramp/SR-74 has one left turn lane and one through lane. The proposed improvements will widen the approach to the intersection approximately seven feet to provide two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and a six-foot bicycle lane.

The existing Bonnie Drive at southbound ramps has a single left turn lane and a free right turn lane with channelized median. The street will be improved to remove the channelized median and provide one left turn and one right-turn lane. ADA ramps will also be constructed at both the northwest and southwest returns at the intersection. A signal modification will be

required at this Bonnie Drive and SR-74 intersection to accommodate the additional widening and bicycle improvements.

The existing SR-74 between the I-215 southbound and northbound onramps contain two-lanes of travel in the eastbound direction with a single lane of travel in the westbound direction and does not have bicycle lanes. The Project would maintain said lanes in both eastbound and westbound directions, with additional widening up to eight feet to accommodate 6-foot bicycle lanes on both sides of the highway.

The improvements are proposed to ensure the local roadway network will be improved to facilitate better traffic circulation once traffic is realized from the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3. In addition, it is proposed to improve traffic operations, safety for pedestrians, and bicyclists.

Additional improvements include regrading of existing slopes, removal of existing pavement sections, grind and overlay pavement rehabilitation, construction of a retaining wall, and relocation of existing signs. The maximum depths of excavation will be up to 15 feet for the traffic signal poles and the road improvements will require approximately two to three feet of excavation.

The expected length of construction is a total of sixty (60) working days. This is expected to be comprised of forty (40) full eight-hour days and twenty (20) half-days. Construction will occur during daytime hours.

The proposed improvements are located within existing Caltrans right-of-way.

Figure 1 – Project Improvements Map

2.3 PROJECT APPROVALS

The following approvals and permits are required from the City of Perris to implement the proposed Project:

- Approve Notice of Exemption (Class 1 Categorical Exemption for Existing Facilities) pursuant to Section 15301 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Approvals and permits that may be required by other agencies include:

- Encroachment permits from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans);
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Santa Ana Region – National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit; and
- RWQCB, Santa Ana Region – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)

2.4 DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

The following reports and/or studies are applicable to development of the Project site and are hereby incorporated by reference:

- *Perris Comprehensive General Plan 2030,* City of Perris, originally approved on April 26, 2005. https://www.cityofperris.org/departments/development-services/general-plan.
- *Perris General Plan 2030 Environmental Impact Report,* SCH No. 2004031135, certified April 26, 2005. https://www.cityofperris.org/home/showdocument?id=451.
- *South Perris Industrial Environmental Impact Report,* SCH No. 2008071060, certified August 31, 2010.

These reports/studies are available for review at:

Public Service Counter
City of Perris Planning Division
135 North “D” Street
Perris, California 92570
(951) 943-5003

Hours: Monday – Thursday: 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

SECTION 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology and Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

SECTION 4.0 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation, no impacts were found as a result of the Project, and a Notice of Exemption would be prepared.

Signature of Lead Agency Representative — Date

Nathan Perez, Senior Planner — City of Perris
Printed name — Agency

SECTION 5.0 INITIAL STUDY

This section contains the Environmental Checklist Form (Form) for the proposed Project. This analysis has been undertaken, pursuant to the provisions of CEQA, to provide the City of Perris with the factual basis for determining, based on the information available, the form of environmental documentation the Project warrants. The basis for each of the findings listed in the attached Form is explained in the Explanation of Checklist Responses following the checklist.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

City of Perris **135 North "D" Street, Perris,** **California 92570**	
Project Title	I-215 Interchange Project
Lead Agency Name and Address	City of Perris, 135 North "D" Street, Perris, California 92570
Contact Person and Phone Number	Nathan Perez, Senior Planner (951) 943-5003 Ext 279 NPerez@cityofperris.org`

City of Perris **135 North "D" Street, Perris,** **California 92570**	
Project Location	The I-215/SR-74 interchange southbound ramps near Case Road, in the northeast quarter of Section 9 and the northwest quarter of Section 10 in Township 5 South, Range 3 West as shown on the Perris, California 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic quadrangle map. (**Figure 1 – Project Improvement Map**)
Project Sponsor's Name and Address	City of Perris 135 N. D Street Perris, CA 92570
General Plan Designation	N/A
Zoning Designation	N/A

Remainder of page intentionally blank.

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

References: Caltrans 2019, Perris 2005a, Perris 2005b, Project Proposal

Explanation of Checklist Answers

1a-d. **No impact.** The proposed Project site is not located within the vicinity of a scenic vista, scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings, or a state scenic highway. The proposed Project involves the widening of existing freeway onramps, offramps, lanes, and other portions of an existing roadway network to facilitate better traffic circulation. Construction of these improvements would not adversely affect sensitive views or degrade the visual character of the site. The proposed Project would not include additional lighting; therefore, it would not introduce new sources of light or glare. In addition, all construction will take place during daytime hours, so no temporary lighting is required. No impact will occur as no vertical structures are proposed.

Remainder of page intentionally blank.

5.2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Perris 2005b, Perris 2016a, FMMP, Riverside 2015a,

Explanation of Checklist Answers

2a. **No impact.** Although the Project is freeway interchange widening improvements within Caltrans right-of-way, which is not used for agriculture, the Project site is identified as partially Farmland of Local Importance by the Farmland Mapping Management Program of the California Resources Agency (FMMP), with portions of the Project site touching or overlapping Urban and Built-Up Land. Per Section 21060.1 of the CEQA Guidelines, Farmland of Local Importance is not considered Farmland. Because there is no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance at the Project site, there will not be any new significant impacts related to conversion of Farmland. Thus, no impact will occur.

2b. **No impact.** The City's 1991 General Plan eliminated the agricultural land use designation from within City boundaries. Therefore, there are no agricultural zones identified by the City and the proposed Project site is not covered under a Williamson Act Contract (Perris 2005b, p. VI-3). Additionally, the Project is freeway interchange widening improvements within Caltrans right-of-way which is not used for agriculture. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project will not conflict with an existing zoned agricultural use nor a Williamson Act Contract and no impacts would occur.

2c. **No impact.** There is no existing or proposed zoning of forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production Zones within the City and there is no commercial forestry or timber production industry within the City (Perris 2016a). Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project will not impact forestland or timberland as defined by Public

Resources Code section 4526, or a Timberland Production Zone as defined by Government Code section 51104(g).

2d. **No impact.** As discussed in *Threshold 2c*, above, there is no land zoned forest land within the City. Further, there are no existing land use designations explicitly for timber production zones or other commercial timber activities within the larger County of Riverside area (Riverside 2015a, p. 4.5-11). Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project will have no impact on land zoned for forest land and will not result in the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses.

2e. **No impact.** The Project site is bordered by agricultural lands that are planned in the City's General Plan to convert to non-agriculture uses. The proposed Project does not affect the planned conversion of any of these adjacent lands. Thus, no impact will occur.

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

References: Perris 2005b, SCAQMD 2003, SCAQMD 2005, SCAQMD 2017, CARB 2018, Webb 2021

Explanation of Checklist Answers

3a. **No Impact.** The City is located within the South Coast Air Basin (herein after "the Basin"), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD has prepared and regularly updates an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin to establish a comprehensive program to lead the Basin into compliance with all federal and state air quality standards, the most recent of which is the 2016 AQMP (SCAQMD 2017).

The AQMP control measures and related emission reduction estimates are based upon emissions projections for a future development scenario derived from land use, population, and employment characteristics defined in consultation with local governments. Accordingly, conformance with the AQMP for development projects is determined by demonstrating compliance with local land use plans and/or population projections, which for the City are contained within the GP. In other words, if projects are consistent with the GP land uses, they are also consistent with the AQMP. Since the proposed Project is freeway interchange widening improvements within Caltrans

right-of-way and contains no land use changes from those designated in the City's GP, the Project is in compliance with the AQMP. Therefore, Project will not conflict or obstruct any air quality plan, or contribute to air quality violation, and there is no impact.

3b. **Less than significant impact.** The portion of the Basin within which the proposed Project site is located is designated as a non-attainment area for particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM-10) under state standards, and for ozone and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM-2.5) under both state and federal standards (CARB 2018).

The SCAQMD considers the thresholds for project-specific impacts and cumulative impacts to be the same (SCAQMD 2003). Therefore, projects that exceed project-specific significance thresholds are considered by SCAQMD to be cumulatively considerable. Based on SCAQMD's regulatory jurisdiction over regional air quality, it is reasonable to rely on its thresholds to determine whether there is a cumulative air quality impact.

Air quality impacts can be described in a short- and long-term perspective. Short-term impacts occur during site preparation and Project construction, whereas long-term impacts are associated with Project operation. A discussion of the Project's potential short-term construction-period and long-term operational-period air quality impacts is provided below.

Construction Emissions

Construction of the proposed interchange would generate temporary, short-term emissions. According to the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis (Webb 2021), construction of the proposed project would not generate emissions exceeding the SCAQMD regional or localized thresholds for short-term emissions (Webb 2021, p. 2-3).

Operational Emissions

The Project consists of interchange improvements, without any long-term sources of emissions. Operational emissions would be from the infrequent visits by vehicles driven by maintenance personnel and are considered negligible; therefore, only short-term impacts were quantified. (Webb 2021, p. 2, 4). Therefore, the Project's cumulative impact to air quality is considered to be less than significant.

3c. **Less than significant impact.** Sensitive receptors include residential uses, school playgrounds, childcare facilities, athletic facilities, hospitals, retirement homes, and convalescent homes (SCAQMD 2005). The closest sensitive receptor location is a motel on Case Road approximately 475 meters (1,558 feet) east of the Project site. The construction local significance threshold (LST) analysis completed in the AQ/GHG Analysis (Webb 2021) for this Project determined that the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because no pollutant emissions exceed the LST (Webb 2021, p. 4).

Additionally, no sensitive uses are proposed for the Project site. The Project's is a proposed freeway interchange. The Project does not include any residential or otherwise sensitive receptors.

Therefore, the Project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Less than significant impact is anticipated.

3d. **Less than significant impact.** The human nose is the best means of determining the strength of an odor; however, not all people are equally sensitive and they do not always agree about the severity of an odor once it is detected. Therefore, precise documentation of the strength and nature of an odor is generally unavailable.

It is anticipated that the major potential sources of dust and odor from the proposed Project would occur during construction, particularly from construction equipment exhaust. However, this impact would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the proposed Project site and short-term. Land uses in the vicinity of the proposed Project includes vacant land, office, commercial, and industrial uses.

Additionally, the SCAQMD has developed a Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning that also outlines major common sources of odor complaints, including: sewage treatment plants, landfills, recycling facilities, and petroleum refineries (SCAQMD 2005, p. 2-2). The proposed interchange improvements do not include uses that are on SCAQMD's list of facilities that are known to be prone to generate odors. Consequently, the Project would not expose substantial numbers of people to odors, because the Project does not propose land uses that create odors as defined by the SCAQMD. Therefore, odor-related impacts will be less than significant.

Remainder of page intentionally blank.

5.4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Perris 2003, GLA 2021

Explanation of Checklist Answers

4a. **Less than significant impact.** The Project site is located at the boundary between the Mead Valley Area Plan and the Harvest Valley/Winchester Area Plan of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP); therefore, an MSHCP consistency analysis was prepared and is contained within the General Biological Report for the Interstate 215 Interchange Project prepared by Glenn Lukos Associates (GLA) (Appendix B). The Project site is not located in the MSHCP Criteria Area, and therefore Joint Project Review (JPR) is not required for the Project. The western edge of the Project footprint is within the MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area but is not within the Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area (NEPSSA), Criteria Area Plant Species Survey Area (CAPSSA), Mammal or Amphibian Survey Areas, or Core and Linkage areas. (GLA 2021, p. 2)

No special-status plants were detected at the Project site, and none are expected to occur due to the existing interchange features and a lack of suitable habitat. Species were evaluated based on the following factors: 1) species identified by the CNDDB and CNPS as occurring (either currently or historically) on or in the vicinity of the

Project site, and 2) any other special-status plants that are known to occur within the vicinity of the Project site, or for which potentially suitable habitat occurs within the site. (GLA 2021, p. 21).

Additionally, no special-status animals were detected at the Project site, and generally none are expected to occur due to the existing interchange features and a lack of suitable habitat. Species were evaluated based on the following factors, including: 1) species identified by the CNDDB as occurring (either currently or historically) on or in the vicinity of the Project site, 2) applicable MSHCP survey areas, and 3) any other special-status animals that are known to occur within the vicinity of the Project site, for which potentially suitable habitat occurs on the site. (GLA 2021, p. 24).

The Project site contains suitable habitat for burrowing owls; however, burrowing owls were not detected onsite during focused surveys. MSHCP Objective 6 for burrowing owls requires that pre-construction surveys prior to site grading. Accordingly, the following is required by the MSHCP before site grading: A 30-day pre-construction survey for burrowing owls prior to future ground-disturbing activities (e.g., vegetation clearing, clearing and grubbing, tree removal, site watering, equipment staging, etc.) to ensure that no owls have colonized the site in the days or weeks preceding the ground-disturbing activities. If burrowing owls have colonized the project site prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the project proponent will immediately inform the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) and the Wildlife Agencies and will need to coordinate in the future with the RCA and the Wildlife Agencies, including the possibility of preparing a Burrowing Owl Protection and Relocation Plan, prior to initiating ground disturbance. If ground disturbing activities occur, but the site is left undisturbed for more than 30 days, preconstruction survey will again be necessary to ensure that burrowing owl have not colonized the site since it was last disturbed. If burrowing owls are found, the same coordination described above will be necessary. (GLA 2021, p. 34).

Based on the foregoing analysis, impacts to special-status species are less than significant.

4b. **No impact.** The entirety of the Project site and study area is in a disturbed condition and has been subject to high levels of continuous human disturbance for decades. The Project site does not contain native vegetation communities, including sensitive communities. (GLA 2021, p. 32).

Therefore, no impact to riparian habitat or other sensitive communities will occur.

4c. **No impact.** The Project site does not contain state or federally protected wetlands. Therefore, the Project will not impact wetlands. (GLA 2021, pp. 32-33) Therefore, no impacts to state or federally designated wetlands would occur as a result of the proposed Project.

4d. **No impact.** Habitat linkages are areas which provide a communication between two or more other habitat areas which are often larger or superior in quality to the linkage. Such linkage sites can be quite small or constricted, but may can be vital to the long-term health of connected habitats. Linkage values are often addressed in terms of “gene flow” between populations, with movement taking potentially many generations. Corridors are similar to linkages but provide specific opportunities for

individual animals to disperse or migrate between areas, generally extensive but otherwise partially or wholly separated regions. Adequate cover and tolerably low levels of disturbance are common requirements for corridors. Habitat in corridors may be quite different than that in the connected areas, but if used by the wildlife species of interest, the corridor will still function as desired. The Project site is not located within a habitat linkage or wildlife corridor.

Wildlife nurseries are sites where wildlife concentrate for hatching and/or raising young, such as rookeries, spawning areas, and bat colonies. Nurseries can be important to both special-status species as well as commonly occurring species. The Project site does not represent a native wildlife nursery.

Accordingly, the Project will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.

4e. **No Impact.** The City of Perris has adopted an ordinance (Ordinance No. 1123) to establish a local development mitigation fee for funding the preservation of natural ecosystems in accordance with the MSHCP and has also adopted the following General Plan policies for the protection of biological resources:

Goal II	Preservation of areas with significant biotic communities.
Policy II.A	Comply with state and federal regulations to ensure protection and preservation of significant biological resources.
Measure II.A.2	Public and private projects, located in areas with potential for moderate or high plant and wildlife sensitivity, require biological surveys as part of the development review process.
Measure II.A.3	Public and private projects that are also subject to federal or State approval with respect to impacts to Water of the U.S. and/or Streambeds require evidence of completion of the applicable federal permit process prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
Goal III	Implementation of the Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).
Policy III.A	Review all public and private development and construction projects and any other land use plans or activities within the MSHCP area, in accordance with the conservation criteria procedures and mitigation requirements set forth in the MSHCP.

As documented in this Initial Study, the requisite biological surveys have been completed, no impacts to jurisdictional waters will occur, and the Project is consistent with the MSHCP. Thus, the Project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances to protect biological resources and no impacts will occur.

4f. **No Impact** As stated in *Threshold 4a*, above, an MSHCP consistency analysis was prepared and is contained in Appendix B. Specifically, this analysis evaluates the proposed Project with respect to the Project's consistency with MSHCP Reserve assembly requirements, *Section 6.1.2* (Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools), *Section 6.1.3* (Protection of Narrow

Endemic Plant Species), *Section 6.1.4* (Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface), and *Section 6.3.2* (Additional Survey Needs and Procedures). The Project's consistency with each section is discussed below.

Reserve Assembly

The Project site is not located within the MSHCP Criteria Area, and therefore the Project would not conflict with Reserve Assembly. The proposed Project is not subject to the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process or Joint Project Review (JPR) by the RCA.

Section 6.1.2 Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools

Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP requires that site-specific focused surveys for species associated with Riparian/Riverine areas are conducted for all public and private projects where appropriate habitat is present. No suitable habitat is present in the Project study area for species associated with Riparian/Riverine habitats. (GLA 2021, pp. 35-36)

Section 6.1.3 Protection of Narrow Endemic Plant Species

Volume I, Section 6.1.3 of the MSHCP requires that within identified Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Areas (NEPSSA), site-specific focused surveys for Narrow Endemic Plants Species will be required for all public and private projects where appropriate soils and habitat are present. The Project site is not within the NEPSSA and will not impact NEPSSA target species. Therefore, a DBESP will not be required. (GLA 2021, p. 36).

Section 6.1.4 Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface

The MSHCP Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines are intended to address indirect effects associated with locating development in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area. The Project site is not in proximity to the MSHCP Conservation Area, and therefore the Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines do not apply to the Project. (GLA 2021, p. 36).

Section 6.3.2 Additional Survey Needs and Procedures

A portion of the Project site is within the MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, but is not within the CAPSSA, mammal, or amphibian survey area. Burrowing owls were not detected during focused surveys, but as noted above, a pre-construction burrowing owl survey is recommended to ensure consistency with the MSHCP. (GLA 2021, p. 36).

As outlined above, the proposed Project will be consistent with the biological requirements of the MSHCP. Therefore, no impacts will result.

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

References: Applied Earthworks 2021 (AE-1)

Explanation of Checklist Answers

5a-c. **Less than significant impact.** A Phase 1 Cultural Resource Assessment ("Phase 1") was prepared by Applied Earthworks ("AE") in April 2021 (cited as AE-1 and included as Appendix C). According to the Phase1, no cultural resources were observed during the survey of the Project area. The cultural resource investigation conducted identified no archaeological or built environment resources within the Project area. While the results of the records search conducted by AE indicate that 23 previously recorded historical resources have been identified within one mile of the Project area, most of these resources are not within close proximity to the Project area.

As mapped by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service, the entire Project area is within the Madera soil series. (AE, p. 8). The Phase 1 showed that the Madera series soil maps do not illustrate buried paleosols and the Project area is thought to have Low to Moderate sensitivity for buried archaeological sites. Therefore, no further cultural resource management of the Project area was recommended. (AE-1, p. 14).

AE Archaeologist Andrew DeLeon completed an intensive pedestrian archaeological survey of the Project area on February 16, 2021. (AE-1, p. ii). No cultural resources were encountered within the Project area during this Phase I survey. Because the terrain throughout the Project area has been disturbed by road development and maintenance, the Phase 1 suggests a low sensitivity ranking for the potential for intact and significant buried archaeological sites. (AE-1, pp. 13-14).

If cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, work in the immediate area must halt and an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards for archaeology (National Park Service [NPS] 1983) must be contacted immediately to evaluate the find. If the discovery proves to be significant under CEQA, additional work such as data recovery excavation may be warranted.

The project site is the widening of lanes at an existing interstate interchange there are no known cemeteries or reason to believe human remains of cultural significance would be found. The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California

Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the county coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the county coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a most likely descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of notification and may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

Therefore, resulting impacts related to cultural resources will be less than significant.

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

References: Webb 2021

Explanation of Checklist Answers

6a-b. **Less than significant impact.** The Project will improve existing roadways. As an infrastructure project, the majority of impact will be short-term with only infrequent, routine maintenance occurring post-construction. The Project's short-term construction would last approximately four months. Project construction would require the use of construction equipment for grading, paving, as well as construction workers and vendors traveling to and from the Project site (Webb 2021). Construction equipment requires diesel as the fuel source and construction worker and vendor trips use both gasoline and diesel fuel.

Fuel consumption from on-site heavy-duty construction equipment and construction would be temporary in nature and uses a limited number of equipment, which would represent a negligible demand on energy resources. Additionally, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency because the Project consists of existing roadway improvements, some of which promote active modes of transportation (widening of lanes for bicycle lanes). Furthermore, there are no unusual Project site characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy-efficient than at comparable construction sites in other parts of the State. For these reasons, the Project would not result in a potentially significant impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy during Project construction or operation.

5.7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐

References: Applied Earthworks 2021 (AE-2), Perris 2005a, Perris 2005b, RCIT

Explanation of Checklist Answers

7a(i). **No impact.** There are no mapped Alquist-Priolo Zones within the City and there are no County of Riverside-designated special status studies fault zones (Perris 2005a, p. SE-3). Because no habitable structure is proposed and the trail improvements will be constructed in accordance with standard soil engineering practice and current code specifications, no impact related to surface rupture will be anticipated.

7a(ii). **No impact.** Although there are no faults directly within the City, there are several active faults within the Southern California region that may contribute to ground shaking at the Project site, including: San Andreas, San Jacinto, Cucamonga, and Elsinore Faults (Perris 2005b, p. VI-10). However, since no habitable structure is proposed and the roadway improvements will be constructed in accordance with

standard soil engineering practice and current code specifications, no impact related to strong ground shaking are anticipated.

7a(iii). **Less than significant impact.** Liquefaction occurs when shallow, fine to medium-grained sediments saturated with water are subjected to strong seismic ground shaking. It generally occurs when the underlying water table is 50 feet or less below the surface (Perris 2005a, p. SE-9). The Riverside County GIS website indicates that the proposed Project site is located within a zone of moderate liquefaction potential (RCIT). A standard soils report will be prepared prior to grading work to address any potential low ground water level, soil compaction, and base materials. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

7a(iv). **No impact.** A combination of geologic conditions leads to landslide vulnerability. These include high seismic potential; rapid uplift and erosion resulting in steep slopes and deeply incised canyons; highly fractured and folded rock; and rock with inherently weak components such as silt or clay layers. The Slope Instability Map of the Safety Element of the City's GP indicates those areas of the City where new development may be at risk from seismically induced landslides and rockfalls (Perris 2005b, p. VI-11). The Project site is not identified as a high risk area (Perris 2005a, p. 13). The site is also not located near any areas that possess potential landslide characteristics, therefore no impacts are anticipated.

7b. **Less than significant impact.** Some soil erosion may occur during construction; however, erosion is expected to be minimal since the proposed Project would be constructed entirely within the roadways and freeway shoulders. Grading would be required to smooth the surface and prepare the site for construction. As such, construction activities would temporarily create the potential for increased erosion. In accordance with NPDES regulations, the State of California requires that any construction activity disturbing one acre or more of soil comply with the Construction General Permit (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended by Order No. 2012-0006-DWQ; NPDES No. CAS000002). The implementation of NPDES permits ensures that the state's mandatory standards for the maintenance of clean water and the federal minimums are met. Coverage with the permit would prevent soil erosion through implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and periodic inspections by Regional Water Quality Control Board staff. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

7c. **Less than significant impact.** As discussed in *Threshold 7aiii* and *7aiv*, liquefaction and landslides are not considered to be a significant design concern for this Project. The topography of the proposed Interchange area is relatively flat with no significant shift in elevation. Therefore, there is little potential for lateral spreading or collapse. The Riverside County GIS indicates that the Project site is not in an active subsidence zone (RCIT). Thus, impacts are less than significant.

7d. **Less than significant impact.** A standard soils report will be prepared prior to grading work to address any potential with expansive soil, and to determine appropriate soil compaction, and base materials. Also, an engineering firm will be retained to design the Interchange to mitigate any potential impact associated with expansive soil. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

7e. **No impact.** The Interchange Project will not require sewer connection. No impacts are anticipated.

7f. **Less than significant impact.** A Paleontological Technical Memorandum ("Paleo Memo") was prepared by Applied Earthworks ("AE") in April 2021.

To assess the paleontological sensitivity of geologic units exposed at the ground surface and those likely to occur in the subsurface of the Project area, AE reviewed published geologic maps and paleontological literature, and conducted museum records searches. For the records searches, AE retained the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (NHMLAC) and the Western Science Center (WSC) in Hemet, California, to conduct a search of fossil localities recorded in their collections. (AE-2, p. 3).

AE also conducted searches of the online Paleobiology Database (PBDB) and the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP).

The records searches from the NHMLAC and WSC do not list any previously recorded fossil localities within the Project area, although several have been reported from the same sedimentary units as those mapped in and close to the Project area. Table 1 below summarizes the records search results from the NHMLAC, WSC, previous records searches in the immediate area, and online databases. (AE-2, p. 5).

Table 1

Locality No.	Geologic Unit (Date)	Taxon	Depth	Approx. Distance from Project Area
LACM VP 6059	Unknown formation (Pleistocene)	*Camelops hesternus* (camel, extinct)	Unknown	9 miles
LACM VP 7261	Unknown Formation-arenaceous silt (Pleistocene)	Proboscidea (elephant order); Ungulate, unspecified	Unknown	13 miles
LACM, 4 VP 1207	Unknown formation (Pleistocene)	*Odocoileus* (deer)	Unknown	24 miles
LACM VP 7811	Unknown formation-tan eolian silt (Pleistocene)	*Masticophis flagellum* (coachwhip snake)	9-11 ft.	33 miles
WSC	Unspecified alluvium (Pleistocene)	All extinct: *Mammut pacificus* (mastodon); *Mammuthus columbi* (mammoth); *Equus sp.* (horse); *Camelops hesternus* (camel); *Smilodon fatalis* (sabertooth cat), et al.	Unknown	<10 miles
PBDB 200319	Unknown formation (Pleistocene)	*Mammut pacificus* (mastodon)	Unknown	3 miles

Source: AE-2, p. 5

The nearest previously recorded locality to the Project area is PBDB 200319, which is approximately 3 miles northwest of the Project area, also within the City of Perris. This locality yielded a specimen of *Mammut pacificus* (mastodon) at unknown depths that correlate to the Rancholabrean North American Land Mammal Age (NALMA).

Among the NHMLAC collections, the closest locality is LACM 6059, southeast of Lake Elsinore. This locality yielded a specimen of *Camelops hesternus* (camel) at unknown depths. LACM 7261, south of the Project area at Skinner Reservoir, yielded a specimen of Proboscidea (elephant) and an unspecified ungulate at unknown depths. Northwest of the Project area, between the cities of Corona and Norco, LACM 1207 yielded a specimen of *Odocoileus* (deer) from an unknown depth. Lastly, LACM 7811, farther northwest from the Project area than LACM 1207, yielded a fossil specimen of a coachwhip snake (*Masticophis flagellum)* at 9–11 feet bgs.

The WSC records search results indicate no fossil localities within the Project area. However, fossil localities have been reported from sedimentary units similar to those mapped within Project area (Radford, 2021). The largest known, non-asphaltic, open-environment late Pleistocene fossil assemblage is recorded less than 10 miles southeast of the Project area in the neighboring Diamond and Domenigoni valleys. Discovered during excavations at Diamond Valley Lake, this locality has yielded nearly 100,000 identifiable fossils representing over 105 vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant taxa (Springer et al., 2009).

The PBDB and UCMP online databases list numerous vertebrate, invertebrate, and plant fossil localities from Riverside County. However, only the PBDB lists the specimen of mastodon (*Mammut pacificus*), detailed above, within a 10-mile radius of the Project area. Neither database lists any invertebrate or plant fossils within the Project area or within a 10-mile radius. (AE-2, pp. 5-6).

AE used the City's (2008) sensitivity criteria to determine the paleontological potential of the Project area. When placed over the City's (2008) paleontological sensitivity map, the Project is primarily mapped in Area #2 (High Sensitivity), with the northern edge of the Project area in #5 (Low to High Sensitivity). AE's desktop efforts and the museum and online records searches support these rankings.

Construction-related ground disturbance to a maximum depth of 15 feet bgs have a high likelihood of encountering fossil resources at unknown depths in previously undisturbed middle to late Pleistocene alluvial sediments. In accordance with the City's (2008) Implementation Measure IV.A.4, paleontological monitoring will be required during all ground disturbance in Area #2, and at depths below 5 feet bgs in Area #5. In accordance with Riverside County's (2015) General Plan, Multipurpose Open Space (OS) Element Policy OS 19.6, AE recommends further paleontological resource management, including submittal of a paleontological resources impact mitigation program (PRIMP) prior to the commencement of construction. AE also recommends Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training for construction workers prior to ground disturbance in accordance with industry-wide best practices. (AE-2, p. 6).

Since the Project is required to comply with California Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5, 5097.98, and 15064.5(e), as well as with City and County policies for monitoring and training, impacts are less than significant.

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

References: Perris 2016b, Webb 2021

Explanation of Checklist Answers

8a. **Less than significant impact.** GHG emissions for the Project were analyzed in the Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis (Webb 2021, Appendix A) to determine if the Project could have an impact related to GHG emissions. The CalEEMod output results for construction-related GHG emissions present the GHG emissions estimates for the Project for carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), and carbon dioxide equivalents (CO_2E). Since operational emissions from the Project are negligible, only short-term construction-related emissions were analyzed. Approximately 161.16 $MTCO_2E$ of construction-related emissions are estimated to occur from the Project over the course of the estimated construction period. The proposed Project does not fit into the categories provided (industrial, commercial, and residential) in either the draft thresholds from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the SCAQMD. The Project's GHG emissions do not exceed any of the SCAQMD recommended screening levels. Due to the estimated amount of emissions from Project construction, and negligible operational emissions from infrequent maintenance vehicles, the proposed Project will not generate GHG emissions that exceed the draft screening thresholds. Accordingly, the impacts will be less than significant. (Webb 2021, p. 5).

8b. **Less than significant impact.** Significance under this threshold can be determined by showing compliance with applicable plans. The City of Perris Climate Action Plan (CAP) utilizes Western Riverside County Council of Government's (WRCOG's) analysis of existing greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction programs and policies that have already been implemented in the sub-region and of applicable best practices from other regions to assist in meeting the 2020 sub-regional reduction target (Perris 2016b, p. 1-3). As the Project does not change and land use from those assumed in the City's GP, the Project is also consistent with the land uses assumed in the City's CAP. Therefore, the Project does not conflict with the CAP and impacts are less than significant.

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

References: ALUC 2011, ALUC 2014, DTSC 2021, RCIT

Explanation of Checklist Answers

9a-b. **No impact.** The proposed Project is an interstate improvement project and would not result in an increase in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and would not create reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Since no hazardous materials are associated with the Project, no impact is anticipated.

9c. **No impact.** The Project site is not located within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school, and the Project would not emit hazardous materials or involve handling of hazardous materials. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

9d. **No impact.** The California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (also known as the Cortese List) is a planning document used by state and local agencies and by private developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials sites. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to annually update

the Cortese List. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is responsible for preparing a portion of the information that comprises the Cortese List. Other state and local government agencies are required to provide additional hazardous material release information that is part of the complete list. The EnviroStor database constitutes the DTSC's component of Cortese List data by identifying state response sites, federal Superfund sites, school cleanup sites, and voluntary cleanup sites. The EnviroStor database identifies sites that have known contamination or sites for which further investigation is warranted. It also identifies facilities that are authorized to treat, store, dispose, or transfer hazardous waste. Based on a review of the EnviroStor database, the Project site is not listed on the Cortese List; in fact, no sites are listed within the City (DTSC 2021). Therefore, there are no Project impacts.

9e. **No impact.** The Project site lies within the Airport Land Use Commission's (ALUC) land use compatibility plans for March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport (MARB/IPA) and Perris Valley Airport, and the Project site is within compatibility zones in both plans (ALUC 2014. Map MA-1 and ALUC 2011, Map PV-1). However, no ALUC review is required as only projects requiring a legislative act (i.e., General Plan, Zone Change or Specific Plan) require their review. In addition, the Project involves only improving a freeway interchange and related roadway improvements. Therefore, no impact related to safety hazard or excessive noise for people living or working in the area is anticipated.

9f. **No impact.** The Project would not impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan as its making improvements to an existing freeway interchange. No impacts are anticipated.

9g. **No impact.** The Project area is an existing freeway interchange and is not adjacent to any wildlands or underdeveloped hillsides where wildland fires might be expected. The Riverside County GIS does not designate this area to be in a fire hazard area (RCIT). No impact would occur.

5.10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				

5.10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) 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; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

References: FEMA 2014, Perris 2005b, SWRCB 2013

Explanation of Checklist Answers

10a-e. **Less than significant impact.** Construction of the Project would involve site preparation to widen existing freeway offramps, remove existing medians, widen existing onramps, regrade existing slopes, remove of existing pavement sections, grind and overlay pavement rehabilitation, and relocate existing signs. The maximum depths of excavation will be up to 15 feet for the traffic signal poles and the road improvements will require approximately two to three feet of excavation. There is an existing drainage culvert structure located beneath an offramp that will not be impacted by the proposed Project. Construction activities would temporarily create the potential for increased erosion, runoff, and siltation, but would not alter groundwater quality or alter existing drainage patterns. In accordance with NPDES regulations, the State of California requires that any construction activity disturbing one acre or more of soil comply with the Construction General Permit (SWRCB 2013, p. 1). The implementation of NPDES permits ensures that the state's mandatory standards for the maintenance of clean water and the federal minimums are met. Coverage with the permit would prevent sedimentation and soil erosion through implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and periodic inspections by Regional Water Quality Control Board staff. Compliance with these requirements will reduce any potential impacts to water quality and groundwater to less than significant.

The Project contractors will acquire all necessary water needed for construction from the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). The addition of paved surfaces for the ramp widening would result in a nominal increase in impervious surface in the City. In general, the addition of impervious surfaces can impair groundwater recharge. Recharge from percolation of precipitation is one of numerous processes of groundwater recharge and reduction in volume from this source would not be

significant. Furthermore, the relatively small amount of area (3.25 acres) that would be covered with impervious surfaces would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Recharge of sub-basins from current and planned EMWD storage/percolation ponds and implementation of an inter-agency management plan for Perris-area groundwater basins would promote maintenance of existing groundwater levels. Therefore, the Project will not decrease groundwater supplies by direct withdrawal or interfere with groundwater recharge that would impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.

The addition of paved surfaces for on and offramp widening would result in an increase in impervious surfaces which would nominally increase the runoff from the Project site. However, runoff from the site as well as runoff from adjacent land uses, including agriculture, commercial developments and roadways, currently drains into the storm channel from existing drainage culverts. The proposed Project would not substantially increase the runoff into the storm channel above existing conditions.

Storm water control measures during construction and grading will be outlined in the construction NPDES permit and SWPPP prepared for the proposed Project. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are designed to prevent or control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff. Examples of such BMP control measures include detention basins for containment, use of silt fencing, gravel bags, or straw bales to control runoff, and identification of emergency procedures in case of hazardous materials spills. The Project proponent will be required to obtain a construction NPDES permit prior to site grading.

Implementation of a SWPPP and in compliance with the Construction General Permit would ensure that the proposed Project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, result in substantial erosion or siltation, contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of an existing or planned stormwater drainage, provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

As shown on Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Panel No. 06065C1440H, the proposed Project is located entirely within the Floodway Area in Zone AE, which is a zone that would be inundated by a 100-year flood (FEMA 2014). However, because no housing or structures would be constructed as part of the Project, impacts related to release of pollutants due to inundation would be less than significant.

The Project site is not located near an ocean coast that could produce a tsunami or seiche. The Project site is located approximately 11 miles southwest of the Lake Perris Reservoir, which is a confined basin of water susceptible to a reverberating surface wave action induced by seismic action. Although a seiche in Lake Perris could conceivably cause the Lake Perris dam to fail, the dam inundation study by the California Water Resources Agency indicates the dam is not likely to be breached as a result of seismic activity (Perris 2005b, p. IV-77 – IV-79). Therefore, impacts related to release of pollutants due to inundation are less than significant.

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

References: Perris 2005a

Explanation of Checklist Answers

11a. **No impact.** Construction of the Project would involve site preparation to widen existing freeway offramps, remove existing medians, widen existing onramps, regrade existing slopes, remove of existing pavement sections, grind and overlay pavement rehabilitation, and relocate existing signs. No new roadways or highways would be constructed that could physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

11b. **No impact.** The proposed Project does not involve any land use changes. The purpose of the Project is to ensure the local roadway network will be improved to facilitate better traffic circulation once traffic is realized from the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3. In addition, it will improve traffic operations, safety for pedestrians, and bicyclists. The Project site is located within the MSHCP area implemented to address biological resources in western Riverside County. See response to Bio (f) above for documentation about how the Project does not conflict with the MSHCP.A General Plan consistency analysis is provided below:

- Circulation Element: Construction of the Project would involve site preparation to widen existing freeway offramps, remove existing medians, widen existing onramps, regrade existing slopes, remove of existing pavement sections, grind and overlay pavement rehabilitation. It will improve traffic operations, as well as safety for pedestrians, and bicyclists. Therefore, the Project is consistent with Perris General Plan Policies I.B, II.B, III.A, V.A, and V.II.A (which apply to the City's Circulation Element).

- Conservation Element: The Project is consistent with General Plan Policies II.A, III.A, IV.A, VIII.B, as outlined in Section 5.4 – Biological Resources, because the Project will comply with the relevant state and federal regulations pertaining to biological resources through compliance with the MSHCP. Also as stated in Section 5.5 – Cultural Resources and in Section 5.7 – Geology and Soils, no historical, archeological, or paleontological sites are located within the boundaries of the Project Site.

- Noise Element: While the Project involves freeway offramp widening, noise generated by freeway usage would not cause an increase in noise relative to existing conditions, given that no induced travel is proposed by the improvements. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not contribute to a

permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above existing conditions. Thus, the Project is consistent with Policy II.A.

- Safety Element: The Project will improve traffic operations, as well as safety for pedestrians, and bicyclists. The proposed Project will also be designed according to the current Caltrans Seismic Design Criteria., which require structures to be designed to meet or exceed the seismic safety standards set forth therein. Accordingly, the Project will be consistent with General Plan Policies II.A, I.B, and I.5.

  No impacts will result from the proposed Project.

5.12. MINERAL RESOURCES	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant With Mitigation**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Perris 2005a, Perris 2005b, Riverside 2015b

Explanation of Checklist Answers

12a. **No impact.** The City General Plan notes that lands within City are either designated Mineral Resource Zone Two (MRZ-2) or Mineral Resource Zone Three (MRZ-3), as defined by the California Department of Conservation. (Perris 2005a, p.VI-28.) The proposed Project site is located within MRZ-3, as classified by the State Mining and Geology Board (Riverside 2015b, Figure OS-6). Within MRZ-3, available geologic information suggests that mineral deposits exist, or are likely to exist; however, the significance of the deposit is unknown. No sites in the City of Perris have been designated as locally important mineral resource recovery sites on any regional or local plan. Accordingly, no impact to availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site will occur.

12b. **No impact.** No sites have been designated as locally-important mineral resource recovery sites on any local plan (Perris 2005b, p. VI-28). Therefore, no impact to the availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site will occur.

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

References: ALUC 2011, ALUC 2014, Caltrans 2013, FHWA 2006, Perris 2005a, Municipal Code

Explanation of Checklist Answers

13a. **Less than significant impact.** There will be temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels during construction. Typical construction equipment noise may range from 75-89 dB at 50 feet for short periods of time, depending upon the types of equipment in operation at any given time and phase of construction (FHWA 2006, p. 3). In addition, the noise from point sources such as construction equipment decrease 6 dB for each doubling of distance (Caltrans 2013, pp. 2-25 - 2-26). The closest sensitive receptor location is a motel on Case Road approximately 475 meters (1,558 feet) east of the Project site. Construction of the proposed Project would comply with City construction timing restrictions set forth in Chapter 7.34 of the Municipal Code, which prohibits construction between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of any day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day, or on a legal holiday, with the exception of Columbus Day and Washington's birthday, or on Sundays. Construction activity shall not exceed 80 dBA L_{max} within any residential zones in the city.

Because construction activities are typically limited to weekdays, during daylight hours, construction noise is considered a nuisance or annoying, rather than a significant impact (Perris 2005a). According to the Perris General Plan Noise Element, continued compliance with construction timing restrictions would reduce construction noise impacts to a level considered less than significant (Perris 2005a). For the Project, construction will only take place during daytime hours and will comply with the General Plan requirements.

Noise generated by freeway usage would not cause an increase in noise relative to existing conditions, given that no induced travel is proposed by the improvements. Accordingly, the proposed Project would not contribute to a permanent or temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above existing conditions. The Project would result in less than significant short- and long-term noise impact.

13b. **Less than significant impact.** Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment used on the site. Operation of

construction equipment causes ground vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish in strength with distance. Construction activities that could occur within the Project site include grading, jackhammering, and paving.

Given the Project site's distance from any nearby receptors, it is unlikely that any proposed Project construction activities will result in human annoyance as a result of ground vibration. Indeed, the Project provides improvements to an existing freeway, already an existing source of ground vibration. Thus, ground vibration generated by construction would not cause a noticeable increase in ground vibration relative to existing conditions. Moreover, construction at the Project site will be restricted to daytime hours, thereby eliminating potential vibration impact during the sensitive nighttime hours. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

13c. **No impact.** The Project site lies within ALUC land use compatibility plans for MARB/IPA (ALUC 2014, Map MA-1). The Project site is located in Zone D. According MARB/IPA LUCP, the proposed Project site is depicted as being in an area inside the 55-60 CNEL aircraft noise contour. However, the proposed Project is an interstate improvement project. No new buildings or land uses would be constructed that could expose people living or working in the area to excessive noise levels from aircraft operations. No impact would occur.

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

References: US Census 2019, SCAG 2016

Explanation of Checklist Answers

14a. **No impact.** According to the US Census Bureau, the City's population as of July 2019 is 79,291 (US Census 2019). The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) estimate that the population of Perris is expected to increase to about 116,700 by the year 2040 (SCAG 2016, p. 27) although that is far above current City development conditions. The proposed Project would not directly or indirectly result in an increase in population and would not accommodate growth beyond that anticipated by the City's adopted General Plan or induce additional population growth. Since the Project is merely implementing a condition of approval for an approved industrial development, no impacts are anticipated.

14b. **No impact.** The Project would not displace existing housing or people as it only involves freeway improvements, thereby not necessitating people to move. Because the Project will not require the displacement of people, no impact would occur.

5.15. PUBLIC SERVICES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Perris 2005a

Explanation of Checklist Answers

15a-e. **No Impact.** As discussed in *Threshold 14a*, the Project would not facilitate additional growth beyond that anticipated by the City's General Plan. The Project is merely an improvement required by a condition of approval for an approved industrial development. Therefore, it would not increase demand for public services or facilities such as schools, parks, or other public facilities, or generate a 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 objective for any of the public services.

The Project would be constructed within existing developed areas which are currently serviced by the City's fire and police protection services and would not result in new fire hazards or increase demand for fire or police services. While the freeway improvements would result in alterations to the I-215/Case Road/SR-74 southbound ramps to facilitate better traffic operations, safety for pedestrians, and bicyclists, the Project would not impair emergency access. No impact will occur.

5.16. RECREATION	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would/does the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Project Proposal

Explanation of Checklist Answers

16a-b. **No Impact.** The Project would not directly or indirectly increase population or demand for park facilities. The Project merely consists of roadway improvements for traffic avoidance and safety reasons and does not include any recreational facilities. No impact would occur.

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

References: Caltrans 2020, Perris 2020, Webb 2021a

Explanation of Checklist Answers

17a. **No Impact.** The City approved three industrial warehouses as part of the project known as the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3 (Tentative Parcel Maps 35877 and 35886) and an Environmental Impact Report Addendum. To accommodate the increased traffic flow generated by the industrial warehouse development approved in the City of Perris, the City imposed a Condition of Approval to make improvements to the I-215/Case Road/SR-74 Interchange southbound ramps. The City found that the improvements are needed to ensure the local roadway network will be improved to facilitate better traffic circulation once traffic is realized from the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3. In addition, it will improve traffic operations, safety for

pedestrians, and bicyclists. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an applicable program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, or conflict with section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines.

17b. **No Impact.** In June 2021, Albert A. Webb Associates (Webb) prepared a VMT Analysis Screening Form to ensure compliance with SB 743. (See, Appendix E.) Per Caltrans VMT CEQA Significance Determinations for State Highway System Projects Implementation Timeline Memorandum (Timing Memo) (Caltrans 2020), projects initiated after December 28, 2018, and achieve Caltrans Milestone 020 "Begin Environmental" before September 15, 2020, will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine if the project requires an induced travel analysis. The project falls into the following project types that would not likely lead to a substantial or measurable increase in vehicle travel, and therefore generally should not require an induced travel analysis:

- The project proposes to reconfigure traffic lanes to include turn lanes.
- The project proposes to widen the local street and improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The project is proposing to install traffic signals and also proposing to optimized traffic signal timing.
- Timing of traffic signals to optimize vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian flow.
- Reconstruction of enhanced pedestrian facilities within public rights-of-way.

Similarly, under the *City of Perris Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for CEQA* (Perris 2020), the proposed Project should not require an induced travel analysis because it falls under the following list of prescreened projects:

- Reconfiguration of traffic lanes to accommodate turn lanes,
- Installation of traffic signals, traffic control devices and TSM (transportation system management) systems.
- Addition of new or enhanced bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

Because the Project will not induce additional travel, there are no impacts related to VMT.

17c-d. **No Impact.**

Construction of the proposed improvements would modify the existing roadway. However, the improvements would conform to traffic control design standards. Moreover, the improvements will improve traffic operations, safety for pedestrians, and bicyclists. Therefore, the proposed Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature.

The Project would ensure the local roadway network will be improved to facilitate better traffic circulation and safety. It would not result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

5.18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Applied Earthworks 2021 (AE-2)

Explanation of Checklist Answers:

18a-b. No Impact. As discussed in *Threshold 5*, above, there are no eligible cultural resources have been recorded on the Project site nor were any prehistoric sites identified during AE's investigation. Tribal outreach was conducted via the NAHC by Applied Earthworks and no Tribes responded with information indicating significant resources are in the project footprint (see Appendix C). No AB52 consultation is being conducted by the City as this document is supporting the preparation of a Notice of Exemption, which does not trigger the need for AB52 consultation.

5.19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒

5.19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Perris 2005b, EMWD 2020

Explanation of Checklist Answers:

19a-c. **No Impact.** The Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) provides water and wastewater services to the City of Perris (Perris 2005b, pp. IV-229 and IV-237). The proposed Project is an interchange improvement; thus, EMWD will not need to provide sanitary sewer service for an interchange roadway project.

The proposed interchange Project does not require or include the use of natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. The Project will be designed to perpetuate and accept the existing drainage patterns with respect to tributary drainage and outlet points. The rate and volume of stormwater leaving the Project site would incrementally increase from the existing condition as result of widening the roadway and off ramps, which would create a new impervious surface. However, because the new impervious surface area would be extremely small in proportion to the watershed, there would be no need for the construction of new storm water infrastructure or the expansion of existing infrastructure to serve the Project site. No impacts to existing or new utilities are anticipated.

19d-e. **No impact.** Trash, recycling, and green waste service in the City of Perris is provided by CR&R Waste Services (Perris 2005b, p. IV-244). However, the Project will not create solid waste, as no habitable structures or operational sources of solid waste are proposed. No impact will occur.

5.20. WILDFIRE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

References:Perris 2005b, Cal Fire 2007

Explanation of Checklist Answers:

20a-d. **No impact.** According to California Department of Forest and Fire Protection (Cal Fire), the proposed Project is not within a state responsibility area (SRA) or land classified as very high fire hazard severity zone. Further, as discussed in *Threshold 9g*, above, the proposed Project site is not adjacent to any wildlands or undeveloped hillsides where wildland fires might be expected. Additionally, the Perris GP does not designate this area to be at risk from wildland fires (GP, Safety Element, p 32). Therefore, no impact would occur.

5.21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Does the project:				
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

References: Checklist above

Explanation of Checklist Answers

21a. **Less than significant.** As discussed in, above, no cultural resources were identified within the Project site as a result of the records search, Native American consultation, and pedestrian survey. Therefore, based on the above analysis, no impacts are anticipated for cultural resources.

Based on the biological studies conducted on the project, as outlined above, the Project is not expected to have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment or reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animals. Requirements through standard conditions of approval from the City via the MSHCP to conduct preconstruction surveys for burrowing owls will be adhered to, and for this reason, impacts are considered less than significant.

21b. **No impact.** The City approved three industrial warehouses as part of the project known as the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3 (Tentative Parcel Maps 35877 and 35886) and an Environmental Impact Report Addendum. To accommodate the increased traffic flow generated by the industrial warehouse development approved in the City of Perris, the City imposed a Condition of Approval to make improvements to the I-215/Case Road/SR-74 Interchange southbound ramps. The City found that the improvements are needed to ensure the local roadway network will be improved to facilitate better traffic circulation once traffic is realized from the South Perris Industrial Project Site 3. In addition, it will improve traffic operations, safety for pedestrians, and bicyclists. Therefore, no cumulative impacts are associated with the Project.

21c. **No impact.** Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of this analysis of this IS under the air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, and traffic thresholds. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this IS, the proposed Project will not cause substantial adverse effects directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, no impacts are expected.

Remainder of page intentionally blank.

SECTION 6.0 REFERENCES

Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). 2011. *Perris Valley Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. March 2011 (Available athttp://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/19%20-%20Vol.%201%20Perris%20Valley%20(Final-Mar.2011).pdf?ver=2016-08-15-155627-183, accessed July 2021.)

Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). 2014. *March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. November 2014 (Available athttp://www.rcaluc.org/Portals/13/17%20-%20Vol.%201%20March%20Air%20Reserve%20Base%20Final.pdf?ver=2016-08-15-145812-700, accessed July 2021.)

Albert A. Webb Associates (Webb). 2021. *Technical Memorandum: Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Analysis for the Case Road Interchange Project.* (Appendix A)

Albert A. Webb Associates (Webb). 2021a.*VMT Analysis Screening Form.* (Appendix E)

Applied Earthworks Inc. (AE-1) 2021. *Phase I Cultural Resource Assessment for the IDI South Perris 215 Improvement Project*. (Appendix C)

Applied Earthworks Inc. (AE-2) 2021. *Paleontological Technical Memorandum for the IDI South Perris 215 Improvement Project*. (Appendix D)

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2018. *Area Designations Maps / State and National*. (Available at https://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm, accessed July 2021.)

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). 2018. *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) Farmland Map: Riverside County, California.* Sacramento, CA: FMMP. (Available at https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/Riverside.aspx, accessed July 2021.)

California Department of Forest and Fire Protection. (Cal Fire).2007. *Riverside County (West) FHSZ Map*, Adopted November 2007. (Available at https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/media/5921/perris.pdf, accessed July 24, 2021.)

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2013. *Technical Noise Supplement to the Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol*. (Available at https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tens-sep2013-a11y.pdf, accessed July 2021.)

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2019. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System, Riverside County*. (Available at https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfcc19983, accessed July 2021.)

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2020. *VMT CEQA Significance Determinations for State Highway System Projects Implementation Timeline Memorandum. (Available at https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/transportation-planning/documents/sb-743/2020-04-13-implementation-timing-memo-fnl-a11y.pdf, accessed July 2021.)*

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. *Envirostor Database.* (Available at https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search?cmd=search&reporttype=CORTESE&site_type=CSITES,FUDS&status=ACT,BKLG,COM&reporttitle=HAZARDOUS+WASTE+AND+SUBSTANCES+SITE+LIST+%28CORTESE%29, accessed July 2021.)

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). January 23, 2013. *Construction General Permit: 2009-0009-DWQ amended by 2010-0014-DWQ & 2012-0006-DWQ*. (Available at *https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/constpermits.shtml*, accessed July 20, 2021.)

Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). 2020. *Public Map Portal*. (Available at https://mapportal.emwd.org/, accessed January 2020.)

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2014. *Flood Insurance Rate Maps. (Panel No. 06065C1440G, 06065C1430G)*, City of Perris. (Available at https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=280%20Perris%20Valley%20Storm%20Drain%2C%20ca#searchresultsanchor, accessed July 2021.)

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2006. *FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model User's Guide*. (Available at https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf, accessed July 2021.)

Glenn Lukos Associates (GLA). 2021 (June). *General Biological Report for the Interstate 215 Interchange Project*. (Appendix B)

Perris, City of . *Municipal Code*. Perris, CA. updated May 11,2021 (Available at https://library.municode.com/ca/perris/codes/code_of_ordinances, accessed July 2021.)

Perris, City of. 2003. *Ordinance Number 1123*. Perris, CA. (Available at https://www.cityofperris.org/home/showpublisheddocument/3319/637250613005670000, accessed July 2021.)

Perris, City of. 2005a (as amended through 2016). *Comprehensive General Plan 2030*. Perris, CA. (Available at https://www.cityofperris.org/departments/development-services/general-plan, accessed July 2021.)

Perris, City of. 2005b (April 26). *Draft Environmental Impact Report, City of Perris General Plan 2030* (State Clearinghouse #2004031135). Perris, CA. (Available at https://www.cityofperris.org/home/showdocument?id=451, accessed July 2021.)

Perris, City of. 2016a (October). *City of Perris Zoning Map*. Perris, CA. (Available at https://www.cityofperris.org/home/showpublisheddocument/1717/637209988160600000, accessed July 2021.)

Perris, City of. 2016b. *City of Perris Climate Action Plan*. Perris, CA. (Available at https://www.cityofperris.org/Home/ShowDocument?id=12935, accessed July 2021.)

Perris, City of.2020 *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for CEQA*. Perris, CA. (Available at https://www.cityofperris.org/departments/development-services/general-plan, accessed July 2021.)

Riverside, County of. 2015a. *Draft Environmental Impact Report No. 521 for Riverside County General Plan*. County of Riverside. (Available at https://planning.rctlma.org/Portals/14/genplan/general_plan_2015/DEIR%20521/DEIR%20No.%20521.pdf, accessed July 2021.)

Riverside, County of. 2015b. *Riverside County General Plan Amendment*. County of Riverside. (Available at https://planning.rctlma.org/General-Plan-Zoning/General-Plan , accessed July 2021.)

Riverside, County Department of Information Technology (RCIT). 2021. *Map My County Online GIS Database*. County of Riverside. (Available at https://gis1.countyofriverside.us/Html5Viewer/index.html?viewer=MMC_Public, accessed July 2021.)

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2003. *White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution*. Diamond Bar, CA: SCAQMD. (Available at http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/Agendas/Environmental-Justice/cumulative-impacts-working-group/cumulative-impacts-white-paper.pdf, accessed July 2021.)

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2005. *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning*. (Available at (http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/planning/air-quality-guidance/complete-guidance-document.pdf?sfvrsn=4, accessed July 2021.)

South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 2017. *Final 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).* Diamond Bar, CA: SCAQMD. (Available at http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/clean-air-plans/air-quality-management-plans/2016-air-quality-management-plan/final-2016-aqmp/final2016aqmp.pdf?sfvrsn=15, accessed July 2021.)

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2016. *2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Current Demographic and Growth Forecast Appendix.* Los Angeles, CA: SCAG. (Available at https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/2016_2040rtpscs_finalgrowthforecastbyjurisdiction.pdf?1605576071, accessed July 2021.)

State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2013. *Construction General Permit Fact Sheet.* Sacramento, CA: SWRCB. (Available at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/docs/constpermits/wqo_2009_0009_factsheet.pdf, accessed June 2021.)

U.S. Census Bureau. 2019. *Perris California Quickfacts,* Records for the State of California in Perris City. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Census Bureau. (Available at http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/0656700,00, accessed July 2021.)