
VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this section is to assess a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project that would feasibly attain most of the basic Project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the Project and to evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). The CEQA Guidelines state that the selection of alternatives should be governed by a “rule of reason.” CEQA also states that, “[t]he EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.” Generally, significant impacts of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the project, and should provide decision-makers perspective as well as a reasoned choice.

ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

To develop Project alternatives, the EIR preparers considered the Project objectives and reviewed the significant impacts identified in Section IV of this EIR, considered those significant impacts that could be substantially avoided or reduced through an alternative, and determined the modifications that would be needed (refer to Table VI-37 at the end of this section). The objectives of the Project are as follows:

1. Expand the range of housing choices in the City of Hemet to serve a range of lifestyles, including first-time buyers, young singles and couples, families, empty nesters, and seniors, by providing both attached and detached housing options at a variety of densities, configurations, and prices.
2. Provide a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses, strategically located recreational facilities, and a desirable package of amenities to encourage outdoor activity and create a sense of community and identity.
3. Utilize onsite drainage and utility corridors as opportunities to balance cut and fill as well as provide recreational amenities, walkable connections, and add value to the community.
4. Implement the goals and policies of the City of Hemet General Plan to encourage a balanced and sustainable pattern of land use and implement high-quality pedestrian-oriented design.
5. Establish plans for the improvement and/or development of new public infrastructure to serve the project area consistent with applicable master plans.
6. Create an integrated and interconnected community that allows residents to access the various amenities, shops, and services without the need to use the automobile.
7. Provide for new residential, commercial, and open space development that is integrated with existing and planned surrounding development.

8. Enhance the economic well being of the City by locating uses that capitalize on the Florida Avenue frontage.
9. Enhance the City's existing job base through the creation of a broad range of employment and career opportunities.
10. Accommodate a range of commercial, service, and professional business and employment options to meet the needs of the market and to create a project that is fiscally positive.
11. Provide flexible standards to allow the project to best meet market demand at the time of development.

The significant Project impacts that would be less than significant with mitigation include the following:

Aesthetics – Lighting

Air Quality – Regional Construction Emissions and Localized Construction Emissions

Biological Resources – Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (the “MSHCP”), Special Status Species, Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool Resources, and Wetlands

Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains

Geology and Soils – Expansive Soils

Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Risk of Upset, Airport Safety, and Wildland Fires

Noise – Construction Noise and On-Site Traffic Noise

Public Services – Fire Protection Services and Police Protection Services

The Project impacts that would remain significant after mitigation include the following:

Air Quality – Regional Operational Emissions

Transportation/Traffic – Intersection Level of Service (LOS)

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

Alternate Project Site Alternative

This alternative considered development of the Project on an alternate site in the City. However, this alternative was rejected for further analysis, because the Project Applicant does not own any other developable property in the City and cannot “reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to [an]

alternative site” (refer to Section 15126.6f1 of the CEQA Guidelines). Thus, this alternative was deemed infeasible. Additionally, this alternative was rejected for further review, because of the inability of the alternative to substantially reduce or avoid the significant impacts of the proposed Project. Development of the Project on an alternate site (if one were controlled by the Applicant) in the Project area would likely result in environmental impacts similar to those identified in this EIR, including the significant unavoidable impacts related to regional operational emissions and intersection LOS, due to similar existing environmental conditions as those associated with the Project site (i.e., the developed nature of the Project area, regional air quality, and traffic conditions).

“Maximum Reduced Density” Alternative

This alternative considers reductions in the overall size of the Project required to avoid the significant unavoidable regional air quality and traffic impacts identified for the Project. In order to avoid the significant unavoidable regional air quality impacts, the Project would need to be reduced to approximately one-eighth the size of what is proposed. Also, under the conditions, the intersection of California Avenue and Florida Avenue currently operates at an unsatisfactory LOS.¹ In order to avoid creating a significant unavoidable impact at this intersection, the Project would need to be reduced to a level where fewer than 50 peak-hour trips were generated (e.g., approximately 49 single-family dwelling units). Such reductions in the Project would render it financially infeasible and incapable of meeting most of the basic Project objectives, including development the Project site at a density that would allow for implementation of the goals and policies of the City’s General Plan to encourage a balanced and sustainable pattern of land use and implement high-quality pedestrian-oriented design. For these reasons, this alternative was rejected for further review.

SELECTED ALTERNATIVES

ALTERNATIVE A: NO PROJECT (CONTINUATION OF EXISTING CONDITION)

CEQA requires the alternatives analysis to include a “no project” alternative, which is the circumstance under which the Project does not proceed. The purpose of analyzing a No Project Alternative is to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][1]). Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2), requirements of the analysis of the “no project” alternative are as follows:

The “no project” analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time the

¹ *Installation of a traffic signal is in process for this intersection. It could be operational by the time the Project is constructed. Because it is currently not operational, the unsatisfactory LOS described here reflects the existing condition, which is required as a baseline under CEQA.*

environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved, based on current plans, and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

At the time the notice of preparation (NOP) was published for the Project, there was no evidence that another development at the Project site would be forthcoming in the event the Project is not approved. Thus, for the purposes of this EIR, Alternative A: No Project (Continuation of Existing Conditions) (herein referred to as “Alternative A”) assumes that the Project site would remain in its current undeveloped condition. Although no new development would occur on the Project site under Alternative A, this alternative assumes the development of the related projects in the area of the Project site. The potential environmental impacts associated with Alternative A are described below and are compared to the environmental impacts associated with the Project (also refer to Table VI-36 at the end of this section).

Aesthetics

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to scenic resources, scenic vistas, and visual character would be less than significant, and with implementation of Mitigation Measure B-1, impacts related to lighting would be less than significant. Under Alternative A, the Project site would not be developed with residential, commercial, and open space land uses, and no impacts related to aesthetics would occur.

Agricultural Resources

This EIR concluded that although the Project would change the agricultural zoning for the Project site to Specific Plan, based on the General Plan, the intended use of the Project site and surrounding properties does not include agriculture, and as such, the change in the zoning of the site would not result in conflicts with existing agricultural zoning. Thus, Project impacts related to agricultural resources would be less than significant. Under Alternative A, no zone change would occur, and the Project site would not be developed with residential, commercial, and open space land uses. No impacts related to agricultural resources would occur under Alternative A.

Air Quality

Consistency with the AQMP

This EIR concluded that the Project would be consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (the “AQMP”), and impacts would be less than significant. Under Alternative A, no development would occur at the Project site, and no traffic would be generated. As such, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Regional Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that with implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2, Project impacts related to regional construction emissions would be less than significant. Under Alternative A, no development would occur at the Project site. As such, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Under Alternative A, no construction activities would occur, and no construction emissions would be generated. No impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Regional Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project's emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would exceed the significance thresholds, and Project impacts related to regional operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable, primarily due to mobile source emissions.

Under Alternative A, no land uses would be developed and operated at the Project site, and no traffic would be generated. Thus, no operational emissions would be generated, and no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Localized Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to localized construction emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no construction activities would occur, and no construction emissions would be generated. No impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Localized Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and Project impacts related to localized CO emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no land uses would be developed and operated at the Project site, and no traffic would be generated. Thus, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Sensitive Receptors

This EIR concluded that the Project's design feature of a 100-foot buffer between any on-site or offsite sensitive receptor during construction activities would ensure that air quality impacts related to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no land uses would be developed and operated at the Project site, and no traffic would be generated. Thus, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Odors

No impacts related to odors would occur under the Project or under Alternative A.

Biological Resources

This EIR concluded that Project potentially could result in significant impacts related to consistency with the MSHCP, Stephens' kangaroo rat, burrowing owl, consistency with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, riparian/riverine/vernal pool resources, and wetlands, but with implementation of Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-7, impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no grading/construction of the Project site would occur. No land uses would be developed and operated. Thus, no impacts related to biological resources would occur under Alternative A.

Cultural Resources

This EIR concluded that based on the known ethnographic and historic information for the region, the potential for finding buried remains in alluvium deposits, and the site's location adjacent to the foothills of the Tres Cerritos Foothills, there is a possibility that archaeological resources could be unearthed during excavation and grading activities. Additionally, although no paleontological resources or human remains are known to exist on the Project site, there is the remote possibility of an unanticipated discovery during grading and excavation of the Project site. Impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains under the Project potentially could be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-8, Project impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no ground disturbing activities would occur, and no impacts to cultural resources would occur.

Geology and Soils

This EIR concluded that soil samples from the Project site indicate a medium expansion potential, and Project impacts related to expansive soils could potentially be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure G-1, Project impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no grading/construction would occur, and no land uses would be developed. Thus, no impacts related to geology and soils would occur under this alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would comply with all mandatory regulatory requirements imposed by the State of California and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (the “SCAQMD”) aimed at reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. In addition, the Project would incorporate Project design features to further reduce GHG emissions. Overall, the Project would generate approximately 36,700.83 metric tons of GHG emission per year, and Project impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no grading/construction activities would occur, and no land uses would be developed and operated. Thus, no GHG emissions would be generated at the Project site. Therefore, no impacts related to GHG emissions would occur under Alternative A.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Risk of Upset

This EIR concluded that no recognized environmental conditions (RECs) are present at the Project site, and no impacts related to risk of upset would occur as a result of the Project.

Because there are no RECs at the Project site, no impacts related to risk of upset would occur under any of the Project Alternatives.

Airport Safety

This EIR concluded that the airport land use compatibility study noted that there are no relevant safety factors to consider related to the Project’s compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan Comprehensive Land Use Plan (the “CLUP”). However, Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 were provided to ensure future land use compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan Airport; impacts would be less than significant under the Project.

Under Alternative A, no development and operation of land uses would occur at the Project site, and as such no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Wildland Fires

This EIR concluded that development would occur within the portion of the Project site north of Devonshire Avenue that is within the moderate fire hazard zone. Mitigation Measure I-5 was identified to ensure that Project impacts related to wildland fires would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no development and operation of land uses would occur at the Project site, and as such no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Erosion/Siltation

This EIR concluded that Applicant would be required to implement best management practices (BMPs) outlined in a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to ensure that erosion and siltation would not occur during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to erosion/siltation would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no ground-disturbing activities or operational activities would occur at the Project, and thus, erosion/siltation impacts associated with such activities would occur. However, the Project site is currently exposed, and no BMPs are in operation at the site. The Project's implementation of BMPs could reduce erosion/siltation at the Project site over the existing condition.

Flooding/Stormdrain Capacity

This EIR concluded that the Project would include appropriately sized detention basins and other drainage infrastructure to ensure that runoff from the Project site under post-Project conditions would not exceed pre-Project conditions. No significant impacts related to flooding/stormdrain capacity would occur under the Project.

Under Alternative A, no development would occur at the Project site, and no impacts related to this issue would occur.

Water Quality

This EIR concluded that the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to protect water quality during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no ground-disturbing activities or operational activities would occur at the Project, and thus, water quality impacts associated with such activities would occur. However, the Project site is currently exposed, and no BMPs are in operation at the site. The Project's implementation of BMPs could improve water quality at the Project site over the existing condition.

100-year Flood Hazard

This EIR concluded that a small portion of the southwestern part of the Project site lies within a 100-year flood zone as designated by FEMA. However, the only Project development that would occur within this area includes surface parking and landscaping, neither of which would impede any flood flows within the flood zone. Additionally, the Project's Line BB storm drain would collect runoff and eliminate flooding along Florida Avenue and Myers Street. These flows would be collected and conveyed to the existing

storm drain culvert at the intersection of Warren Road and Florida Avenue. Therefore, Project impacts related to 100-year flood hazards would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no development would occur at the Project site, and no impacts related to this issue would occur.

Land Use and Planning

This EIR concluded that the Project would be substantially consistent with all applicable plans, policies, and regulations that apply to development of the Project site.

Under Alternative A, no development of the Project site would occur, and no impacts related to land use and planning would occur.

Noise

Construction

This EIR concluded that the Project's construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of the significance thresholds. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-1 through L-4, construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no construction activities would occur, and no construction-related noise would be generated. As such, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Operation

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and operation of the Project would not create any significant off-site noise impacts. However, on-site traffic noise levels could exceed the significance thresholds. With implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4 and L-5, Project impacts related to on-site traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no development and operation of land uses would occur at the Project site. Thus, no operational noise would be generated by this alternative. Therefore, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Vibration

This EIR concluded that the Project's construction activities would not generate construction-related vibration levels in excess of the significance thresholds, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no grading/construction would occur, and as such, no vibration would be generated. Thus, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Population and Housing

This EIR concluded that the Project would result in an increase of 954 dwelling units, approximately 2,470 residents, and 2,300 jobs at the Project site, and the population, housing, and employment growth associated with the Project would be consistent with the growth projections for the region. Project impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

Under Alternative A, no land uses would be developed, and no housing, population, or employment would be generated at the Project site. As such, no impacts related to this issue would occur under Alternative A.

Public Services

This EIR concluded that the Project would implement Mitigation Measures N-1 and N-2, requiring (a) formation of a or participation in the Public Safety CFD in accordance with City Council Resolution 3821, and (b) payment of DIF and/or construction of and/or funding the required public service improvements to and obtain DIF credit, in accordance with City Council Resolution 3981. Additionally, the Project Applicant would be required to pay school developer fees in order to ensure that Project impacts related to school services would be less than significant. The Project includes open space that exceeds the requirements of the City, and no significant impacts related to parks and recreational services would occur.

Under Alternative A, no development of land uses at the Project site would occur, and no additional demand for public services would occur over the existing condition. Thus, no impacts related to public services would occur under Alternative A.

Transportation/Traffic

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips. With implementation of mitigation identified in Section IV.O (Transportation/Traffic), the Project would result in significant unavoidable impacts at 2 study intersection under the Existing (2012) With-Project condition; 8 study intersections under the Opening Year (2015) With-Project condition; and 13 study intersections under the General Plan Buildout (post-2035) With-Project condition).

Under Alternative A, no development and operation of land uses would occur at the Project site, and no traffic would be generated. As such, no impacts related to transportation/traffic would occur under Alternative A.

Utilities

This EIR concluded that existing utility infrastructure and supply could accommodate the Project's demand for utility services.

Under Alternative A, no land uses would be developed and operated at the Project site, and no demand for utilities would occur. Thus, no impacts related to utility services would occur under Alternative A.

Relationship of Alternative A to the Project Objectives

Alternative A would not meet any of the Project objectives.

ALTERNATIVE B: NO SCHOOL

The No School Alternative (herein referred to as "Alternative B") assumes development of the Project site with land uses similar to the types and sizes included under the Project, but without the development of the elementary school. Specifically, Alternative B would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way (refer to Table VI-1). Implementation of Alternative B would require approval of the same discretionary actions described for the Project in Section III (Project Description).

Table VI-1
Alternative B: No School

Land Use Category	Acres	Units ¹	Square Feet	Planning Area
Residential				
Low Medium Density Residential	42.6	254 du	-	9, 10
Medium Density Residential	19.4	229 du	-	6, 7, 8
Village Residential	34.3	594 du	-	4, 5
Total	96.3	1,077 du	-	
Commercial Mixed-Use				3
Shopping Center	-	-	369,788	
General Office	-	-	166,000	
Total	43.0	-	536,788	
Parks/Open Space				
Community Park	11.2	-	-	2
Passive Parks	23.9	-	-	1
Total	35.1	-	-	
Street Right of Way	34.47	-	-	-
¹ Please note that the units listed on the table are used to determine total buildout instead of a calculation based on the maximum density allowed in each land use category. Source: The Planning Center, 2013.				

Aesthetics

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to scenic resources, scenic vistas, and visual character would be less than significant, and with implementation of Mitigation Measure B-1, impacts related to lighting would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The siting, massing, height, and architecture of the buildings and the types and amount of lighting under Alternative B would be similar to that of the Project. Because Alternative B includes development that is substantially similar to that proposed under the Project, the impacts and mitigation identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative.

Agricultural Resources

As discussed in Section IV.C (Agricultural Resources), a portion of the Project site is zoned A-5, and off-site properties at the northwestern and northeastern boundaries of the Project site are zoned A-10 and A-5, respectively. However, the land use designations identified in the General Plan for the Project site include Low-Density Residential for the northern portion of the site and Mixed Use for the mid to southern portions of the site. Similarly, the land use designations for the properties surrounding the Project site are also non-agricultural and include: Low-Density Residential to the north; High-Density Residential, Very-High-Density Residential, and Community Commercial to the east; Neighborhood Commercial and Community Commercial to the south; and Mixed Use to the west. This EIR concluded that although the Project would change the agricultural zoning for the Project site to Specific Plan, based on the General Plan, the intended use of the Project site and surrounding properties does not include agriculture, and as such, the change in the zoning of the site would not result in conflicts with existing agricultural zoning. Thus, Project impacts related to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative B would require the same zone change as requested under the Project and includes development that is substantially similar to that proposed under the Project, the less than significant impact related to agricultural resources identified for the Project would also occur under this alternative.

Air Quality

Consistency with the AQMP

The analysis of the Project's consistency with the AQMP in Section IV.D (Air Quality) conservatively assumed development of the Project site with 1,077 residential dwelling units and 535,788 square feet of commercial land uses, which the development included under Alternative B. This EIR concluded that development of the Project with 1,077 residential dwelling units and 535,788 square feet of commercial land uses would be consistent with the development and growth assumptions in the AQMP, and impacts related to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative B includes these same development assumptions, Alternative B also would be consistent with the AQMP, and impacts related to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

Regional Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that with implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2, Project impacts related to regional construction emissions would be less than significant. These same mitigation measures would be applicable to Alternative B, and impacts related to regional construction emissions under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative B, the amount of grading and construction required, including the maximum daily amount, would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. Thus, the amount of construction-related pollutant emissions associated with Alternative B would be approximately the same as under the Project, and implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Regional Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project's emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would exceed the significance thresholds, and Project impacts related to regional operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable, primarily due to mobile source emissions.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Tables VI-2 and VI-3, all emissions under Alternative B would be less than under the Project; this alternative would avoid the Project's significant unavoidable impact specific to PM_{2.5}. However, Alternative B would exceed the significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, and impacts related to regional operational emissions under this alternative would be significant and unavoidable, primarily due to mobile source emissions.

**Table VI-2
Summary of Summer Peak Operational Emissions – Alternative B
(in pounds per day)**

Operational Activity	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Area Source Emissions	46.91	1.08	91.72	-	1.79	1.77
Energy Source Emissions	0.88	7.60	3.56	0.05	0.67	0.61
Mobile Emissions	144.16	350.18	1,359.81	2.47	277.17	17.02
Maximum Daily Emissions – Alternative B	191.95	358.86	1,445.09	2.52	279.57	19.40
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	No
Maximum Daily Emissions - Project	320.60	441.06	2,077.06	3.95	404.74	73.01
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	YES

Source: Urban Crossroads, March 2013.

**Table VI-3
Summary of Winter Peak Operational Emissions – Alternative B
(in pounds per day)**

Operational Activity	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Area Source Emissions	46.91	1.08	91.72	-	1.79	1.77
Energy Source Emissions	0.88	7.60	3.56	0.05	0.61	0.61
Mobile Emissions	147.17	374.15	1,337.21	2.30	277.34	17.18
Maximum Daily Emissions – Alternative B	194.93	382.83	1,432.49	2.35	279.74	19.56
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	No
Maximum Daily Emissions - Project	320.60	441.06	2,077.06	3.95	404.74	73.01
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	YES

Source: Urban Crossroads, March 2013.

Localized Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to localized construction emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative B, the amount of grading and construction required would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. Thus, the amount of construction-related pollutant emissions associated with Alternative B would be approximately the same as under the Project. As such, impacts under Alternative B related to localized construction emissions under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Localized Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and Project impacts related to localized CO emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative B would generate approximately 23,619 daily trips (1,936 fewer than the Project), 1,030 AM peak-hour trips (816 fewer than the Project), and 1,664 PM peak-hour trips (376 fewer than the Project). As such, the amount of localized CO emissions generated under Alternative B would be less than under the Project, and impacts related to localized CO emissions would be less than significant.

Sensitive Receptors

This EIR concluded that the Project's design feature of a 100-foot buffer between any on-site or offsite sensitive receptor during construction activities would ensure that air quality impacts related to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The 100-foot buffer area as a project design feature also could be incorporated into Alternative B, and air quality impacts related to sensitive receptors under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Odors

Neither the Project nor Alternative B includes land uses typically associated with odors (e.g., agricultural uses, wastewater treatment, food processing, chemical plants, composting operations, refineries, etc.), and no significant impacts related to odors would occur.

Biological Resources

This EIR concluded that Project potentially could result in significant impacts related to consistency with the MSHCP, Stephens' kangaroo rat, burrowing owl, consistency with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, riparian/riverine/vernal pool resources, and wetlands, but with implementation of Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-7, impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. The overall development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative B includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to biological resources identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-7 also would apply to Alternative B. Thus, impacts related to biological resources under Alternative B would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

This EIR concluded that based on the known ethnographic and historic information for the region, the potential for finding buried remains in alluvium deposits, and the site's location adjacent to the foothills of the Tres Cerritos Foothills, there is a possibility that archaeological resources could be unearthed during excavation and grading activities. Additionally, although no paleontological resources or human remains are known to exist on the Project site, there is the remote possibility of an unanticipated discovery during grading and excavation of the Project site. Impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains under the Project potentially could be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-8, Project impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. The overall amount of grading and the development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative B includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to cultural resources identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-8 also would apply to Alternative B. Thus, impacts related to cultural resources under Alternative B would be less than significant.

Geology and Soils

This EIR concluded that soil samples from the Project site indicate a medium expansion potential, and Project impacts related to expansive soils could potentially be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure G-1, Project impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative B includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar types of land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to expansive soils identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measure G-1 also would apply to Alternative B. Thus, impacts related to geology and soils under Alternative B would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would comply with all mandatory regulatory requirements imposed by the State of California and the SCAQMD aimed at reducing GHG emissions. In addition, the Project would incorporate Project design features to further reduce GHG emissions. Overall, the Project would generate approximately 36,700.83 metric tons of GHG emission per year, and Project impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-4, Alternative B would generate approximately 36,210.09 metric tons of GHG emissions per year, less emissions than would be generated under the Project. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant under Alternative B.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Risk of Upset

This EIR concluded that no RECs are present at the Project site, and no impacts related to risk of upset would occur as a result of the Project.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open

space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative B includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to risk of upset identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative. Thus, impacts related to risk of upset under Alternative B would be less than significant.

Table VI-4
Total Annual (2020) GHG Emissions
With PDFs and State Requirements – Alternative B

Emission Source	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	Total CO ₂ E
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	167.42	0.01	-	167.43
Area	725.08	0.04	0.01	729.92
Energy	5,213.90	0.20	0.09	5,246.31
Mobile	28,566.83	1.17	-	28,591.44
Waste	275.66	16.29	-	617.78
Water	762.15	3.18	0.09	857.21
Total CO₂E – Alternative B	36,210.09			
Total CO₂E – Project	36,700.83			
<i>Source: Urban Crossroads, January 2013. Modeling results included in Appendix IV.H.</i>				

Airport Safety

This EIR concluded that the airport land use compatibility study noted that there are no relevant safety factors to consider related to the Project's compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan CLUP. However, Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 were provided to ensure future land use compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan Airport; impacts would be less than significant under the Project.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative B includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to airport safety identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 also would apply to Alternative B. Thus, impacts related to airport safety under Alternative B would be less than significant.

Wildland Fires

This EIR concluded that development would occur within the portion of the Project site north of Devonshire Avenue that is within the moderate fire hazard zone. Mitigation Measure I-4 was identified to ensure that Project impacts related to wildland fires would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative B includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to wildland fires identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measure I-4 also would apply to Alternative B. Thus, impacts related to wildland fires under Alternative B would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Erosion/Siltation

This EIR concluded that Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP to ensure that erosion and siltation would not occur during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to erosion/siltation would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall amount of construction and the development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project. Under any development scenario for the Project site (including Alternative B), the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP to ensure that erosion and siltation would not occur during the construction and operational phases of the development, and impacts related to erosion/siltation would be less than significant, including under Alternative B.

Flooding/Stormdrain Capacity

This EIR concluded that the Project would include appropriately sized detention basins and other drainage infrastructure to ensure that runoff from the Project site under post-Project conditions would not exceed pre-Project conditions. No significant impacts related to flooding/stormdrain capacity would occur under the Project.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling

units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project, and as such, the overall amount of runoff associated with Alternative B would be approximately the same as under the Project. Under any development scenario for the Project site (including Alternative B), the Applicant would be required to design and install appropriately sized drainage infrastructure at the Project site to ensure that post-development conditions do not exceed pre-development conditions, ensuring that impacts related to flooding/stormdrain capacity would be less than significant, including under Alternative B.

Water Quality

This EIR concluded that the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP and a WQMP to protect water quality during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project, and as such, the overall amount of runoff associated with Alternative B would be approximately the same as under the Project. Under Alternative B, the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP and a WQMP to ensure protection of water quality during the construction and operational phases of the development, and impacts under Alternative B related to water quality would be less than significant.

100-Year Flood Hazard

This EIR concluded that a small portion of the southwestern part of the Project site lies within a 100-year flood zone as designated by FEMA. However, the only Project development that would occur within this area includes surface parking and landscaping, neither of which would impede any flood flows within the flood zone. Additionally, the Project's Line BB storm drain would collect runoff and eliminate flooding along Florida Avenue and Myers Street. These flows would be collected and conveyed to the existing storm drain culvert at the intersection of Warren Road and Florida Avenue. Therefore, Project impacts related to 100-year flood hazards would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative B would be the same as under the Project. Under Alternative B, similar to the Project, the only development that would occur within the portion of the Project site that falls within the 100-year flood zone would be

surface parking and landscaping, and Alternative B also would include drainage infrastructure to collect and convey flows away from the Project site. As such, impacts under Alternative B related to 100-year flood hazards would be less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

This EIR concluded that the Project would be substantially consistent with all applicable plans, policies, and regulations that apply to development of the Project site, including the Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy, 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (the “2008 RCP”), Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (the “RTP/SCS”), Air Quality Management Plan (the “AQMP”), Riverside County Congestion Management Program (the “CMP”), Hemet-Ryan Airport Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (the “ALUP”), MSHCP, City’s General Plan, and City Zoning Code. Project impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because the overall types and sizes of land uses that would be developed under Alternative B would be similar to those under the Project, Alternative B also would be substantially consistent with the applicable plans, policies, and regulations that apply to the development of the Project site, and impacts related to land use and planning under Alternative B would be less than significant.

Noise

Construction

This EIR concluded that the Project’s construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of the significance thresholds. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-1 through L-4, construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative B, the amount of construction required would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. As such, the construction noise levels under Alternative B would be similar to those identified for the Project and could exceed the significance thresholds. Mitigation Measures L-1 through L-3 would apply to Alternative B, and construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant under this alternative.

Operation

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and operation of the Project would not create any significant off-site noise impacts. However, on-site traffic noise levels could exceed the significance thresholds. With implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4 and L-5, Project impacts related to on-site traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative B includes the development of very similar types and sizes of land uses as under the Project, the types of noise and associated noise levels would be very similar to that identified for the Project. Alternative B would generate approximately 23,619 daily trips (1,936 fewer than the Project), 1,030 AM peak-hour trips (816 fewer than the Project), and 1,664 PM peak-hour trips (376 fewer than the Project). As such, the traffic noise levels associated with Alternative B would exceed the significance threshold. However, similar to the Project, with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4 and L-5, impacts related to on-site traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Vibration

This EIR concluded that the Project's construction activities would not generate construction-related vibration levels in excess of the significance thresholds, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but without development of a school. Alternative B would include 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative B, the amount of construction required would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. As such, the construction-related vibration levels under Alternative B would be similar to those identified for the Project and would not exceed the significance thresholds. Similar to the Project, impacts under Alternative B related to construction vibration would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

This EIR concluded that the Project would result in an increase of 954 dwelling units, approximately 2,470 residents, and 2,300 jobs at the Project site, and the population, housing, and employment growth associated with the Project would be consistent with the growth projections for the region. Project impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative B would generate 123 more dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,789 residents (319 more than the Project); and 1,686 jobs (refer to Table VI-5) (614 fewer than the Project). As shown on Table VI-6, the population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative B would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, growth under Alternative B would be consistent with regional growth projections, and impacts related to population and housing under Alternative B would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

**Table VI-5
Approximate Employee Generation – Alternative B**

Land Use	Size¹	Employee Rate²	Employees
Office	91,084 sf	0.00479/sf	436
Institutional	139,305 sf	0.00304/sf	423
Shopping Center	305,399 sf	0.00271/sf	827
Total			1,686
¹ <i>The square footages for Alternative B are based on the overall square foot percentages for the same land uses under the Project.</i>			
² <i>LAUSD 2012 Developer Fee Justification Study, February 2012.</i>			

Public Services

Fire Protection Services

This EIR concluded that the Project's increase in the number of residents (approximately 2,470) and employees (approximately 2,300) would increase the need for fire protection and emergency medical services at the Project site. However, the Project Applicant would be required to implement Mitigation Measures N-1, requiring (a) formation of a or participation in the Public Safety CFD in accordance with City Council Resolution 3821, and (b) payment of DIF and/or construction and/or funding the required fire protection services improvements to and obtain DIF credit, in accordance with City Council Resolution 3981. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1, Project impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As discussed previously, Alternative B would generate 123 more dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,789 residents (319 more than the Project); and 1,686 jobs (refer to Table VI-5) (614 fewer than the Project). As shown on Table VI-6, the population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative B would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services under Alternative B

would be similar to that under the Project. Under Alternative B, Mitigation Measure N-1 also would be required, and impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

**Table VI-6
Change in Population, Housing, and Employment and Percentage of Change
Alternative B**

County of Riverside									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %
2008 to 2020	464,000	0.59	0.60	155,000	0.61	0.69	275,000	0.83	0.61
2020 to 2035	732,000	0.37	0.38	258,000	0.36	0.41	204,000	1.12	0.82
2008 to 2035	1,196,000	0.22	0.23	413,000	0.23	0.26	479,000	0.48	0.35
City of Hemet									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %
2008 to 2020	7,000	39.1	39.8	3,800	25.1	28.3	13,600	16.9	12.3
2020 to 2035	26,900	10.1	10.3	12,200	7.8	8.8	12,700	18.1	13.2
2008 to 2035	33,900	8.0	8.2	16,000	5.9	6.7	26,300	8.7	6.4
Census Tract 43504									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. B %
2008 to 2020	2,630	104.1	106.0	1,467	65.0	73.4	2,535	90.7	66.5
2020 to 2035	3,874	70.7	71.9	1,806	58.8	59.6	3,221	71.4	52.3
2008 to 2035	6,504	42.1	42.8	3,273	29.1	32.9	5,756	39.9	29.2
^a Refer to Table IV.M-1 in Section IV.M (Population and Housing)									
NA = Not Available									

Police Services

This EIR concluded that the Project's increase in the number of residents (approximately 2,470) and employees (approximately 2,300) would increase the need for police services at the Project site. However, the Project Applicant would be required to implement Mitigation Measures N-2, requiring (a) formation of a or participation in the Public Safety CFD in accordance with City Council Resolution 3821, and (b) payment of DIF and/or construction and/or funding the required police protection services improvements to and obtain DIF credit, in accordance with City Council Resolution 3981. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2, Project impacts related to police services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As discussed previously, Alternative B would generate 123 more dwelling units

than the Project; approximately 2,789 residents (319 more than the Project); and 1,686 jobs (refer to Table VI-5) (614 fewer than the Project). As shown on Table VI-6, the population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative B would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, the demand for police services under Alternative B would be similar to that under the Project. Also, the design features identified for the Project to reduce the need for police services also could be implemented under Alternative B. Further, this alternative would be subject to review by the HPD and would be required to comply with the requirements of the HPD. Under Alternative B, Mitigation Measure N-2 also would be required, and impacts related to police services under Alternative B would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

School Services

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 568 students, including 307 elementary students, 87 middle school students, and 174 high school students. Pursuant to the California Government Code and the City’s Municipal Code, payment of the school fees established by the Hemet Unified School District (the “HUSD”) in accordance with existing rules and regulations regarding the calculation and payment of such fees would, by law, mitigate any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools. Therefore, Project impacts to school services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way and would generate approximately 568 school children (refer to Table VI-7). Similar to the Project, under Alternative B, payment of school fees established by the HUSD would be required and would mitigate any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools. Therefore, impacts related to school services under Alternative B would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

**Table VI-7
Estimated Student Generation – Alternative B**

Use Type	Amount of Development	School Type	Student Generation Factor^a	Total Students Generated
Residential	1,077 du	Elementary School (K-5)	0.285	307
		Middle School (6-8)	0.081	87
		High School (9-12)	0.162	174
			Total	568
<i>du = dwelling unit Number of students has been rounded to the nearest whole number.</i> ^a <i>Hemet Unified School District, Student Generation Rate Calculation, 2013.</i>				

Parks and Recreational Services

This EIR concluded that based on the City's performance standard for parks (i.e., 5 acres/1,000 residents), the Project would be required to provide approximately 12.5 acres of parkland. Thus, the Project's inclusion of approximately 35.1 acres of open space and recreational areas would exceed the City's requirement for parkland, and impacts related to parks and recreational services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Based on the City's park performance standard, Alternative B would require 13.9 acres of parkland. Because this alternative would include the same amount of parks and recreational areas as under the Project, the amount of parkland included as part of Alternative B also would exceed the City's requirements, and impacts related to parks and recreational services would be less than significant.

Library Services

This EIR concluded that the Project would create a need for approximately 6,175 to 6,792 books, 1,235 to 1,482 square feet of library space, and 9 library seats. The City provides for library services through the City's DIF in accordance with City Council Resolution No. 3981. The additional library facilities and material costs in the City due to buildout of the Project would be offset through the payment of the required DIF. Project impacts related to library services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Based on state standards for library services, Alternative B would create a need for approximately 6,972 to 7,669 books, 1,394 to 1,673 square feet of library space, and 10 library seats. The HPL has a second floor available for expansion in the future, as demand is needed. Similar to the Project, payment of the DIF would be required under Alternative B that would offset the cost of additional library facilities and material costs. Therefore, impacts related to library services under this alternative would be less than significant.

Transportation/Traffic

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips. With implementation of mitigation identified in Section IV.O (Transportation/Traffic), the Project would result in significant unavoidable impacts at 2 study intersection under the Existing (2012) With-Project condition; 8 study intersections under the Near-Term (2015) With-Project condition; and 13 study intersections under the General Plan Cumulative Buildout (post-2035) With-Project condition) (refer to Table VI-8).

**Table VI-8
Traffic Impacts - Alternative B**

Study Intersection	Impact Under the Project		Impact Under Alternative B	
	AM	PM	AM	PM
Existing (2012) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 9		SU		SU
Intersection 12		LTS w/M		*
Near-Term (2015) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 8		SU		SU
Intersection 9	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 11		SU		SU
Intersection 12	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 13	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 15		SU		*
Intersection 16		SU		SU
Intersection 27	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 32		SU		*
Intersection 34	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 39		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 40	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 41		SU		SU
Intersection 42		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 45	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 46	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
General Plan Cumulative Buildout (Post-2035) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 2	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 3		SU		SU
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 6	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 8	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 9	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 11	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 12	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 13	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 14		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 15	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 16		SU		SU
Intersection 27	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 32	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 34	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M

**Table VI-8
Traffic Impacts - Alternative B**

Study Intersection	Impact Under the Project		Impact Under Alternative B	
	AM	PM	AM	PM
Intersection 35	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 36	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 38		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 39	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 40	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 41	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 42		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 44		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 45	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 46	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 47	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 49		SU		SU

SU = Significant unavoidable impacts LTS w/M = Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation

Note: The LTS w/M impacts conclusions assumes that all of the improvements shown on Table IV.O-19 in Section IV.O (Transportation/Traffic) would be implemented. However, as discussed in Section IV.O, full funding and timing of implementation (in relation to buildout of the Project) of some of the improvements required to reduce impacts to less than significant are not guaranteed. Therefore, impacts at these intersections would remain significant and unavoidable.

** Impact would not occur under the alternative.*

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative B would generate approximately 24,610 daily trips (945 fewer than the Project), 1,424 AM peak-hour trips (422 fewer than the Project), and 1,886 PM peak-hour trips (174 fewer than the Project). As shown on Table VI-8, with implementation of mitigation identified in Section IV.O, Alternative B would result in significant unavoidable impacts at 2 study intersection under the Existing (2012) With-Project condition; 6 study intersections under the Near-Term (2015) With-Project condition; and 13 study intersections under the General Plan Cumulative Buildout (post-2035) With-Project condition. Thus, Alternative B would result one less significant unavoidable impact than the Project.

Utilities

Wastewater

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate an approximate average flow of 224.4 gallons of wastewater per minute (or 322,560 gpd) and an approximate peak flow of 561.1 gallons of wastewater per minute (or 807,984 gpd). The existing capacity of the San Jacinto Valley Regional Water Reclamation Facility (the “SJVRWF”) would have adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the Project.

Therefore, implementation of the Project would not require construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The amount of wastewater that would be generated by this alternative (an average flow of 209.3 gallons per minute and a peak flow of 523.3 gallons of wastewater per minute) would be somewhat less than that identified for the Project.² Thus, the existing capacity of the SJVRWRF could accommodate the wastewater treatment needs of Alternative B, and impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

Water

The Water and Wastewater Plan of Service estimated that the Project would consume an average of approximately 427.0 gallons of water per minute.³ Based on the water supply assessment prepared by Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD), the Project's water supply needs could be accommodated by EMWD. Project impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The land use assumptions (types and densities) used to estimate the water supply consumption for the Project are substantially the same as for Alternative B. As such, the amount of water that would be consumed by this alternative (an average of 425.1 gallons per minute) would be somewhat less than that identified for the Project.⁴ Thus, Alternative B's water supply consumption could be accommodated by EMWD, and impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

² Calculations are included in Appendix VI.

³ The Project's water consumption estimates in the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service are more conservative than those estimated by EMWD for purposes of the Water Supply Assessment and the Project's water supply demand, because the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service estimates are used to determine the appropriate conveyance infrastructure sizing, whereas EMWD's estimates are closer to actual water supply demand of the Project. Because water consumption estimates were only prepared by EMWD for the Project and not the Alternatives, the comparison of water consumption between the Project and the Alternatives is based on the water consumption assumptions from the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service.

⁴ Calculations are included in Appendix VI.

Solid Waste

Construction

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 4,095 tons of solid waste during the construction phase (conservatively assuming no recycling efforts). The remaining combined daily intake capacity of the landfills serving the Project area is 10,605 tons per day (tpd). As such, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by the Project. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of construction waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Therefore, Project impacts related to construction solid waste disposal would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-9, Alternative B would generate approximately 4,203 tons of solid waste during the construction phase (conservatively assuming no recycling efforts). Because the landfills serving the Project area have a remaining combined daily intake capacity of 10,605 tpd, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by Alternative B. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of construction waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Therefore, impacts related to construction solid waste disposal under Alternative B would be less than significant.

**Table VI-9
Construction Solid Waste Generation – Alternative B**

Land Use	Size (sf)	Generation Rate (lbs/sf)¹	Total Daily Solid Waste Generation (tons)
Residential	1,443,600	4.38	3,161
Commercial	535,788	3.89	1,042
Total Alternative B			4,203 tons
Total Project			4,095 tons
<i>sf = square feet lbs = pounds</i>			
¹ <i>U.S. EPA Report No EPA530-98-010, Characterization of Building Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States, June 1998. Applied generation rates are averages of empirical waste assessments of residential demolition, non-residential demolition, residential construction, and non-residential construction waste streams in the United States.</i>			

Operation

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 9.53 tons of solid waste per day during the Project’s operation phase, conservatively assuming no recycling efforts. As stated previously, the remaining combined daily intake capacity of the landfills serving the Project area is 10,605 tpd. As such, these facilities would have adequate capacity to accommodate the daily operational waste (9.53 tons)

generated by the Project. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Also, the Project would be required to participate in the City's on-going recycling efforts (refer to Mitigation Measures P-1 through P-9) to further reduce the need the landfill capacity. Therefore, Project impacts related to operational solid waste disposal would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-10, Alternative B would generate approximately 9.48 tons of solid waste per day. Because the landfills serving the Project area have a remaining combined daily intake capacity of 10,605 tpd, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by Alternative B. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of solid waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Also, development under Alternative B would be required to participate in the City's on-going recycling efforts (refer to Mitigation Measures P-1 through P-18) to further reduce the need the landfill capacity. Therefore, impacts related to operational solid waste disposal under Alternative B would be less than significant.

**Table VI-10
Operation Solid Waste Generation – Alternative B**

Land Use	Size	Generation Rate (lbs/1,000 sf/day)	Total Daily Solid Waste Generation (lbs/day)
Residential Units	1,077 DU	12.23 lbs/unit/day	13,171
General Office	166,000 sf	0.006 lbs/sf/day	996
Shopping Center	369,788 sf	0.013 lbs/sf/day	4,807
Parks/Open Space	37.1 acres	---	---
Total Daily Waste			18,974 (9.48 tons)
<i>sf = square feet DU = dwelling unit</i>			

Energy

Electricity

This EIR concluded that the Project would consume approximately 16,616,409 kilowatts per hour (kWh) per year, representing approximately two percent of the County of Riverside's (the "County") forecasted electricity consumption of 684,601,745 kWh per year in 2030 for the County as a whole. Therefore, it is anticipated that Southern California Edison's (SCE) existing and planned electrical capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support the Project's electricity consumption. Therefore, the Project would not require the acquisition of additional electricity resources beyond those that are anticipated by SCE, and impacts related to electricity service would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-11, Alternative B would consume approximately 13,201,578 kWh per year of electricity, less electricity than would be consumed under the Project. As such, SCE's existing and planned electrical capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support Alternative B's electricity consumption. Therefore, Alternative B would not require the acquisition of additional electricity resources beyond those that are anticipated by SCE, and impacts related to electricity service would be less than significant.

**Table VI-11
Electricity Consumption – Alternative B**

Land Use	Size	Consumption Rate	Electricity Demand (kw-h/yr)
Residential	1,077 du	5,626.50 kw-h/du	6,059,740
General Office	166,000 sf	12.95 kw-h/sf	2,149,700
Shopping Center	369,788 sf	13.55 kw-h/sf	4,992,138
Total Alternative B			13,201,578
Total Project			16,616,409
<i>du=dwelling unit; sf=square feet; kw-h = kilowatt-hour; yr = year</i>			

Natural Gas

This EIR concluded that the Project's natural gas consumption of approximately 6,151,018 cubic feet (cf)/month would represent a fraction of one percent of SoCal Gas's total natural gas consumption for projected year 2030 in the County, which is roughly 5.3 billion cf. The Project would not require the acquisition of additional natural gas resources beyond those that are anticipated by SoCal Gas, and impacts related to natural gas services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative B, the Project site would be developed with 1,077 dwelling units (of varying types), 535,788 square feet of commercial mixed-use land uses, 35.1 acres of parks/open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-12, Alternative B would consume approximately 5,724,770 cf of natural gas per month, less natural gas than would be consumed under the Project. Therefore, Alternative B would not require the acquisition of additional natural gas resources beyond those that are anticipated by SoCal Gas, and impacts related to natural gas service would be less than significant.

**Table VI-12
Natural Gas Consumption – Alternative B**

Land Use	Size	Consumption Rate	Natural Gas Demand (cf/mo)
Residential	1,077 du	4,011.5 cf/du	4,320,385
General Office	166,000 sf	2.0 cf/mo/sf	332,000
Retail	369,788 sf	2.9 cf/mo/sf	1,072,385
Total Alternative B			5,724,770
Total Project			6,151,018
<i>du=dwelling unit; sf=square feet; cf=cubic feet; mo=month</i>			

Relationship of Alternative B to the Project Objectives

Alternative B would meet all of the Project Objectives, which include the following:

1. Expand the range of housing choices in the City of Hemet to serve a range of lifestyles, including first-time buyers, young singles and couples, families, empty nesters, and seniors, by providing both attached and detached housing options at a variety of densities, configurations, and prices.
2. Provide a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses, strategically located recreational facilities, and a desirable package of amenities to encourage outdoor activity and create a sense of community and identity.
3. Utilize onsite drainage and utility corridors as opportunities to balance cut and fill as well as provide recreational amenities, walkable connections, and add value to the community.
4. Implement the goals and policies of the City of Hemet General Plan to encourage a balanced and sustainable pattern of land use and implement high-quality pedestrian-oriented design.
5. Establish plans for the improvement and/or development of new public infrastructure to serve the project area consistent with applicable master plans.
6. Create an integrated and interconnected community that allows residents to access the various amenities, shops, and services without the need to use the automobile.
7. Provide for new residential, commercial, and open space development that is integrated with existing and planned surrounding development.
8. Enhance the economic well being of the City by locating uses that capitalize on the Florida Avenue frontage.

9. Enhance the City's existing job base through the creation of a broad range of employment and career opportunities.
10. Accommodate a range of commercial, service, and professional business and employment options to meet the needs of the market and to create a project that is fiscally positive.
11. Provide flexible standards to allow the project to best meet market demand at the time of development.

ALTERNATIVE C: RESIDENTIAL-ORIENTED

The Residential-Oriented Alternative (herein referred to as "Alternative C") assumes development of the Project site with land uses similar to the types and sizes included under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Specifically, Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way (refer to Table VI-13). Implementation of Alternative C would require approval of the same discretionary actions described for the Project in Section III (Project Description).

Table VI-13
Alternative C: Residential-Oriented

Land Use Category	Size
Residential	
Single-Family	254 du
Condos/Townhomes	491 du
Apartments	<u>332 du</u>
<i>Total</i>	<i>1,077 du</i>
General Office	166,000 sf
Elementary School	750 students
Shopping Center	369,788 sf
Parks/Open Space	
Community Park	11.2 acres
Passive Parks	23.9 acres
Street Right-of-Way	34.47 acres
<i>du = dwelling unit sf = square feet</i>	
<i>Source: The Planning Center, 2013.</i>	

Aesthetics

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to scenic resources, scenic vistas, and visual character would be less than significant, and with implementation of Mitigation Measure B-1, impacts related to lighting would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The siting, massing, height, and architecture of the buildings and the types and amount of lighting under Alternative C would be similar to that of the Project. Because Alternative C includes development that is substantially similar to that proposed under the Project, the impacts and mitigation identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative.

Agricultural Resources

As discussed in Section IV.C (Agricultural Resources), a portion of the Project site is zoned A-5, and off-site properties at the northwestern and northeastern boundaries of the Project site are zoned A-10 and A-5, respectively. However, the land use designations identified in the General Plan for the Project site include Low-Density Residential for the northern portion of the site and Mixed Use for the mid to southern portions of the site. Similarly, the land use designations for the properties surrounding the Project site are also non-agricultural and include: Low-Density Residential to the north; High-Density Residential, Very-High-Density Residential, and Community Commercial to the east; Neighborhood Commercial and Community Commercial to the south; and Mixed Use to the west. This EIR concluded that although the Project would change the agricultural zoning for the Project site to Specific Plan, based on the General Plan, the intended use of the Project site and surrounding properties does not include agriculture, and as such, the change in the zoning of the site would not result in conflicts with existing agricultural zoning. Thus, Project impacts related to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative C would require the same zone change as requested under the Project and includes development that is substantially similar to that proposed under the Project, the less than significant impact related to agricultural resources identified for the Project would also occur under this alternative.

Air Quality

Consistency with the AQMP

The analysis of the Project's consistency with the AQMP in Section IV.D (Air Quality) conservatively assumed development of the Project site with 1,077 residential dwelling units and 535,788 square feet of commercial land uses, which the development included under Alternative C. This EIR concluded that development of the Project with 1,077 residential dwelling units and 535,788 square feet of commercial

land uses would be consistent with the development and growth assumptions in the AQMP, and impacts related to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative C includes these same development assumptions, Alternative C also would be consistent with the AQMP, and impacts related to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

Regional Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that with implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2, Project impacts related to regional construction emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative C, the amount of grading and construction required, including the maximum daily amount, would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. These same mitigation measures would be applicable to Alternative C, and impacts related to regional construction emissions under this alternative also would be less than significant. Thus, the amount of construction-related pollutant emissions associated with Alternative C would be approximately the same as under the Project, and implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Regional Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project's emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would exceed the significance thresholds, and Project impacts related to regional operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable, primarily due to mobile source emissions.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Tables VI-14 and VI-15, all emissions under Alternative C would be less than under the Project; this alternative would avoid the Project's significant unavoidable impact specific to PM_{2.5}. However, Alternative C would exceed the

significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, and impacts related to regional operational emissions under this alternative would be significant and unavoidable, primarily due to mobile source emissions.

Table VI-14
Summary of Summer Peak Operational Emissions – Alternative C
(in pounds per day)

Operational Activity	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Area Source Emissions	48.55	1.08	91.72	-	1.79	1.77
Energy Source Emissions	0.81	6.97	3.17	0.14	0.56	0.56
Mobile Emissions	127.76	306.37	1,183.94	2.12	237.13	14.62
Maximum Daily Emissions – Alternative C	177.12	314.12	1,278.83	2.16	239.48	16.95
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	No
Maximum Daily Emissions - Project	320.60	441.06	2,077.06	3.95	404.74	73.01
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	YES

Source: Urban Crossroads, March 2013.

Table VI-15
Summary of Winter Peak Operational Emissions – Alternative C
(in pounds per day)

Operational Activity	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Area Source Emissions	48.55	1.08	91.72	-	1.79	1.77
Energy Source Emissions	0.81	6.97	3.17	0.04	0.56	0.56
Mobile Emissions	130.12	326.64	1,172.14	1.97	237.29	14.78
Maximum Daily Emissions – Alternative C	179.48	334.69	1,267.03	2.01	239.64	17.11
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	No
Maximum Daily Emissions - Project	320.60	441.06	2,077.06	3.95	404.74	73.01
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	YES

Source: Urban Crossroads, March 2013.

Localized Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to localized construction emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative C, the amount of grading and construction required would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. Thus, the amount of construction-related pollutant emissions associated with Alternative C would be approximately the same as under the Project. As such, impacts under Alternative C related to localized construction emissions under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Localized Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and Project impacts related to localized CO emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative C would generate approximately 22,363 daily trips (3,192 fewer than the Project), 1,512 AM peak-hour trips (334 fewer than the Project), and 1,771 PM peak-hour trips (269 fewer than the Project). As such, the amount of localized CO emissions generated under Alternative C would be less than under the Project, and impacts related to localized CO emissions would be less than significant.

Sensitive Receptors

This EIR concluded that the Project's design feature of a 100-foot buffer between any on-site or offsite sensitive receptor during construction activities would ensure that air quality impacts related to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The 100-foot buffer area as a project design feature also could be incorporated into Alternative C, and air quality impacts related to sensitive receptors under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Odors

Neither the Project nor Alternative C includes land uses typically associated with odors (e.g., agricultural uses, wastewater treatment, food processing, chemical plants, composting operations, refineries, etc.), and no significant impacts related to odors would occur.

Biological Resources

This EIR concluded that Project potentially could result in significant impacts related to consistency with the MSHCP, Stephens' kangaroo rat, burrowing owl, consistency with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, riparian/riverine/vernal pool resources, and wetlands, but with implementation of Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-7, impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. The overall development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative C includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to biological resources identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-7 also would apply to Alternative C. Thus, impacts related to biological resources under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

This EIR concluded that based on the known ethnographic and historic information for the region, the potential for finding buried remains in alluvium deposits, and the site's location adjacent to the foothills of the Tres Cerritos Foothills, there is a possibility that archaeological resources could be unearthed during excavation and grading activities. Additionally, although no paleontological resources or human remains are known to exist on the Project site, there is the remote possibility of an unanticipated discovery during grading and excavation of the Project site. Impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains under the Project potentially could be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-8, Project impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. The overall amount of grading and the development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative C includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to cultural resources identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-8 also would apply to Alternative C. Thus, impacts related to cultural resources under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Geology and Soils

This EIR concluded that soil samples from the Project site indicate a medium expansion potential, and Project impacts related to expansive soils could potentially be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure G-1, Project impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative C includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar types of land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to expansive soils identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measure G-1 also would apply to Alternative C. Thus, impacts related to geology and soils under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would comply with all mandatory regulatory requirements imposed by the State of California and the SCAQMD aimed at reducing GHG emissions. In addition, the Project would incorporate Project design features to further reduce GHG emissions. Overall, the Project would generate approximately 36,700.83 metric tons of GHG emission per year, and Project impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-16, Alternative C would generate approximately 36,210.09 metric tons of GHG emissions per year, less emissions than would be generated under the Project. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant under Alternative C.

**Table VI-16
Total Annual (2020) GHG Emissions
With PDFs and State Requirements – Alternative C**

Emission Source	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	Total CO ₂ E
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	167.42	0.01	-	167.43
Area	725.08	0.04	0.01	729.92
Energy	5,213.90	0.20	0.09	5,246.31
Mobile	28,566.83	1.17	-	28,591.44
Waste	275.66	16.29	-	617.78
Water	762.15	3.18	0.09	857.21
Total CO₂E – Alternative C	36,210.09			
Total CO₂E – Project	36,700.83			
<i>Source: Urban Crossroads, January 2013. Modeling results included in Appendix IV.H.</i>				

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Risk of Upset

This EIR concluded that no RECs are present at the Project site, and no impacts related to risk of upset would occur as a result of the Project.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative C includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to risk of upset identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative. Thus, impacts related to risk of upset under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Airport Safety

This EIR concluded that the airport land use compatibility study noted that there are no relevant safety factors to consider related to the Project's compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan CLUP. However, Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 were provided to ensure future land use compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan Airport; impacts would be less than significant under the Project.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C

would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative C includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to airport safety identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 also would apply to Alternative C. Thus, impacts related to airport safety under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Wildland Fires

This EIR concluded that development would occur within the portion of the Project site north of Devonshire Avenue that is within the moderate fire hazard zone. Mitigation Measure I-5 was identified to ensure that Project impacts related to wildland fires would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative C includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to wildland fires identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measure I-4 also would apply to Alternative C. Thus, impacts related to wildland fires under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Erosion/Siltation

This EIR concluded that Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP to ensure that erosion and siltation would not occur during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to erosion/siltation would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall amount of construction and the development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project. Under any development scenario for the Project site (including Alternative C), the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP to ensure that erosion and siltation would not occur during the

construction and operational phases of the development, and impacts related to erosion/siltation would be less than significant, including under Alternative C.

Flooding/Stormdrain Capacity

This EIR concluded that the Project would include appropriately sized detention basins and other drainage infrastructure to ensure that runoff from the Project site under post-Project conditions would not exceed pre-Project conditions. No significant impacts related to flooding/stormdrain capacity would occur under the Project.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project, and as such, the overall amount of runoff associated with Alternative C would be approximately the same as under the Project. Under any development scenario for the Project site (including Alternative C), the Applicant would be required to design and install appropriately sized drainage infrastructure at the Project site to ensure that post-development conditions do not exceed pre-development conditions, ensuring that impacts related to flooding/stormdrain capacity would be less than significant, including under Alternative C.

Water Quality

This EIR concluded that the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP and a WQMP to protect water quality during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project, and as such, the overall amount of runoff associated with Alternative C would be approximately the same as under the Project. Under Alternative C, the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP and a WQMP to ensure protection of water quality during the construction and operational phases of the development, and impacts under Alternative C related to water quality would be less than significant.

100-Year Flood Hazard

This EIR concluded that a small portion of the southwestern part of the Project site lies within a 100-year flood zone as designated by FEMA. However, the only Project development that would occur within this area includes surface parking and landscaping, neither of which would impede any flood flows within the flood zone. Additionally, the Project's Line BB storm drain would collect runoff and eliminate flooding along Florida Avenue and Myers Street. These flows would be collected and conveyed to the existing storm drain culvert at the intersection of Warren Road and Florida Avenue. Therefore, Project impacts related to 100-year flood hazards would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative C would be the same as under the Project. Under Alternative C, similar to the Project, the only development that would occur within the portion of the Project site that falls within the 100-year flood zone would be surface parking and landscaping, and Alternative C also would include drainage infrastructure to collect and convey flows away from the Project site. As such, impacts under Alternative C related to 100-year flood hazards would be less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

This EIR concluded that the Project would be substantially consistent with all applicable plans, policies, and regulations that apply to development of the Project site, including the Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy, 2008 RCP, RTP/SCS, AQMP, CMP, ALUP, MSHCP, City's General Plan, and City Zoning Code. Project impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because the overall types and sizes of land uses that would be developed under Alternative C would be similar to those under the Project, Alternative C also would be substantially consistent with the applicable plans, policies, and regulations that apply to the development of the Project site, and impacts related to land use and planning under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Noise

Construction

This EIR concluded that the Project's construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of the significance thresholds. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-1 through L-4, construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative C, the amount of construction required would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. As such, the construction noise levels under Alternative C would be similar to those identified for the Project and could exceed the significance thresholds. Mitigation Measures L-1 through L-3 would apply to Alternative C, and construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant under this alternative.

Operation

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and operation of the Project would not create any significant off-site noise impacts. However, on-site traffic noise levels could exceed the significance thresholds. With implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4 and L-5, Project impacts related to on-site traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative C includes the development of very similar types and sizes of land uses as under the Project, the types of noise and associated noise levels would be very similar to that identified for the Project. Alternative C would generate approximately 22,363 daily trips (3,192 fewer than the Project), 1,512 AM peak-hour trips (334 fewer than the Project), and 1,771 PM peak-hour trips (269 fewer than the Project). As such, the traffic noise levels associated with Alternative B would exceed the significance threshold. However, similar to the Project, with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4 and L-5, impacts related to on-site traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Vibration

This EIR concluded that the Project's construction activities would not generate construction-related vibration levels in excess of the significance thresholds, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative C, the amount of construction required would be approximately the same as under the Project, and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be approximately the same. As such, the construction-related vibration levels under Alternative C would be similar to those identified for the Project and would not exceed the significance thresholds. Similar to the Project, impacts under Alternative C related to construction vibration would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

This EIR concluded that the Project would result in an increase of 954 dwelling units, approximately 2,470 residents, and 2,300 jobs at the Project site, and the population, housing, and employment growth associated with the Project would be consistent with the growth projections for the region. Project impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative C would generate 123 more dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,789 residents (319 more than the Project); and 2,367 jobs (refer to Table VI-17) (67 more than the Project). As shown on Table VI-18, the population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative C would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, growth under Alternative C would be consistent with regional growth projections, and impacts related to population and housing under Alternative C would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

Table VI-17
Approximate Employee Generation – Alternative C

Land Use	Size	Employee Rate ¹	Employees
Office	166,000 sf	0.00479/sf	795
Elementary School	187,500 sf	0.00304/sf	570
Shopping Center	369,788 sf	0.00271/sf	1,002
Total			2,367

¹ LAUSD 2012 Developer Fee Justification Study, February 2012.

Table VI-18
Change in Population, Housing, and Employment and Percentage of Change
Alternative C

County of Riverside									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %
2008 to 2020	464,000	0.59	0.60	155,000	0.61	0.69	275,000	0.83	0.86
2020 to 2035	732,000	0.37	0.38	258,000	0.36	0.41	204,000	1.12	1.16
2008 to 2035	1,196,000	0.22	0.23	413,000	0.23	0.26	479,000	0.48	0.49
City of Hemet									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %
2008 to 2020	7,000	39.1	39.8	3,800	25.1	28.3	13,600	16.9	17.4
2020 to 2035	26,900	10.1	10.3	12,200	7.8	8.8	12,700	18.1	18.6
2008 to 2035	33,900	8.0	8.2	16,000	5.9	6.7	26,300	8.7	9.0
Census Tract 43504									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. C %
2008 to 2020	2,630	104.1	106.0	1,467	65.0	73.4	2,535	90.7	93.3
2020 to 2035	3,874	70.7	71.9	1,806	58.8	59.6	3,221	71.4	73.4
2008 to 2035	6,504	42.1	42.8	3,273	29.1	32.9	5,756	39.9	41.1

^a Refer to Table IV.M-1 in Section IV.M (Population and Housing)

Public Services

Fire Protection Services

This EIR concluded that the Project's increase in the number of residents (approximately 2,470) and employees (approximately 2,300) would increase the need for fire protection and emergency medical services at the Project site. However, the Project Applicant would be required to implement Mitigation Measures N-1, requiring (a) formation of a or participation in the Public Safety CFD in accordance with

City Council Resolution 3821, and (b) payment of DIF and/or construction and/or funding the required fire protection services improvements to and obtain DIF credit, in accordance with City Council Resolution 3981. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1, Project impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As discussed previously, Alternative C would generate 123 more dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,789 residents (319 more than the Project); and 2,367 jobs (refer to Table VI-17) (67 more than the Project). As shown on Table VI-18, the population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative C would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services under Alternative C would be similar to that under the Project. Under Alternative C, Mitigation Measure N-2 also would be required, and impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

Police Services

This EIR concluded that the Project's increase in the number of residents (approximately 2,470) and employees (approximately 2,300) would increase the need for police services at the Project site. However, the Project Applicant would be required to implement Mitigation Measures N-2, requiring (a) formation of a or participation in the Public Safety CFD in accordance with City Council Resolution 3821, and (b) payment of DIF and/or construction and/or funding the required police protection services improvements to and obtain DIF credit, in accordance with City Council Resolution 3981. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2, Project impacts related to police services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As discussed previously, Alternative C would generate 123 more dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,789 residents (319 more than the Project); and 2,367 jobs (refer to Table VI-17) (67 more than the Project). As shown on Table VI-18, the population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative C would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, the demand for police services under Alternative C would be similar to that under the Project. Also, the design features identified for the Project to reduce the need for police services also could be implemented under Alternative C. Further, this alternative would be subject to review by the HPD and would be required to comply with the requirements of the

HPD. Under Alternative C, Mitigation Measure N-2 also would be required, and impacts related to police services under Alternative C would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

School Services

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 568 students, including 307 elementary students, 87 middle school students, and 174 high school students. Pursuant to the California Government Code and the City’s Municipal Code, payment of the school fees established by the HUSD in accordance with existing rules and regulations regarding the calculation and payment of such fees would, by law, mitigate any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools. Therefore, Project impacts to school services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way and would generate approximately 568 school children (refer to Table VI-19). Similar to the Project, under Alternative C, payment of school fees established by the HUSD would be required and would mitigate any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools. Therefore, impacts related to school services under Alternative C would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

**Table VI-19
Estimated Student Generation – Alternative C**

Use Type	Amount of Development	School Type	Student Generation Factor ^a	Total Students Generated
Residential	1,077 du	Elementary School (K-5)	0.285	307
		Middle School (6-8)	0.081	87
		High School (9-12)	0.162	174
			Total	568
<i>du = dwelling unit Number of students has been rounded to the nearest whole number.</i> ^a <i>Hemet Unified School District, Student Generation Rate Calculation, 2013.</i>				

Parks and Recreational Services

This EIR concluded that based on the City’s performance standard for parks (i.e., 5 acres/1,000 residents), the Project would be required to provide approximately 12.5 acres of parkland. Thus, the Project’s inclusion of approximately 35.1 acres of open space and recreational areas would exceed the City’s requirement for parkland, and impacts related to parks and recreational services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Based on the City's park performance standard, Alternative C would require 13.9 acres of parkland. Because this alternative would include the same amount of parks and recreational areas as under the Project, the amount of parkland included as part of Alternative C also would exceed the City's requirements, and impacts related to parks and recreational services would be less than significant.

Library Services

This EIR concluded that the Project would create a need for approximately 6,175 to 6,792 books, 1,235 to 1,482 square feet of library space, and 9 library seats. The City provides for library services through the City's DIF in accordance with City Council Resolution No. 3981. The additional library facilities and material costs in the City due to buildout of the Project would be offset through the payment of the required DIF. Project impacts related to library services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Based on state standards for library services, Alternative C would create a need for approximately 6,972 to 7,669 books, 1,394 to 1,673 square feet of library space, and 10 library seats. The HPL has a second floor available for expansion in the future, as demand is needed. Similar to the Project, payment of the DIF would be required under Alternative C that would offset the cost of additional library facilities and material costs. Therefore, impacts related to library services under this alternative would be less than significant.

Transportation/Traffic

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips. With implementation of mitigation identified in Section IV.O (Transportation/Traffic), the Project would result in significant unavoidable impacts at 2 study intersection under the Existing (2012) With-Project condition; 7 study intersections under the Near-Term (2015) With-Project condition; and 13 study intersections under the General Plan Cumulative Buildout (post-2035) With-Project condition) (refer to Table VI-20).

**Table VI-20
Traffic Impacts - Alternative C**

Study Intersection	Impact Under the Project		Impact Under Alternative B	
	AM	PM	AM	PM
Existing (2012) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 9		SU		SU
Intersection 12		LTS w/M		*
Intersection 34			LTS w/M	
Near-Term (2015) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 8		SU		SU
Intersection 9	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 11		SU		SU
Intersection 12	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 13	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 15		SU		SU
Intersection 16		SU		SU
Intersection 27	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 32		SU		*
Intersection 34	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 39		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 40	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 41		SU		SU
Intersection 42		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 45	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 46	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
General Plan Cumulative Buildout (Post-2035) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 2	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 3		SU		SU
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 6	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 8	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 9	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 11	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 12	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 13	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 14		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 15	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 16		SU		SU
Intersection 27	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 32	SU	SU	SU	SU

**Table VI-20
Traffic Impacts - Alternative C**

Study Intersection	Impact Under the Project		Impact Under Alternative B	
	AM	PM	AM	PM
Intersection 34	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 35	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 36	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 38		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 39	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 40	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 41	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 42		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 44		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 45	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 46	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 47	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 49		SU		SU

SU = Significant unavoidable impacts LTS w/M = Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation

Note: The LTS w/M impacts conclusions assumes that all of the improvements shown on Table IV.O-19 in Section IV.O (Transportation/Traffic) would be implemented. However, as discussed in Section IV.O, full funding and timing of implementation (in relation to buildout of the Project) of some of the improvements required to reduce impacts to less than significant are not guaranteed. Therefore, impacts at these intersections would remain significant and unavoidable.

** Impact would not occur under the alternative.*

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative C would generate approximately 22,363 daily trips (3,192 fewer than the Project), 1,512 AM peak-hour trips (334 fewer than the Project), and 1,771 PM peak-hour trips (269 fewer than the Project). As shown on Table VI-19, with implementation of mitigation identified in Section IV.O, Alternative C would result in significant unavoidable impacts at 2 study intersection under the Existing (2012) With-Project condition; 7 study intersections under the Near-Term (2015) With-Project condition; and 13 study intersections under the General Plan Cumulative Buildout (post-2035) With-Project condition. Thus, Alternative C would result one less significant unavoidable impact than the Project.

Utilities

Wastewater

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate an approximate average flow of 224.4 gallons of wastewater per minute (or 322,560 gpd) and an approximate peak flow of 561.1 gallons of wastewater per minute (or 807,984 gpd). The existing capacity of the SJVRWRF would have adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not require construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The amount of wastewater that would be generated by this alternative (an average flow of 241.1 gallons per minute and a peak flow of 602.8 gallons of wastewater per minute) would be somewhat more than that identified for the Project.⁵ However, the existing capacity of the SJVRWRF could accommodate the wastewater treatment needs of Alternative C, and impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

Water

The Water and Wastewater Plan of Service estimated that the Project would consume an average of approximately 427.0 gallons of water per minute.⁶ Based on the water supply assessment prepared by EMWD, the Project's water supply needs could be accommodated by EMWD. Project impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C

⁵ *Calculations are included in Appendix VI.*

⁶ *The Project's water consumption estimates in the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service are more conservative than those estimated by EMWD for purposes of the Water Supply Assessment and the Project's water supply demand, because the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service estimates are used to determine the appropriate conveyance infrastructure sizing, whereas EMWD's estimates are closer to actual water supply demand of the Project. Because water consumption estimates were only prepared by EMWD for the Project and not the Alternatives, the comparison of water consumption between the Project and the Alternatives is based on the water consumption assumptions from the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service.*

would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The amount of water that would be consumed by this alternative (an average of approximately 457.2 gallons per minute per day) would be somewhat more than that identified for the Project. However, Alternative C's water supply consumption likely could be accommodated by EMWD, and impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Solid Waste

Construction

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 4,095 tons of solid waste during the construction phase (conservatively assuming no recycling efforts). The remaining combined daily intake capacity of the landfills serving the Project area is 10,605 tons per day (tpd). As such, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by the Project. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of construction waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Therefore, Project impacts related to construction solid waste disposal would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-21, Alternative C would generate approximately 5,091 tons of solid waste during the construction phase (conservatively assuming no recycling efforts). Because the landfills serving the Project area have a remaining combined daily intake capacity of 10,605 tpd, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by Alternative C. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of construction waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Therefore, impacts related to construction solid waste disposal under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Operation

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 9.53 tons of solid waste per day during the Project's operation phase, conservatively assuming no recycling efforts. As stated previously, the remaining combined daily intake capacity of the landfills serving the Project area is 10,605 tpd. As such, these facilities would have adequate capacity to accommodate the daily operational waste (9.53 tons) generated by the Project. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Also, the Project would be required to participate in the City's on-going recycling efforts (refer to Mitigation Measures P-1

through P-9) to further reduce the need the landfill capacity. Therefore, Project impacts related to operational solid waste disposal would be less than significant.

**Table VI-21
Construction Solid Waste Generation – Alternative C**

Land Use	Size (sf)	Generation Rate (lbs/sf)¹	Total Daily Solid Waste Generation (tons)
Residential	1,683,200	4.38	3,686
Commercial	732,288	3.89	1,406
Total Alternative C			5,091 tons
Total Project			4,095 tons
<i>sf = square feet lbs = pounds</i>			
¹ U.S. EPA Report No EPA530-98-010, <i>Characterization of Building Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States, June 1998. Applied generation rates are averages of empirical waste assessments of residential demolition, non-residential demolition, residential construction, and non-residential construction waste streams in the United States.</i>			

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-22, Alternative C would generate approximately 10.1 tons of solid waste per day. Because the landfills serving the Project area have a remaining combined daily intake capacity of 10,605 tpd, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by Alternative C. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of solid waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Also, development under Alternative C would be required to participate in the City’s on-going recycling efforts (refer to Mitigation Measures P-1 through P-18) to further reduce the need the landfill capacity. Therefore, impacts related to operational solid waste disposal under Alternative C would be less than significant.

Energy

Electricity

This EIR concluded that the Project would consume approximately 16,616,409 kilowatts per hour (kWh) per year, representing approximately two percent of the County of Riverside’s (the “County” forecasted electricity consumption of 684,601,745 kWh per year in 2030 for the County as a whole. Therefore, it is anticipated that SCE existing and planned electrical capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support the Project’s electricity consumption. Therefore, the Project would not require the acquisition of additional electricity resources beyond those that are anticipated by SCE, and impacts related to electricity service would be less than significant.

**Table VI-22
Operation Solid Waste Generation – Alternative C**

Land Use	Size	Generation Rate	Total Daily Solid Waste Generation (lbs/day)
Residential Units	1,077 DU	12.23 lbs/unit/day	13,171
General Office	166,000 sf	0.006 lbs/sf/day	996
Elementary School	187,500	0.007 lbs/sf/day	1,312
Shopping Center	369,788 sf	0.013 lbs/sf/day	4,807
Parks/Open Space	37.1 acres	---	---
Total Daily Waste			20,286 (10.0 tons)
<i>sf = square feet DU = dwelling unit</i>			

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-23, Alternative C would consume approximately 15,742,203 kWh per year of electricity, less electricity than would be consumed under the Project. As such, SCE's existing and planned electrical capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support Alternative C's electricity consumption. Therefore, Alternative C would not require the acquisition of additional electricity resources beyond those that are anticipated by SCE, and impacts related to electricity service would be less than significant.

**Table VI-23
Electricity Consumption – Alternative C**

Land Use	Size	Consumption Rate	Electricity Demand (kw-h/yr)
Residential	1,077 du	5,626.50 kw-h/du	6,059,740
General Office	166,000 sf	12.95 kw-h/sf	2,149,700
Shopping Center	369,788 sf	13.55 kw-h/sf	4,992,138
Elementary School	187,500 sf	13.55 kw-h/sf	2,540,625
Total Alternative C			15,742,203
Total Project			16,616,409
<i>du=dwelling unit; sf=square feet; kw-h = kilowatt-hour; yr = year</i>			

Natural Gas

This EIR concluded that the Project's natural gas consumption of approximately 6,151,018 cf/month would represent a fraction of one percent of SoCal Gas's total natural gas consumption for projected year 2030 in the County, which is roughly 5.3 billion cf. The Project would not require the acquisition of additional natural gas resources beyond those that are anticipated by SoCal Gas, and impacts related to natural gas services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative C, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but reduces the commercial square footage by 113,256 square feet. Alternative C would include 1,077 residential dwelling units (of varying types) 166,000 square feet of office land uses, a 750-student elementary school, 369,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-24, Alternative C would consume approximately 6,100,685 cf of natural gas per month, more natural gas than would be consumed under the Project. However, the natural gas consumption associated with Alternative C would represent a fraction of one percent of SoCal Gas's total natural gas consumption for the projected year 2030 in the County, similar to the Project. Therefore, Alternative C would not require the acquisition of additional natural gas resources beyond those that are anticipated by SoCal Gas, and impacts related to natural gas service would be less than significant.

Table VI-24
Natural Gas Consumption – Alternative C

Land Use	Size	Consumption Rate	Natural Gas Demand (cf/mo)
Residential	1,077 du	4,011.5 cf/du	4,320,385
General Office	166,000 sf	2.0 cf/mo/sf	332,000
Shopping Center	369,788 sf	2.9 cf/mo/sf	1,072,385
Elementary School	187,500 sf	2.9 cf/mo/sf	543,750
Total Alternative C			6,268,520
Total Project			6,151,018
<i>du=dwelling unit; sf=square feet; cf= cubic feet; mo = month</i>			

Relationship of Alternative C to the Project Objectives

Alternative C would meet all of the Project Objectives, which include the following:

1. Expand the range of housing choices in the City of Hemet to serve a range of lifestyles, including first-time buyers, young singles and couples, families, empty nesters, and seniors, by providing both attached and detached housing options at a variety of densities, configurations, and prices.

2. Provide a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses, strategically located recreational facilities, and a desirable package of amenities to encourage outdoor activity and create a sense of community and identity.
3. Utilize onsite drainage and utility corridors as opportunities to balance cut and fill as well as provide recreational amenities, walkable connections, and add value to the community.
4. Implement the goals and policies of the City of Hemet General Plan to encourage a balanced and sustainable pattern of land use and implement high-quality pedestrian-oriented design.
5. Establish plans for the improvement and/or development of new public infrastructure to serve the project area consistent with applicable master plans.
6. Create an integrated and interconnected community that allows residents to access the various amenities, shops, and services without the need to use the automobile.
7. Provide for new residential, commercial, and open space development that is integrated with existing and planned surrounding development.
8. Enhance the economic well being of the City by locating uses that capitalize on the Florida Avenue frontage.
9. Enhance the City's existing job base through the creation of a broad range of employment and career opportunities.
10. Accommodate a range of commercial, service, and professional business and employment options to meet the needs of the market and to create a project that is fiscally positive.
11. Provide flexible standards to allow the project to best meet market demand at the time of development.

ALTERNATIVE D: COMMERCIAL-ORIENTED

The Commercial-Oriented Alternative (herein referred to as "Alternative D") assumes development of the Project site with land uses similar to those included under the Project, but generally with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way (refer to Table VI-25).⁷ Implementation of

⁷ The NOP sent out for the Project noted that the Project would include 1,077 residential dwelling units and 535,788 square feet of commercial land uses. Alternative D includes 778 residential dwelling units and 760,035 square feet of commercial land uses. Although the amount of commercial square footage under Alternative D is

Alternative D would require approval of the same discretionary actions described for the Project in Section III (Project Description).

Table VI-25
Alternative D: Commercial-Oriented

Land Use Category	Size
Residential	
Detached Senior	401 du
Condos/Townhomes	377 du
<i>Total</i>	778 du
General Office	224,247 sf
Shopping Center	535,788 sf
Parks/Open Space	
Community Park	11.2 acres
Passive Parks	23.9 acres
Street Right-of-Way	34.47
<i>du = dwelling unit sf = square feet</i>	
<i>Source: The Planning Center, 2013.</i>	

Aesthetics

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to scenic resources, scenic vistas, and visual character would be less than significant, and with implementation of Mitigation Measure B-1, impacts related to lighting would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The siting, massing, height, and architecture of the buildings and the types of lighting under Alternative D would be similar to that of the Project. However, the overall amount of lighting would be somewhat less due to the decrease in the number of residential dwelling units. For these reasons, the impacts and mitigation identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative.

higher than under the Project, as noted in this section, Alternative D would not result in any new or increased significant impacts than those identified for the Project.

Agricultural Resources

As discussed in Section IV.C (Agricultural Resources), a portion of the Project site is zoned A-5, and off-site properties at the northwestern and northeastern boundaries of the Project site are zoned A-10 and A-5, respectively. However, the land use designations identified in the General Plan for the Project site include Low-Density Residential for the northern portion of the site and Mixed Use for the mid to southern portions of the site. Similarly, the land use designations for the properties surrounding the Project site are also non-agricultural and include: Low-Density Residential to the north; High-Density Residential, Very-High-Density Residential, and Community Commercial to the east; Neighborhood Commercial and Community Commercial to the south; and Mixed Use to the west. This EIR concluded that although the Project would change the agricultural zoning for the Project site to Specific Plan, based on the General Plan, the intended use of the Project site and surrounding properties does not include agriculture, and as such, the change in the zoning of the site would not result in conflicts with existing agricultural zoning. Thus, Project impacts related to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative D would require the same zone change as requested under the Project and includes development that is substantially similar to that proposed under the Project, the less than significant impact related to agricultural resources identified for the Project would also occur under this alternative.

Air Quality

Consistency with the AQMP

The analysis of the Project's consistency with the AQMP in Section IV.D (Air Quality) conservatively assumed development of the Project site with 1,077 residential dwelling units and 535,788 square feet of commercial land uses, which the development included under Alternative D. This EIR concluded that development of the Project with 1,077 residential dwelling units and 535,788 square feet of commercial land uses would be consistent with the development and growth assumptions in the AQMP, and impacts related to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative D includes similar development assumptions as the Project but somewhat less overall square footage, Alternative D also would be consistent with the AQMP, and impacts related to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

Regional Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that with implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2, Project impacts related to regional construction emissions would be less than significant. These same mitigation measures would be applicable to Alternative D, and impacts related to regional construction emissions under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative D, although the overall the amount of grading and construction required and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be somewhat less than under the Project due to the development of fewer residential dwelling units, the maximum daily grading/construction assumptions for Alternative D would be the same as for the Project. Thus, the maximum amount of daily construction-related pollutant emissions associated with Alternative D would be approximately the same as under the Project, and implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 and D-2 would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Regional Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project's emissions of VOC, NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} would exceed the significance thresholds, and Project impacts related to regional operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable, primarily due to mobile source emissions.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Tables VI-26 and VI-27, all emissions under Alternative D would be less than under the Project; this alternative would avoid the Project's significant unavoidable impact specific to PM_{2.5}. However, Alternative D would exceed the significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, and impacts related to regional operational emissions under this alternative would be significant and unavoidable, primarily due to mobile source emissions.

Table VI-26
Summary of Summer Peak Operational Emissions – Alternative D
(in pounds per day)

Operational Activity	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Area Source Emissions	48.55	1.08	91.72	-	1.79	1.77
Energy Source Emissions	0.81	6.97	3.17	0.04	0.56	0.56
Mobile Emissions	127.76	306.37	1,183.94	2.12	237.13	14.62
Maximum Daily Emissions – Alternative D	177.12	314.12	1,278.93	2.16	239.48	16.95
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	No
Maximum Daily Emissions - Project	320.60	441.06	2,077.06	3.95	404.74	73.01
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	YES

Source: Urban Crossroads, March 2013.

Table VI-27
Summary of Winter Peak Operational Emissions – Alternative D
(in pounds per day)

Operational Activity	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Area Source Emissions	48.55	1.08	91.72	-	1.79	1.77
Energy Source Emissions	0.81	6.97	3.17	0.04	0.56	0.56
Mobile Emissions	130.12	326.64	1,172.14	1.97	237.29	14.78
Maximum Daily Emissions – Alternative D	179.48	334.69	1,267.03	2.01	239.64	17.11
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	No
Maximum Daily Emissions - Project	320.60	441.06	2,077.06	3.95	404.74	73.01
<i>SCAQMD Regional Threshold</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>	<i>550.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>150.00</i>	<i>55.00</i>
Significant Impact?	YES	YES	YES	No	YES	YES

Source: Urban Crossroads, March 2013.

Localized Construction Emissions

This EIR concluded that Project impacts related to localized construction emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative D, although the overall amount of grading and

construction required and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed would be less than under the Project, the maximum daily grading/construction assumptions for Alternative D would be the same as for the Project. Thus, the maximum amount of daily construction-related pollutant emissions associated with Alternative D would be approximately the same as under the Project. As such, impacts under Alternative D related to localized construction emissions under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Localized Operational Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and Project impacts related to localized CO emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative D would generate approximately 22,790 daily trips (2,765 fewer than the Project), 1,053 AM peak-hour trips (793 fewer than the Project), and 1,643 PM peak-hour trips (397 fewer than the Project). As such, the amount of localized CO emissions generated under Alternative D would be less than under the Project, and impacts related to localized CO emissions would be less than significant.

Sensitive Receptors

This EIR concluded that the Project's design feature of a 100-foot buffer between any on-site or offsite sensitive receptor during construction activities would ensure that air quality impacts related to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The 100-foot buffer area as a project design feature also could be incorporated into Alternative D, and air quality impacts related to sensitive receptors under this alternative also would be less than significant.

Odors

Neither the Project nor Alternative D includes land uses typically associated with odors (e.g., agricultural uses, wastewater treatment, food processing, chemical plants, composting operations, refineries, etc.), and no significant impacts related to odors would occur.

Biological Resources

This EIR concluded that Project potentially could result in significant impacts related to consistency with the MSHCP, Stephens' kangaroo rat, burrowing owl, consistency with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, riparian/riverine/vernal pool resources, and wetlands, but with implementation of Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-7, impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. The overall development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative D includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to biological resources identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures E-1 through E-7 also would apply to Alternative D. Thus, impacts related to biological resources under Alternative D would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

This EIR concluded that based on the known ethnographic and historic information for the region, the potential for finding buried remains in alluvium deposits, and the site's location adjacent to the foothills of the Tres Cerritos Foothills, there is a possibility that archaeological resources could be unearthed during excavation and grading activities. Additionally, although no paleontological resources or human remains are known to exist on the Project site, there is the remote possibility of an unanticipated discovery during grading and excavation of the Project site. Impacts related to archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains under the Project potentially could be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-8, Project impacts related to these issues would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with land uses that are similar to the types and sizes under the Project, but with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. The overall area of grading and the development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative D includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to cultural resources identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-8 also would apply to Alternative D. Thus, impacts related to cultural resources under Alternative D would be less than significant.

Geology and Soils

This EIR concluded that soil samples from the Project site indicate a medium expansion potential, and Project impacts related to expansive soils could potentially be significant. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measure G-1, Project impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative D includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar types of land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to expansive soils identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measure G-1 also would apply to Alternative D. Thus, impacts related to geology and soils under Alternative D would be less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This EIR concluded that the Project would comply with all mandatory regulatory requirements imposed by the State of California and the SCAQMD aimed at reducing GHG emissions. In addition, the Project would incorporate Project design features to further reduce GHG emissions. Overall, the Project would generate approximately 36,700.83 metric tons of GHG emission per year, and Project impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-28, Alternative D would generate approximately 35,105.57 metric tons of GHG emissions per year, less emissions than would be generated under the Project. Thus, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant under Alternative D.

Table VI-28
Total Annual (2020) GHG Emissions
With PDFs and State Requirements – Alternative D

Emission Source	Emissions (metric tons per year)			
	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	Total CO ₂ E
Annual construction-related emissions amortized over 30 years	167.42	0.01	-	167.43
Area	523.78	0.03	0.01	527.28
Energy	4,557.56	0.19	0.08	4,586.01
Mobile	28,433.41	1.17	-	28,457.95
Waste	229.63	13.57	-	514.62
Water	756.31	3.21	0.09	852.28
Total CO₂E – Alternative D	35,105.57			
Total CO₂E – Project	36,700.83			

Source: Urban Crossroads, January 2013. Modeling results included in Appendix IV.H.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Risk of Upset

This EIR concluded that no RECs are present at the Project site, and no impacts related to risk of upset would occur as a result of the Project.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative D includes development of the same site and the same overall footprint as under the Project, the impacts related to risk of upset identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative. Thus, impacts related to risk of upset under Alternative D would be less than significant.

Airport Safety

This EIR concluded that the airport land use compatibility study noted that there are no relevant safety factors to consider related to the Project's compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan CLUP. However, Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 were provided to ensure future land use compatibility with the Hemet-Ryan Airport; impacts would be less than significant under the Project.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project. Because Alternative D includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to airport safety identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 also would apply to Alternative D. Thus, impacts related to airport safety under Alternative D would be less than significant.

Wildland Fires

This EIR concluded that development would occur within the portion of the Project site north of Devonshire Avenue that is within the moderate fire hazard zone. Mitigation Measure I-4 was identified to ensure that Project impacts related to wildland fires would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space,

and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because Alternative D includes development of the same site, the same overall footprint, and very similar land uses as under the Project, the impacts related to wildland fires identified for the Project also would occur under this alternative, and Mitigation Measure I-4 also would apply to Alternative D. Thus, impacts related to wildland fires under Alternative D would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Erosion/Siltation

This EIR concluded that Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP to ensure that erosion and siltation would not occur during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to erosion/siltation would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall amount of construction and the development footprint under Alternative D would be substantially the same as under the Project. Under any development scenario for the Project site (including Alternative D), the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP to ensure that erosion and siltation would not occur during the construction and operational phases of the development, and impacts related to erosion/siltation would be less than significant, including under Alternative D.

Flooding/Stormdrain Capacity

This EIR concluded that the Project would include appropriately sized detention basins and other drainage infrastructure to ensure that runoff from the Project site under post-Project conditions would not exceed pre-Project conditions. No significant impacts related to flooding/stormdrain capacity would occur under the Project.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project, and as such, the overall amount of runoff associated with Alternative D would be approximately the same as under the Project. Under any development scenario for the Project site (including Alternative D), the Applicant would be required to design and install appropriately sized drainage infrastructure at the Project site to ensure that post-development conditions do not exceed pre-development conditions, ensuring that impacts related to flooding/stormdrain capacity would be less than significant, including under Alternative D.

Water Quality

This EIR concluded that the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP and a WQMP to protect water quality during the construction and operational phases of the Project; impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project, and as such, the overall amount of runoff associated with Alternative D would be approximately the same as under the Project. Under Alternative D, the Applicant would be required to implement BMPs outlined in a SWPPP and a WQMP to ensure protection of water quality during the construction and operational phases of the development, and impacts under Alternative D related to water quality would be less than significant.

100-Year Flood Hazard

This EIR concluded that a small portion of the southwestern part of the Project site lies within a 100-year flood zone as designated by FEMA. However, the only Project development that would occur within this area includes surface parking and landscaping, neither of which would impede any flood flows within the flood zone. Additionally, the Project's Line BB storm drain would collect runoff and eliminate flooding along Florida Avenue and Myers Street. These flows would be collected and conveyed to the existing storm drain culvert at the intersection of Warren Road and Florida Avenue. Therefore, Project impacts related to 100-year flood hazards would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The overall development footprint under Alternative D would be the same as under the Project. Under Alternative D, similar to the Project, the only development that would occur within the portion of the Project site that falls within the 100-year flood zone would be surface parking and landscaping, and Alternative D also would include drainage infrastructure to collect and convey flows away from the Project site. As such, impacts under Alternative D related to 100-year flood hazards would be less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

This EIR concluded that the Project would be substantially consistent with all applicable plans, policies, and regulations that apply to development of the Project site, including the Compass Blueprint 2% Strategy, 2008 RCP, RTP/SCS, AQMP, CMP, ALUP, MSHCP, City's General Plan, and City Zoning Code. Project impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Because the overall types and sizes of land uses that would be developed under Alternative D would be similar to those under the Project, Alternative D also would be substantially consistent with the applicable plans, policies, and regulations that apply to the development of the Project site, and impacts related to land use and planning under Alternative D would be less than significant.

Noise

Construction

This EIR concluded that the Project's construction activities could generate noise levels in excess of the significance thresholds. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-1 through L-4, construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative D, although the overall amount of grading required and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed under Alternative D would be somewhat less due to the development of fewer dwelling units, the maximum daily construction scenario assumed for the Project also would be assumed for Alternative D. As such, the construction noise levels under Alternative D would be similar to those identified for the Project and could exceed the significance thresholds. Mitigation Measures L-1 through L-3 would apply to Alternative D, and construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant under this alternative.

Operation

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips, and operation of the Project would not create any significant off-site noise impacts. However, on-site traffic noise levels could exceed the significance thresholds. With implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4 and L-5, Project impacts related to on-site traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative D would generate approximately 22,790 daily trips (2,765 fewer than the Project), 1,053 AM peak-hour trips (793 fewer than the Project), and 1,643 PM peak-hour trips (397 fewer than the Project). Because Alternative D includes the development of very

similar types and sizes of land uses as under the Project, the types of noise and associated noise levels would be very similar to that identified for the Project. As such, the traffic noise levels associated with Alternative B would exceed the significance threshold. However, similar to the Project, with implementation of Mitigation Measures L-4 and L-5, impacts related to on-site traffic noise levels would be less than significant.

Vibration

This EIR concluded that the Project's construction activities would not generate construction-related vibration levels in excess of the significance thresholds, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Under Alternative D, although the overall amount of grading required and the total amount of square footage that would be constructed under Alternative D would be somewhat less due to the development of fewer dwelling units, the maximum daily construction scenario assumed for the Project also would be assumed for Alternative D. As such, the construction-related vibration levels under Alternative D would be similar to those identified for the Project and would not exceed the significance thresholds. Similar to the Project, impacts under Alternative D related to construction vibration would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

This EIR concluded that the Project would result in an increase of 954 dwelling units, approximately 2,470 residents, and 2,300 jobs at the Project site, and the population, housing, and employment growth associated with the Project would be consistent with the growth projections for the region. Project impacts related to population and housing would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative D would generate 176 fewer dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,015 residents (455 fewer than the Project); and 2,525 jobs (refer to Table VI-29) (225 more than the Project). As shown on Table VI-30, the population and housing growth associated with Alternative D would be somewhat lower than under the Project, and employment growth would be somewhat higher. However, overall population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative D would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, growth under Alternative D would be consistent with regional growth projections, and impacts related to population and housing under Alternative D would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

Table VI-29
Approximate Employee Generation – Alternative D

Land Use	Size	Employee Rate ¹	Employees
Office	224,247 sf	0.00479/sf	1,074
Shopping Center	535,788 sf	0.00271/sf	1,451
Total			2,525

¹ LAUSD 2012 Developer Fee Justification Study, February 2012.

Table VI-30
Change in Population, Housing, and Employment and Percentage of Change
Alternative D

County of Riverside									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %
2008 to 2020	464,000	0.59	0.43	155,000	0.61	0.50	275,000	0.83	0.91
2020 to 2035	732,000	0.37	0.27	258,000	0.36	0.30	204,000	1.12	1.23
2008 to 2035	1,196,000	0.22	0.16	413,000	0.23	0.18	479,000	0.48	0.52
City of Hemet									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %
2008 to 2020	7,000	39.1	28.7	3,800	25.1	20.47	13,600	16.9	18.56
2020 to 2035	26,900	10.1	7.49	12,200	7.8	6.37	12,700	18.1	19.88
2008 to 2035	33,900	8.0	5.94	16,000	5.9	4.86	26,300	8.7	9.60
Census Tract 43504									
Years	Population			Households			Employment		
	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %	Change ^a	Project %	Alt. D %
2008 to 2020	2,630	104.1	76.61	1,467	65.0	53.03	2,535	90.7	99.60
2020 to 2035	3,874	70.7	52.01	1,806	58.8	43.07	3,221	71.4	78.39
2008 to 2035	6,504	42.1	30.98	3,273	29.1	23.77	5,756	39.9	43.86

^a Refer to Table IV.M-1 in Section IV.M (Population and Housing)

Public Services

Fire Protection Services

This EIR concluded that the Project's increase in the number of residents (approximately 2,470) and employees (approximately 2,300) would increase the need for fire protection and emergency medical services at the Project site. However, the Project Applicant would be required to implement Mitigation Measures N-1, requiring (a) formation of a or participation in the Public Safety CFD in accordance with City Council Resolution 3821, and (b) payment of DIF and/or construction and/or funding the required

fire protection services improvements to and obtain DIF credit, in accordance with City Council Resolution 3981. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1, Project impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As discussed previously, Alternative D would generate 176 fewer dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,015 residents (455 fewer than the Project); and 2,525 jobs (refer to Table VI-29) (225 more than the Project). As shown on Table VI-30, the population and housing growth associated with Alternative D would be somewhat lower than under the Project, and employment growth would be somewhat higher. However, overall population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative D would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, the demand for fire protection and emergency medical services under Alternative D would be similar to that under the Project. Under Alternative D, Mitigation Measure N-1 also would be required, and impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

Police Services

This EIR concluded that the Project's increase in the number of residents (approximately 2,470) and employees (approximately 2,300) would increase the need for police services at the Project site. However, the Project Applicant would be required to implement Mitigation Measures N-2, requiring (a) formation of a or participation in the Public Safety CFD in accordance with City Council Resolution 3821, and (b) payment of DIF and/or construction and/or funding the required police protection services improvements to and obtain DIF credit, in accordance with City Council Resolution 3981. With implementation of Mitigation Measure N-2, Project impacts related to police services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As discussed previously, Alternative D would generate 176 fewer dwelling units than the Project; approximately 2,015 residents (455 fewer than the Project); and 2,525 jobs (refer to Table VI-29) (225 more than the Project). As shown on Table VI-30, the population and housing growth associated with Alternative D would be somewhat lower than under the Project, and employment growth would be somewhat higher. However, overall population, housing, and employment growth associated with Alternative D would be substantially similar to the growth identified for the Project. As such, the demand for police services under Alternative D would be similar to that under the Project. Also, the design features identified for the Project to reduce the need for police services also could be implemented under Alternative D. Further, this alternative would be subject to review by the HPD and would be required to comply with the requirements of the HPD. Under Alternative D,

Mitigation Measure N-2 also would be required, and impacts related to police services under Alternative D would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

School Services

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 568 students, including 307 elementary students, 87 middle school students, and 174 high school students. Pursuant to the California Government Code and the City’s Municipal Code, payment of the school fees established by the HUSD in accordance with existing rules and regulations regarding the calculation and payment of such fees would, by law, mitigate any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools. Therefore, Project impacts to school services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way and would generate approximately 410 school children (refer to Table VI-31). Similar to the Project, under Alternative D, payment of school fees established by the HUSD would be required and would mitigate any potential direct and indirect impacts to schools. Therefore, impacts related to school services under Alternative D would be less than significant, similar to the Project.

**Table VI-31
Estimated Student Generation – Alternative D**

Use Type	Amount of Development	School Type	Student Generation Factor^a	Total Students Generated
Residential	778 du	Elementary School (K-5)	0.285	221
		Middle School (6-8)	0.081	63
		High School (9-12)	0.162	126
Total				410

du = dwelling unit Number of students has been rounded to the nearest whole number.

^a *Hemet Unified School District, Student Generation Rate Calculation, 2013.*

Parks and Recreational Services

This EIR concluded that based on the City’s performance standard for parks (i.e., 5 acres/1,000 residents), the Project would be required to provide approximately 12.5 acres of parkland. Thus, the Project’s inclusion of approximately 35.1 acres of open space and recreational areas would exceed the City’s requirement for parkland, and impacts related to parks and recreational services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Based on the City's park performance standard, Alternative D would require 10.3 acres of parkland. Because this alternative would include the same amount of parks and recreational areas as under the Project, the amount of parkland included as part of Alternative D also would exceed the City's requirements, and impacts related to parks and recreational services would be less than significant.

Library Services

This EIR concluded that the Project would create a need for approximately 6,175 to 6,792 books, 1,235 to 1,482 square feet of library space, and 9 library seats. The City provides for library services through the City's DIF in accordance with City Council Resolution No. 3981. The additional library facilities and material costs in the City due to buildout of the Project would be offset through the payment of the required DIF. Project impacts related to library services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Based on state standards for library services, Alternative D would create a need for approximately 5,127 to 5,640 books, 1,025 to 1,230 square feet of library space, and 7 library seats. The HPL has a second floor available for expansion in the future, as demand is needed. Similar to the Project, payment of the DIF would be required under Alternative D that would offset the cost of additional library facilities and material costs. Therefore, impacts related to library services under this alternative would be less than significant.

Transportation/Traffic

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 25,555 trip-ends per day with 1,846 AM peak-hour trips and 2,040 PM peak-hour trips. With implementation of mitigation identified in Section IV.O (Transportation/Traffic), the Project would result in significant unavoidable impacts at 2 study intersection under the Existing (2012) With-Project condition; 8 study intersections under the Near-Term (2015) With-Project condition; and 13 study intersections under the General Plan Cumulative Buildout (post-2035) With-Project condition) (refer to Table VI-31).

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. Alternative D would generate approximately 22,790 daily trips (2,765 fewer than the Project), 1,053 AM peak-hour trips (793 fewer than the Project), and 1,643 PM

peak-hour trips (397 fewer than the Project). As shown on Table VI-32, with implementation of mitigation identified in Section IV.O, Alternative D would result in significant unavoidable impacts at 2 study intersection under the Existing (2012) With-Project condition; 7 study intersections under the Near-Term (2015) With-Project condition; and 13 study intersections under the General Plan Cumulative Buildout (post-2035) With-Project condition. Thus, Alternative D would result one less significant unavoidable impact than the Project.

**Table VI-32
Traffic Impacts - Alternative D**

Study Intersection	Impact Under the Project		Impact Under Alternative B	
	AM	PM	AM	PM
Existing (2012) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 9		SU		SU
Intersection 12		LTS w/M		*
Near-Term (2015) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 8		SU		SU
Intersection 9	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 11		SU		SU
Intersection 12	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 13	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 15		SU		SU
Intersection 16		SU		SU
Intersection 27	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 32		SU		*
Intersection 34	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 39		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 40	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 41		SU		SU
Intersection 42		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 45	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 46	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
General Plan Cumulative Buildout (Post-2035) With-Project Condition				
Intersection 2	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 3		SU		SU
Intersection 4	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 6	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 8	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 9	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 11	SU	SU	SU	SU

**Table VI-32
Traffic Impacts - Alternative D**

Study Intersection	Impact Under the Project		Impact Under Alternative B	
	AM	PM	AM	PM
Intersection 12	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 13	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 14		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 15	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 16		SU		SU
Intersection 27	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 32	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 34	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 35	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 36	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 38		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 39	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 40	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 41	SU	SU	SU	SU
Intersection 42		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 44		LTS w/M		LTS w/M
Intersection 45	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 46	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 47	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M	LTS w/M
Intersection 49		SU		SU

SU = Significant unavoidable impacts LTS w/M = Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation

Note: The LTS w/M impacts conclusions assumes that all of the improvements shown on Table IV.O-19 in Section IV.O (Transportation/Traffic) would be implemented. However, as discussed in Section IV.O, full funding and timing of implementation (in relation to buildout of the Project) of some of the improvements required to reduce impacts to less than significant are not guaranteed. Therefore, impacts at these intersections would remain significant and unavoidable.

** Impact would not occur under the alternative.*

Utilities

Wastewater

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate an approximate average flow of 224.4 gallons of wastewater per minute (or 322,560 gpd) and an approximate peak flow of 561.1 gallons of wastewater per minute (or 807,984 gpd). The existing capacity of the SJVRWRF would have adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not require construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The amount of wastewater that would be generated by this alternative (an average flow of 188.5 gallons per minute and a peak flow of 471.1 gallons per minute) would be less than that identified for the Project.⁸ Thus, the existing capacity of the SJVRWRF could accommodate the wastewater treatment needs of Alternative D, and impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant.

Water

The Water and Wastewater Plan of Service estimated that the Project would consume an average of approximately 427.0 gallons of water per minute.⁹ Based on the water supply assessment prepared by EMWD, the Project's water supply needs could be accommodated by EMWD. Project impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. The amount of water that would be consumed by this alternative (an average flow of 332.0 gallons per minute) would be less than that identified for the Project.¹⁰ Thus, Alternative D's water supply consumption could be accommodated by EMWD, and impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

⁸ Calculations are included in Appendix VI.

⁹ The Project's water consumption estimates in the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service are more conservative than those estimated by EMWD for purposes of the Water Supply Assessment and the Project's water supply demand, because the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service estimates are used to determine the appropriate conveyance infrastructure sizing, whereas EMWD's estimates are closer to actual water supply demand of the Project. Because water consumption estimates were only prepared by EMWD for the Project and not the Alternatives, the comparison of water consumption between the Project and the Alternatives is based on the water consumption assumptions from the Water and Wastewater Plan of Service.

¹⁰ Calculations are included in Appendix VI.

Solid Waste

Construction

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 4,095 tons of solid waste during the construction phase (conservatively assuming no recycling efforts). The remaining combined daily intake capacity of the landfills serving the Project area is 10,605 tons per day (tpd). As such, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by the Project. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of construction waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Therefore, Project impacts related to construction solid waste disposal would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-33, Alternative D would generate approximately 3,786 tons of solid waste during the construction phase (conservatively assuming no recycling efforts). Because the landfills serving the Project area have a remaining combined daily intake capacity of 10,605 tpd, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by Alternative D. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of construction waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Therefore, impacts related to construction solid waste disposal under Alternative D would be less than significant.

**Table VI-33
Construction Solid Waste Generation – Alternative D**

Land Use	Size (sf)	Generation Rate (lbs/sf)¹	Total Daily Solid Waste Generation (tons)
Residential	1,053,900	4.38	2,308
Commercial	760,035	3.89	1,478
Total Alternative D			3,786 tons
Total Project			4,095 tons
<i>sf = square feet lbs = pounds</i>			
¹ <i>U.S. EPA Report No EPA530-98-010, Characterization of Building Related Construction and Demolition Debris in the United States, June 1998. Applied generation rates are averages of empirical waste assessments of residential demolition, non-residential demolition, residential construction, and non-residential construction waste streams in the United States.</i>			

Operation

This EIR concluded that the Project would generate approximately 9.53 tons of solid waste per day during the Project's operation phase, conservatively assuming no recycling efforts. As stated previously, the

remaining combined daily intake capacity of the landfills serving the Project area is 10,605 tpd. As such, these facilities would have adequate capacity to accommodate the daily operational waste (9.53 tons) generated by the Project. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Also, the Project would be required to participate in the City’s on-going recycling efforts (refer to Mitigation Measures P-1 through P-9) to further reduce the need the landfill capacity. Therefore, Project impacts related to operational solid waste disposal would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-34, Alternative D would generate approximately 8.9 tons of solid waste per day. Because the landfills serving the Project area have a remaining combined daily intake capacity of 10,605 tpd, these landfills would have adequate capacity to accommodate the average daily construction waste generated by Alternative D. Additionally, adherence to AB 939 and required use of recycling facilities would reduce further the amount of solid waste that could be deposited in the landfills. Also, development under Alternative D would be required to participate in the City’s on-going recycling efforts (refer to Mitigation Measures P-1 through P-18) to further reduce the need the landfill capacity. Therefore, impacts related to operational solid waste disposal under Alternative D would be less than significant.

**Table VI-34
Operation Solid Waste Generation – Alternative D**

Land Use	Size	Generation Rate (lbs/1,000 sf/day)	Total Daily Solid Waste Generation (lbs/day)
Residential Units	778 DU	12.23 lbs/unit/day	9,514
General Office	224,247 sf	0.006 lbs/sf/day	1,345
Shopping Center	536,788 sf	0.013 lbs/sf/day	6,978
Parks/Open Space	37.1 acres	---	---
Total Daily Waste			17,837 (8.9 tons)
<i>sf = square feet DU = dwelling unit</i>			

Energy

Electricity

This EIR concluded that the Project would consume approximately 16,616,409 kilowatts per hour (kWh) per year, representing approximately two percent of the County of Riverside’s (the “County” forecasted electricity consumption of 684,601,745 kWh per year in 2030 for the County as a whole. Therefore, it is anticipated that SCE existing and planned electrical capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient

to support the Project's electricity consumption. Therefore, the Project would not require the acquisition of additional electricity resources beyond those that are anticipated by SCE, and impacts related to electricity service would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-35, Alternative D would consume approximately 15,041,342 kWh per year of electricity, less electricity than would be consumed under the Project. As such, SCE's existing and planned electrical capacity and electricity supplies would be sufficient to support Alternative D's electricity consumption. Therefore, Alternative D would not require the acquisition of additional electricity resources beyond those that are anticipated by SCE, and impacts related to electricity service would be less than significant.

Table VI-35
Electricity Consumption – Alternative D

Land Use	Size	Consumption Rate	Electricity Demand (kw-h/yr)
Residential	778 du	5,626.50 kw-h/du	4,377,417
General Office	224,247 sf	12.95 kw-h/sf	2,903,998
Shopping Center	535,788 sf	13.55 kw-h/sf	7,759,927
Total Alternative D			15,041,342
Total Project			16,616,409
<i>du=dwelling unit; sf=square feet; kw-h = kilowatt-hour; yr = year</i>			

Natural Gas

This EIR concluded that the Project's natural gas consumption of approximately 6,151,018 cf/month would represent a fraction of one percent of SoCal Gas's total natural gas consumption for projected year 2030 in the County, which is roughly 5.3 billion cf. The Project would not require the acquisition of additional natural gas resources beyond those that are anticipated by SoCal Gas, and impacts related to natural gas services would be less than significant.

Under Alternative D, the Project site would be developed with fewer dwelling units and no elementary school. Specifically, Alternative D would include 778 residential dwelling units, 224,247 square feet of office land uses, 535,788 square feet of shopping center land uses, 35.1 acres of parks and open space, and 34.47 acres of street right-of-way. As shown on Table VI-36, Alternative D would consume approximately 5,123,226 cf of natural gas per month, less natural gas than would be consumed under the Project. Therefore, Alternative D would not require the acquisition of additional natural gas resources

beyond those that are anticipated by SoCal Gas, and impacts related to natural gas service would be less than significant.

**Table VI-36
Natural Gas Consumption – Alternative D**

Land Use	Size	Consumption Rate	Natural Gas Demand (cf/mo)
Residential	778 du	4,011.5 cf/du	3,120,947
General Office	224,247 sf	2.0 cf/mo/sf	448,494
Retail	535,788 sf	2.9 cf/mo/sf	1,553,785
Total Alternative D			5,123,226
Total Project			6,151,018
<i>du=dwelling unit; sf=square feet; cf= cubic feet; mo = month</i>			

Relationship of Alternative D to the Project Objectives

Alternative D would meet all of the Project Objectives, which include the following:

1. Expand the range of housing choices in the City of Hemet to serve a range of lifestyles, including first-time buyers, young singles and couples, families, empty nesters, and seniors, by providing both attached and detached housing options at a variety of densities, configurations, and prices.
2. Provide a mixture of residential and nonresidential uses, strategically located recreational facilities, and a desirable package of amenities to encourage outdoor activity and create a sense of community and identity.
3. Utilize onsite drainage and utility corridors as opportunities to balance cut and fill as well as provide recreational amenities, walkable connections, and add value to the community.
4. Implement the goals and policies of the City of Hemet General Plan to encourage a balanced and sustainable pattern of land use and implement high-quality pedestrian-oriented design.
5. Establish plans for the improvement and/or development of new public infrastructure to serve the project area consistent with applicable master plans.
6. Create an integrated and interconnected community that allows residents to access the various amenities, shops, and services without the need to use the automobile.
7. Provide for new residential, commercial, and open space development that is integrated with existing and planned surrounding development.

8. Enhance the economic well being of the City by locating uses that capitalize on the Florida Avenue frontage.
9. Enhance the City's existing job base through the creation of a broad range of employment and career opportunities.
10. Accommodate a range of commercial, service, and professional business and employment options to meet the needs of the market and to create a project that is fiscally positive.
11. Provide flexible standards to allow the project to best meet market demand at the time of development.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an EIR alternatives analysis include designation of an “environmentally superior” alternative. Based on the analysis presented in this section, Alternative A: No Project would result in the greatest reduction in Project impacts and would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, CEQA requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[e][2]). The significant Project impacts that would be less than significant with mitigation include the following:

As stated at the beginning of this section, the significant (but mitigatable) impacts of the Project include: Aesthetics – Lighting; Air Quality – Regional Construction Emissions and Localized Construction Emissions; Biological Resources – MSHCP, Special Status Species, Riparian/Riverine/Vernal Pool Resources, and Wetlands; Cultural Resources – Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains; Geology and Soils – Expansive Soils; Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Airport Safety and Wildland Fires; Noise – Construction Noise and On-Site Traffic Noise; and Public Services: Fire and Police Protection Services. Project impacts that would remain significant after mitigation include: Air Quality – Regional Operational Emissions and Transportation/Traffic – Intersection LOS.

Many of these impacts would occur regardless of what type of development occurred at the Project site, due to conditions associated with the site (such as impacts biological resources, cultural resources, expansive soils, and hazards) or due to the site's proximity to sensitive land uses (such as impacts associated with construction noise). Thus, all of these Project impacts would occur to a similar to degree under each of the alternatives.

The construction-related air quality impact likely would occur under any reasonable development scenario for the Project site, because of the amount of demolition/construction involved, including that which would occur under all of the alternatives. Similarly, any reasonable development scenario for the Project site likely would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts, given the traffic generation and existing traffic conditions typically associated with suburban development in Southern California. All of

the alternatives would result in one less significant unavoidable traffic impact when compared to the Project.

Of all the alternatives, Alternative D would result in the development of less overall square footage and fewer residential dwelling units. As such, although the level of significance of each of the impacts under the Project would be the same under Alternative D, the degree to which impacts would occur under this alternative would be less than the Project. For instance, under Alternative D, although the maximum daily grading/construction assumptions for Alternative D would be the same as for the Project, because Alternative D includes development of less overall square footage, the overall construction schedule would be shorter and the total amount of construction emissions that would be generated by this alternative would be less than under the Project. This also would be true for construction-related noise: same maximum daily construction scenario as the Project, but shorter overall construction schedule and shorter construction-noise exposure. Alternative D also would generate 793 fewer daily traffic trips, 793 fewer AM peak-hour trips, and 397 fewer PM peak-hour trips. Additionally, this alternative would generate less wastewater and solid waste and would require less water, electricity, and natural gas than would the Project. For these reasons, Alternative D was selected as the environmentally superior alternative.

**Table VI-37
Comparison of the Impacts under the Project to the Impacts under the Alternatives**

Environmental Issues Analyzed in the EIR	Project Impacts	Impacts under the Alternatives			
		Alternative A: No Project	Alternative B: No School	Alternative C: Residential- Oriented	Alternative D: Commercial- Oriented
Aesthetics					
Scenic Vistas	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Scenic Resources	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Visual Character	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Light and Glare	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Agricultural Resources	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Air Quality					
AQMP Consistency	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Construction Emissions					
Regional Air Quality	LTS w/M	NI	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Local Air Quality	LTS	NI	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Operational Impacts					
Regional Air Quality	SU	NI	Similar	Similar	Reduced
CO Hot Spots	LTS	NI	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Odors	LTS	NI	Similar	Similar	Similar
Biological Resources	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Cultural Resources					
Archaeological Resources	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Paleontological Resources	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Human Remains	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Geology and Soils	LTS w/M	NI	Similar	Similar	Similar
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LTS	NC	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
Risk of Upset	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Airport Safety	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Wildland Fires	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Hydrology & Water Quality					
Erosion/Siltation	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar

**Table VI-37
Comparison of the Impacts under the Project to the Impacts under the Alternatives**

Environmental Issues Analyzed in the EIR	Project Impacts	Impacts under the Alternatives			
		Alternative A: No Project	Alternative B: No School	Alternative C: Residential-Oriented	Alternative D: Commercial-Oriented
Flooding/Stormdrain Capacity	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Water Quality	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
100-year Flood Hazard	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Land Use & Planning Policy Consistency	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Noise Construction	LTS w/M	NI	Similar	Similar	Similar
Operation	LTS w/M	NI	Similar	Similar	Similar
Vibration	LTS	NI	Similar	Similar	Similar
Population and Housing	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Public Services Fire Service	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Police Service	LTS w/M	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
School Service	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Parks & Recreational Service	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Similar
Library Service	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Transportation/Traffic Intersection Capacity	SU	NC	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced
Utilities Wastewater	LTS	NC	Reduced	Increased	Reduced
Water	LTS	NC	Reduced	Increased	Reduced
Solid Waste	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Electricity	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Natural Gas	LTS	NC	Similar	Similar	Reduced

LTS = Less Than Significant Impact NC = No change over the existing condition. LTS w/M = Less-Than-Significant-Impact-With-Mitigation
NI = No Impact SU = Significant Unavoidable Impact