

**CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS for the
I-15 CORRIDOR CAMPUS MASTER PLAN
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

State Clearinghouse No. 2015121017

I. BACKGROUND

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that written findings be made by the lead agency in connection with certification of an environmental impact report (EIR) prior to approval of the project pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code. This document provides the findings required by CEQA.

A. Project Summary

Project Location. The 80.32-acre Project Site is located at the northeast corner of Clinton Keith Road and Salida Del Sol, City of Wildomar, Riverside County. The Project Site is bordered by La Estrella Street to the north, Clinton Keith Road to the south, Salida Del Sol to the west, and Elizabeth Lane and single-family residential units to the east.

Project Description. Mt. San Jacinto Community College District (MSJCCD) is proposing a master planned community college, which would provide college and adult education facilities for an enrollment of approximately 15,000 part-time or 10,000 full-time equivalent students and approximately 400 staff at ultimate buildout. The Proposed Project is anticipated to be constructed in four phases totaling approximately 495,000 gross square feet of building area: Phase I) a new center template building; Phase II) a student services building, a library and technology building, and a multipurpose building; Phase III) a general classroom building and a science buildings; and Phase IV) a general classroom building, a STEM building, a maintenance & operations building, a gymnasium/fitness building, and track and field/soccer field. Full buildout is tentatively scheduled to be accomplished sometime between 2035 and 2038. Other campus supporting facilities would include approximately 1,883 surface parking stalls, driveways, arrival/drop-off area, tennis courts, student green, courtyard, pedestrian bridge, community playfields, a community park, and linear stream park and trails, etc. No outdoor recreational nighttime lighting would be installed and MSJCCD proposes to preserve approximately 42 acres of the most valuable habitat on the Project Site in its current condition.

B. Environmental Review Process

In conformance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the MSJCCD conducted an extensive environmental review of the I-15 Corridor Campus Master Plan (Proposed Project).

MSJCCD determined that an EIR would be required for the Proposed Project and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study on December 7, 2015. The public review period was for 30 days, from December 7, 2015 to January 5, 2016.

- A Notice of Completion (NOC), NOP, and the Initial Study were sent to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and circulated to state agencies for review.
- The NOP and Initial Study were mailed to regional and local agencies, organizations, and interested parties.
- The NOP was published in the *Riverside Press Enterprise* (English version) on December 7, 2015.
- The NOP and Initial Study were available to the public for review at Mt. San Jacinto Community College District, Business Office, 1449 North State Street, San Jacinto, CA 92583, Wildomar Library, 34303 Mission Trail, Wildomar, CA 92595, and on the MSJCCD's website.
- A scoping meeting was held on December 17, 2015 from 6:00 PM to 7 PM in the Learning Resource Center/Library, Room 805, Menifee Valley Campus, 28237 La Piedra Road, Menifee, CA 92584.

Based upon the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist Form, MSJCCD staff determined that a Draft EIR should be prepared for the Proposed Project. The scope of the Draft EIR was determined based on the Initial Study, comments received in response to the NOP, and the scoping meeting held on December 17, 2015 by the MSJCCD.

MSJCCD prepared a Draft EIR, which was made available for a 45-day public review period from August 21, 2017, to October 4, 2017.

- A Notice of Completion, Notice of Availability (NOA), and the Draft EIR were sent to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and circulated to state agencies for review.
- The NOA and Draft EIR were mailed to regional and local agencies, organizations, and interested parties.
- The NOA was published in the *Riverside Press Enterprise* (English version) on August 21, 2017.
- The NOA and Draft EIR were available to the public for review at:
 - Mt. San Jacinto Community College District: 1499 North State Street, Building 700, San Jacinto, CA 92583
 - Menifee Valley Campus: 28237 La Piedra Road, Building 2004 (Business Services), Menifee, CA 92584
 - Wildomar Library at 34303 Mission Trail, Wildomar, CA 92595
 - MSJCCD website

MSJCCD prepared a Final EIR, including the Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR, the Findings of Fact, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Final EIR contains comments on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and revisions to the Draft EIR.

MSJCCD held a public Board of Trustees hearing on November 9, 2017, at 7:00 PM in the San Jacinto Campus 1499 N. State Street, San Jacinto, Room 200, San Jacinto, CA 92584.

C. Record Of Proceedings

For purposes of CEQA and these findings, the record of proceedings for the Proposed Project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

- The NOP and all other public notices issued by the MSJCCD in conjunction with the Proposed Project
- The Final EIR for the Proposed Project
- The Draft EIR
- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR
- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft EIR
- All written and verbal public testimony presented during a noticed public hearing for the proposed project
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the Response to Comments
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft EIR and Final EIR
- The Resolutions adopted by the MSJCCD in connection with the Proposed Project and all documents incorporated by reference therein, including comments received after the close of the comment period and responses to those comments
- Matters of common knowledge to the MSJCCD, including but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings
- Any other relevant materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e)

D. Custodian And Location Of Records

The documents and other materials that constitute the administrative record for the MSJCCD's actions related to the project are at the MSJCCD, 1499 North State Street, Building 700, Facilities, San Jacinto, CA 92583. The MSJCCD Facilities Department is the custodian of the administrative record for the project. Copies of these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been and will be available upon request at the offices of the Facilities Department. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(e).

II. FINDINGS OF FACT

MSJCCD, as lead agency, is required under CEQA to make written findings concerning each alternative and each significant environmental impact identified in the Final EIR.

Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

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

- (f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

The “changes or alterations” referred to in Section 15091(a)(1) may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370, including:

- (a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- (b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
- (c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.
- (d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- (e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

A. Findings Of Fact Regarding Impacts

IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

CEQA topics that were determined to have no impact or less than significant impact do not require written findings.

1. Initial Study

An Initial Study was prepared by MSJCCD to identify the potential significant effects of the project. The Initial Study was completed and distributed with the Notice of Preparation for the Proposed Project. The Initial Study determined that the Proposed Project would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to the following.

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Mineral Resources
- Population Housing
- Recreation

All other topical areas of evaluation in the Environmental Checklist were determined to require further assessment in an EIR.

2. Draft EIR

This section identifies impacts of the Proposed Project determined to be less than significant without implementation of project-specific mitigation measures. This determination, however, does assume

compliance with the existing regulatory requirements (RR) and project design features (PDF) as detailed in each respective topical section of Chapter 5 in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR found that the Proposed Project would not have significant impacts on the following.

AESTHETICS

- Impact 5.1-1: The Proposed Project would alter the visual appearance of the Project Site but would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or the existing visual quality of the site and its surroundings.
- Impact 5.1-2: The Proposed Project would generate additional light and glare but would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

AIR QUALITY

- Impact 5.2-1: The Proposed Project would be consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Air Quality Management Plan.
- Impact 5.2-2: Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would not generate short-term emissions in exceedance of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's regional construction significance threshold.
- Impact 5.2-3: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not generate long-term emissions in exceedance of the South Coast Air Quality Management District's regional operation-phase thresholds.
- Impact 5.2-4: Construction of the Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Impact 5.2-5: Operation of the Proposed Project would not expose off-site sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Impact 5.3-5: The Proposed Project would not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or established migratory wildlife corridors.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

- Impact 5.5-1: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not generate emissions that would exceed the forecasted per capita emissions significance threshold.
- Impact 5.5-2: The Proposed Project would not conflict with plans adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- Impact 5.6-1: Project development would not affect the implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- Impact 5.6-2: The Project Site is within a designated high fire hazard area and could expose structures and/or residences to wildfire danger

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- Impact 5.7-1: The Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards during construction or operation by creating runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing stormwater drainage system or adding substantial sources of polluted runoff.
- Impact 5.7-2: Development of the Proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge to cause a net deficit in aquifer volume.
- Impact 5.7-3: Development of the Proposed Project would not adversely impact the existing drainage pattern of the site to result in substantial erosion or siltation.
- Impact 5.7-4: Development of the Proposed Project would not adversely impact the existing drainage pattern of the site through the alteration of the course of a stream or river and would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

- Impact 5.8-1: Project implementation would not conflict with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating and environmental effect.

NOISE

- Impact 5.9-3: Project implementation would not conflict with applicable plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating and environmental effect.
- Impact 5.9-4: The Project Site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not result in exposure of future school population and workers to heliport-related noise.

PUBLIC SERVICES

- Impact 5.10-1: The Proposed Project would not significantly impact fire protection services.
- Impact 5.10-2: The Proposed Project would introduce new structures and students/staff into the Riverside County Sheriff's Department service boundaries, thereby increasing the requirement for police protection facilities and personnel.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

- Impact 5.11-4: Project circulation improvements have been designed to adequately address potentially hazardous conditions (sharp curves, etc.), potential conflicting uses, and emergency access.

- Impact 5.11-5: The Proposed Project would comply with adopted policies, plans, and programs for alternative transportation.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- Impact 5.12-1: Project-generated wastewater would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board.
- Impact 5.12-2: Project-generated wastewater could be adequately treated by the wastewater service provider.
- Impact 5.12-3: The Proposed Project would be served by sufficient water supplies without procurement of additional water entitlements.
- Impact 5.12-4: Construction of new water facilities would not result in adverse environmental effects.

ENERGY

- Impact 5.13-1: The Proposed Project would increase the demand for electrical services but would not require new or expanded electrical infrastructure for the provider or result in wasteful electrical energy consumption.
- Impact 5.13-2: The Proposed Project would not increase the demand for natural gas services to require new or expanded natural gas capacity for the provider or result in wasteful natural gas energy consumption.
- Impact 5.13-3: The Proposed Project would not result in increased demand for transportation energy and would not require new or expanded transportation energy capacity for the provider or result in wasteful transportation energy consumption.

B. Impacts Mitigated To Less Than Significant

The following summary describes impacts of the proposed project that, without mitigation, would result in significant adverse impacts. Upon implementation of the mitigation measures provided in the EIR, these impacts would be considered less than significant.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Transportation and Traffic

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 5.3-1: Development of the Proposed Project would impact the special status plant species.

Several sensitive species are known to occur on the Project Site, and others have moderate to high potential to occur there. As described in Table 5.3-3, *Special Status Plant Species Potentially Occurring on the Project Site*, three special status species have been observed on-site are Parry's spineflower (CRPR 1B.1, CCS), Long-spined spineflower (CRPR 1B.2, CS), and Paniculate tarplant (CRPR 4.2, NCS). However, these species are not listed species. Figure 5.3-5, *Sensitive Species*, shows their distributions on the Project Site.

Parry's spineflower is a Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) conditionally covered species that occurs on Rattlesnake Hill and in the northwestern corner of the site, outside of the development footprint of the Proposed Project. Therefore, Parry's spineflower could be impacted by construction of a foot trail on Rattlesnake Hill. The long-spined spineflower is an MSHCP-covered species that occurs in the central and northern parts of the Project Site. The populations in the central part of the Project Site and the southern-most edge of the northern population would be directly impacted by the Proposed Project in the course of project buildout. Impacts to covered species under the MSHCP would be mitigated through the MSJCCD's participation in the MSHCP, as stated in Mitigation Measure (MM) BIO-1. This would include impacts to Parry's spineflower, the long-spined spineflower, the nonlisted vertebrate species that occur on the site or have the potential to occur there, and the California gnatcatcher (CAGN).

Paniculate tarplant is not covered by the MSHCP and occurs around the site with greatest abundance in the southern part. The Proposed Project would impact virtually all of the paniculate tarplant on the site. However, the paniculate tarplant is a CNPS "watchlist" species that is common in western Riverside County. Therefore, potential impacts to this species are not considered significant.

The below lists special status plant species that were not observed on-site but have moderate to high potential to occur on the Project Site:

- Intermediate mariposa lily is a CPR 1B.2 species and a conditionally covered species within the MSHCP. There is suitable habitat for this species on the Project Site, and the potential for occurrence is high, mainly on Rattlesnake Hill.
- Robinson's peppergrass is a California Rare Plant Rank 4.3 species and is not a covered species within the MSHCP. This species is considered to high potential for occurrence on the Project Site, mainly on Rattlesnake Hill.
- Wiggin's cryptantha is a CRPR 1B.1 species and is not a covered species within the MSHCP. This species has a moderate potential for occurrence on the Project Site.
- Golden-rayed pentachaeta is a CRPR 4.2 species and is not a covered species within the MSHCP. This species has moderate potential for occurrence on the Project Site.

The golden-rayed pentachaeta is a CRPR 4.2 species with moderate potential to occur on the site and is not covered under the MSHCP. However, this species is common in the project region, and therefore, impacts to this species would not be considered a significant impact. The intermediate mariposa lily, Robinson's pepper grass, and Wiggin's cryptantha could be impacted by construction of a foot trail on Rattlesnake Hill. Wiggin's cryptantha also has the potential to occur southeast of Rattlesnake Hill. These species are not covered under the MSHCP and require mitigation to reduce

impacts. Construction of foot trails could also impact the coast live oak trees on the eastern side of Rattlesnake Hill. However, implementation of MM BIO-2 would ensure that impacts to these species are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures

MM BIO-1 The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District (MSJCCD) shall petition the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority to participate in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) to mitigate impacts to the special status plants and animals that occur or may occur on the Project Site, including the federally threatened California gnatcatcher.

Or

MSJCCD shall obtain an individual permit from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Section 10(a) of the Endangered Species Act.

MM BIO-2 A pre-construction survey of the Project Site for intermediate Mariposa lily, Robinson's pepper grass, and Wiggins cryptantha shall be carried out on Rattlesnake Hill, where the plants have potential for occurrence. If any of these species are found within the proposed foot trail, the foot trail shall be moved to avoid direct impacts to the plant. If Wiggins cryptantha is found in an impact area away from Rattlesnake Hill, the seeds shall be collected for placement in a qualified herbarium.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 would reduce impacts related to biological resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

Impact 5.3-2: Development of the Proposed Project would impact the special status wildlife species.

Special status wildlife are species that have been given special recognition by federal, state, or local conservation agencies and organizations due to limited, declining, or threatened population sizes and those species recognized by local and regional resource agencies as sensitive (see Table 5.3-4, *Special Status Animal Species Known from Project Region*, of the DEIR). Most of the sensitive species observed on the Project Site or with moderate or high potential to occur there are associated with the Riversidean coastal sage scrub, chamisal chaparral, grassland, and riparian habitats. The conversion of parts of these habitats to developed uses would adversely impact the sensitive species.

Of these species, the following sensitive wildlife species were historically and/or presently observed on the Project Site: 1) Red-diamond rattlesnake; 2) CAGN; 3) Bell's sage sparrow; 4) California horned lark.

The Proposed Project would convert 7.56 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat to developed land uses. The coastal sage scrub habitat is shown in Figure 5.3-3, *Plant Communities*, of the DEIR. The impacted habitat is in the central and southwestern parts of the site and is used by one pair of CAGN. Construction of foot trails in the northern part of the Project Site, particularly on Rattlesnake Hill, could adversely impact CAGN-occupied habitat. Impacts to CAGN would require a “take” permit under Federal Endangered Species Act.

Additionally, the following sensitive species have moderate or high potential to occur on-site: Western spadefoot toad, Orangethroat whiptail, Coast horned lizard, Cooper’s hawk, Southern California rufous-crowned sparrow, Western burrowing owl, moderate, Loggerhead shrike, moderate, Western yellow warbler, San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, Los Angeles pocket mouse, Dulzura pocket mouse, Stephen’s kangaroo rat (SKR), Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse, and San Diego woodrat.

The habitat assessment for the burrowing owl yielded no observations of burrowing owls or sign but identified burrows that could be used by burrowing owls for roosting and/or nesting. A protocol survey during the nesting season did not yield any evidence of burrowing owls using these burrows or other areas of the Project Site. Although no recently active nesting burrows were found on the Project Site, burrowing owls could establish nests on the site or in the buffer prior to project initiation. The burrowing owl is a covered species under the MSHCP. Therefore, potential impacts to the burrowing owl would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-3.

All of the wildlife species that could be adversely impacted are covered under the MSHCP, with the exception of SKR, which is covered under the separate SKR HCP. Therefore, implementation of MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-3 would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Indirect Impacts

The Proposed Project could indirectly impact sensitive animals in habitats that adjoin the Project Site as a result of noise during construction phase and light/glare during the operational phase.

Construction of the college campus would increase daytime noise levels in the project vicinity due to the operation of construction equipment. However, temporary construction impacts are often considered to be reversible in nature and implementation of RR BIO-1 would provide construction setback to reduce construction noise impact. With implementation of RR BIO-1, MM NOI-1, and MM BIO-1, potential impacts to nesting CAGN would be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Noise. At buildout, the proposed campus would provide college and adult education facilities for approximately 15,000 part-time or 10,000 full-time equivalent students. There would be noise associated with vehicle traffic, school sessions in the day and at night, and maintenance. Traffic noise would increase along Salida Del Sol (the main entrance for the campus on the western side of the site) from an existing 56 dBA CNEL to 68 dBA CNEL at project buildout. Under the Proposed Project, there would not be any sensitive species along the entrance road to the campus from Clinton Keith Blvd. Sound dissipates exponentially with distance from the noise source, decreasing by approximately 6 dB for each doubling of distance from the source. Where noise level along Salida Del Sol is 68 dBA CNEL, the noise would be reduced to 62 dBA CNEL at 50 feet, 56 dBA CNEL at

100 feet, and 50 dBA CNEL at 150 feet. Traffic noise in the coastal sage scrub habitat along of Salida Del Sol at Rattlesnake Hill that is occupied by the CAGN is at least 200 feet from the centerline of Salida Del Sol, therefore noise levels would not exceed the 60 dBA threshold for significant impacts to nesting CAGN. The Proposed Project would meet the exterior noise standard of 65 Leq for a school, and the coastal sage scrub habitat within the Project Site that is occupied by the CAGN from the interior of the campus is at least 50 feet from the area to be disturbed, decreasing the noise level by approximately 6 dB to 59 dBA CNEL. Therefore, the 60 dBA threshold would not be exceeded and impacts would not be significant. Moreover, the recreational field is also at least 100 feet from the area occupied by CAGN and it would not be used to host large sports functions. The absence of any listed bird species from the riparian habitats indicate that recreational noise would also be less than significant.

Light/Glare. Night time lighting would consist of perimeter lighting and security safety lighting. Lighting fixtures would be located and directed such that no light or glare would be directed off-site into natural habitats. The athletic facilities, which would be built in later phases of the project, would not be used after dusk, and no field lighting would be installed. As discussed in Section 5.1, Aesthetics, Impact 5.1-2, compliance with the provisions of City of Wildomar Lighting Ordinance pursuant to PDF AE-2 would ensure that light/glare impacts are less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Same as MM BIO-1.

MM BIO-3 Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall carry out a preconstruction clearance survey for burrowing owls within 30 days prior to ground disturbance in potentially suitable habitat within the site, consistent with the Burrowing Owl Instructions for the Western Riverside County MSHCP. Surveys and mitigation for burrowing owl shall be consistent with Section 6.3.2 of the MSHCP, Additional Survey Needs and Procedures.

If owls are found within the survey area during the nesting season, construction activities will not occur within 300 feet of the occupied burrows until nesting is completed. Take of active nests shall be avoided. A qualified biologist must confirm that nesting has been completed prior to the removal of the work buffer restriction. If owls are found within the disturbance footprint outside of the February 1 through August 31 period, passive relocation (e.g., use of one-way doors and collapse of burrows) shall be employed.

If the presence of one or more burrowing owl is confirmed, MSJCCD shall develop a Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan pursuant to the CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (March 2012) that may include passive relocation, onsite and offsite mitigation to mitigate the specific impacts to burrowing owls at the time of construction. The Plan shall be approved by California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

If the Proposed Project has the potential to impact SKR, the MSJCCD shall participate in the SKR Habitat Conservation Plan. The SKR HCP is implemented

by the Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA). Under the terms of the SKR HCP, the Proposed Project would qualify to obtain take coverage through payment of fees without having to secure an individual permit to mitigate impacts.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-3 would reduce impacts related to biological resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that upon implementation of regulatory requirements RR BIO-1 and PDF AE-2, and implementation of MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-3 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

Impact 5.3-3: Development of the Proposed Project would impact riparian habitat or other sensitive natural habitats.

The Project Site would convert several sensitive plant communities to developed land uses as shown in Table 5.3-5, Plant Community Impacts. The impacts at buildout include 7.56 acres of Riversidean coastal sage scrub, 3.07 acres of Riversidian sage scrub annual grassland ecotone, 0.23 acre of willow riparian forest-woodland, 0.02 acre of willow riparian scrub, and 0.01 acre of mulefat scrub.

Conservation of the Riversidean coastal sage scrub and Riversidian sage scrub annual grassland ecotone communities is covered under the MSHCP. Therefore, impacts to these sensitive habitats would be covered with the incorporation of MM BIO-1, which requires the MSJCCD to take coverage under the MSHCP participation. If MSJCCD elects to obtain its own Section 10(a) permit from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for impacts to the federally threatened CAGN, the permit conditions could be expected to cover mitigation for impacts to sensitive natural communities.

Compliance with MM BIO-4 that requires MSJCCD to obtain all necessary agency permits prior to grading, including impacts to riparian resources at a 2:1 or higher ratio would ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level. The MSHCP does not cover impacts to riparian communities, and requires that a Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) study be prepared to guide mitigation for impacts to these habitats. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitats would be mitigated to a less than significant level by MM BIO-4 and MM BIO-5.

Mitigation Measure

MM BIO-4 Prior to grading, the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall obtain all necessary agency permits for impacts to jurisdictional waters, wetlands, and riparian resources, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer (Corps), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Impacts to riparian habitats shall be mitigated at a minimum of 2:1 ratio or higher ratio, and impacts to unvegetated channel shall be mitigated at a

minimum ratio of 1:1, as required by the Corps, the CDFW, and the RWQCB. Mitigation for both temporary and permanent impacts shall be accomplished by one or more of following options: on- or off-site habitat restoration, purchase of credits from an in-lieu fee program, and/or purchase of credits from a mitigation bank. If a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan is required by any of the resource agencies (Corps, CDFW, and RWQCB), it shall be prepared according to agency requirements and shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

- Location and detailed maps of the mitigation and revegetation areas.
- An evaluation of the existing function and values and a description of the function and values to be achieved through compensatory mitigation.
- Detailed plant- and seed-mix requirements.
- Detailed planting plan.
- Specific and measurable five-year success criteria.
- Five-year maintenance and monitoring requirements.
- Invasive species management.
- Irrigation requirements, including the requirement to be off of irrigation for at least two years prior to final sign-off.
- Details of a bond or line of credit secured to guarantee success of the compensatory mitigation.

MM BIO-5 Prior to grading, the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District (MSJCCD) shall prepare and implement the Determination of Biologically Equivalent or Superior Preservation (DBESP) study. The DBESP shall include the following information, and shall be approved by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority prior to implementation:

- Definition of the project area.
- A written project description, demonstrating why an avoidance alternative is not possible.
- A written description of biological information available for the Project Site including the results of resource mapping.
- Quantification of unavoidable impacts to riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools associated with the project, including direct and indirect effects.
- A written description of project design features and mitigation measures that reduce indirect effects—such as edge treatments, landscaping, elevation difference, minimization and/or compensation through restoration or enhancement.
- A baseline biological assessment of the resources being impacted, used for comparison of biological equivalency.

- A written description of the proposed habitat mitigation—including habitat type, location, functional lift, and long-term stewardship responsibility.
- A finding demonstrating that although the Proposed Project would not avoid impacts, the habitat mitigation would be biologically equivalent or superior to the habitat being impacted and would result in a net equivalent or superior ecological condition.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM BIO-4 and MM BIO-5 would reduce impacts related to biological resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM BIO-4 and MM BIO-5 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

Impact 5.3-4: The Proposed Project would impact delineated jurisdictional waters but would not impact any protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Jurisdictional Waters

The project area contains a potentially jurisdictional ephemeral stream, plus two potentially jurisdictional tributaries as shown in Figure 5.3-6, *Jurisdictional Waters*, of the DEIR. Development of the Project Site would impact Waters of the U.S. and State of California that are associated with these two drainages on the Project Site. Two ephemeral drainages that join in the southern portion of the Project Site are considered Waters of the U.S. in areas where a clearly discernible ordinary high water mark (OHWM) was observed. Impacts to these ephemeral drainages include four locations where foot trails and/or pedestrian bridges would cross the ephemeral drainages, requiring the installation of culverts. Impacts to ephemeral drainages would also occur with the development of a gymnasium during Phase IV in the eastern portion of the Project Site.

The total estimated impacts to ephemeral drainages are 0.04 acre and 317 linear feet. Waters of the U.S. and State of California are both determined by OHWM; therefore, jurisdictional acreage are identical for the ephemeral drainages.

Restrictions on the use of Nationwide Permit (NWP) 39 include the following:

- The acreage limit for this NWP is 0.5 acre. This NWP also limits the loss of stream bed to no more than 300 linear feet, unless for intermittent and ephemeral stream beds the Corps engineer waives the 300 linear foot limit by making a written determination concluding that the discharge will result in minimal adverse effects. Pre-construction notification is required for all activities authorized by this NWP. The pre-construction notification requirement allows district engineers to review proposed activities on a case-by-case basis to ensure that the individual and cumulative adverse effects of those activities on the aquatic environment are minimal. If the district engineer determines that the adverse effects of a particular project are more than minimal after considering mitigation, then discretionary authority will be

asserted and the applicant will be notified that another form of DA authorization, such as a regional general permit or individual permit, is required (see 33 CFR §§ 330.4(e) and 330.5).

Impacts to ephemeral streams could exceed the 300 linear feet limit. If the Corps engineer does not waive the 300 linear foot requirement, MSJCCD would be required to seek an individual permit, which prescribes terms and conditions for projects on an individual basis. If the Corps determines that a permit is required, then the project would also require Water Quality Certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act through the RWQCB. Implementation of MM BIO-4, MM BIO-5, and MM BIO-6 would ensure that impacts to ephemeral stream are mitigated.

Impacts to Riparian Habitat

Development of the Proposed Project would impact riparian habitats associated with the ephemeral drainages, which include the top-of-bank or extent of the riparian vegetation, whichever is greater. The extents of impacts to riparian habitats occur in four locations where foot trails and pedestrian bridges would be constructed. Impacts to riparian habitats also include a sports complex in the eastern portion of the Project Site, totaling an estimated 0.26 acre. The CDFW would require a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement for impacts to riparian habitat and waters of the State. The amount of mitigation required by CDFW would be determined during the permitting process, but would be at a minimum of 2:1 ratio as stated in MM BIO-4.

Potential impacts to Waters of the U.S., State Waters, and riparian habitat would be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementation of MM BIO-4, BIO-5, BIO-6, and BIO-7.

Wetlands

Wetlands are those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Not all Waters of the U.S or State Waters are considered wetlands as wetlands contain three diagnostic environmental characteristics including the type of vegetation, type of soils, and hydrologic conditions. There are no wetlands, either non-jurisdictional or potentially jurisdictional, within the Project Site that meet these three-parameter definition of wetlands under the Corps 1897 Wetland Manual. No impacts to wetland would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Mitigation Measure

Same as MM BIO-4 and MM BIO-5.

MM BIO-6 Direct impacts to jurisdictional waters regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer (Corps)/Regional Water Quality Control Board shall be mitigated through the creation and/or enhancement of jurisdictional waters on-site. Prior to grading, a 404 permit from the Corps shall be required for these impacts. The impacted area of mitigation required by Corps will be determined during the permitting process, but shall be at a minimum ratio of 1:1.

MM BIO-7 Impacts to jurisdictional waters regulated by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) shall be mitigated through the creation and/or enhancement of

riparian habitat on-site. Prior to grading, a 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW shall be obtained for these impacts. The impacted area of mitigation required by the CDFW will be determined during the permitting process, but shall be at a minimum ratio of 2:1.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM BIO-4 through MM BIO-7 would reduce impacts related to biological resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM BIO-4 through MM BIO-7 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

Impact 5.3-6: The Proposed Project could disturb the coast live oak woodlands but would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

The City of Wildomar uses the Riverside County General Plan for planning purposes. The conservation element of the general plan relies strongly on implementation of the Riverside County MSHCP for achieving biological conservation objectives. The Proposed Project is consistent with the provisions of the Riverside County MSHCP and is consistent with the general plan in this respect.

The Project Site contains various trees such as Fremont's cottonwood, red willow, Mexican elderberry, laurel sumac, and coast live oak, as shown in Figure 5.3-4, *Trees Map*, of the DEIR. The Proposed Project would be consistent with the Riverside County Oak Tree Management Guidelines and preserve all on-site coast live oak. The current foot hiking trail alignment could impact coast live oak woodland on the north side of the Project Site. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-8 would ensure that the location of the foot trail would not require removal of any oak trees and in the event that removal of an on-site tree is necessary, MSJCCD would replace it using the same species at a minimum ratio of 1:1. MSJCCD would also be required to obtain a tree removal permit and pay fees in compliance with County Ordinance No. 559, Regulating the Removal of Trees. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Mitigation Measure

MM BIO-8 The foot trail on Rattlesnake Hill shall be designed and constructed to avoid direct and indirect impacts to the oak trees that grow there. If impacts cannot be avoided, then the trees shall be replaced on-site at a minimum ratio of 1:1.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM BIO-8 would reduce impacts related to biological resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes

are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM BIO-8 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 5.4-1: Development of the Proposed Project could impact previously unidentified archaeological resources.

No archaeological resources were identified onsite by the 2016 cultural resources records search, but 10 recorded resources were identified within a one-mile radius of the Project Site. Although the previous foot survey conducted in 2005 did not identify any archaeological resources, because buried resource could be uncovered during grading and 10 archaeological sites are present within one mile of the Project Site, the potential for discovery of buried archaeological resources during grading remains. Therefore, a mitigation measure has been provided to reduce such impact to a less than significant level. In accordance with CCR Title 14, Chapter 3 15126.4(b)(3)(A), MSJCCD acknowledges that preservation in place is the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites.

Mitigation Measures

MM CUL-1 Prior to the issuance of the first grading permit and/or action that would permit disturbance to the Project Site, the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District (MSJCCD) shall retain a Secretary of Interior Standards–qualified archaeological and Native American monitor(s) to observe grading activities and identify opportunities to avoid and preserve archaeological resources as necessary.

The qualified monitor(s) shall be invited to be present at the pregrading conference; shall establish procedures for archaeological and/or tribal resource surveillance; and shall establish, in coordination with the construction contractor, procedures for temporary halting or redirecting work to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of the artifact, as appropriate. The qualified Native American monitor shall be determined in consultation with the affected Native American tribe (i.e., Pechanga Band of Mission Indians) representative, and could also be the same as archaeological monitor.

Should archaeological resources, including tribal resources, be found during ground-disturbing activities, the qualified monitor shall first determine whether the resource is a “unique archaeological resource” pursuant to Section 21083.2(g) of the California Public Resources Code or a “historical resource” pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR]), or “tribal cultural resources” pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21074. Once the determination is made pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 21083.2, the appropriate actions shall be taken in appropriate sections of the regulations (e.g., 14 CCR §15126.4) to ensure that impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

MM CUL-2 Treatment and Disposition of Cultural Resources: In the event that Native American cultural resources are inadvertently discovered during the course of grading for the Proposed Project, the following procedures will be carried out for treatment and disposition of the discoveries:

1. If cultural resources are encountered during the course of ground disturbing activities, the all ground disturbing activities within 100 of the find shall be ceased until it can be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist, the archaeological monitor, and/or Native American monitor, who shall inspect the find within 24 hours of discovery. The qualified archaeologist, the archaeological monitor, and/or Native American monitor shall be empowered to halt or redirect ground disturbing activities away from the vicinity of the find until it has been assessed for significance.
2. Temporary Curation and Storage: During the course of construction, all discovered resources shall be temporarily curated in a secure location onsite or at the offices of the project archaeologist. The removal of any artifacts from the Project Site will need to be thoroughly inventoried with tribal monitor oversight of the process.
3. Treatment and Final Disposition: The landowner(s) shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts and nonhuman remains as part of the required mitigation for impacts to cultural resources. The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall relinquish the artifacts through one or more of the following methods:
 - a. Accommodate the process for onsite reburial of the discovered items with the consulting Native American tribes or bands. This shall include measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts. Reburial shall not occur until all cataloguing and basic recordation have been completed.
 - b. A curation agreement with an appropriate qualified repository in Riverside County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79 and therefore would be professionally curated and made available to other archaeologists/researchers for further study. The collections and associated records shall be transferred, including title, to an appropriate curation facility in Riverside County, to be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation.
 - c. For purposes of conflict resolution, if more than one Native American tribe or band is involved with the project and cannot come to an agreement as to the disposition of cultural materials, they shall be curated at the Western Science Center in Hemet by default.

- d. At the completion of grading, excavation, and ground-disturbing activities on the site, a monitoring report shall be prepared documenting monitoring activities conducted by the project archaeologist and tribal monitors within 60 days of completion of grading. This report shall document the impacts to the known resources on the property; describe how each mitigation measure was fulfilled; document the type of cultural resources recovered and the disposition of such resources; provide evidence of the required cultural sensitivity training for the construction staff held during the required pregrade meeting; and, in a confidential appendix, include the daily/weekly monitoring notes from the archaeologist. All reports produced will be submitted to the city, county museum, and consulting tribes.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-2 would reduce impacts related to cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-2 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

Impact 5.4-2: Master Plan buildout could destroy unique paleontological resources.

Excavations in the intrusive igneous rocks exposed in most of the Project Site would not encounter any recognizable fossils. However, excavations in the exposures of the Pauba Formation have the potential to encounter fossil remains. As shown in Figure 5.4-1, *Geologic Map*, of the DEIR, the Pauba Formation only occurs in the southwestern corner of the Project Site where planned improvements include a community park; the Student Services building; and a parking lot (see Figure 3-4, *Full Buildout Master Site Plan*, of the DEIR). The development in this area would occur in different phases and would require excavation at varying depths. In the event that the soil disturbances encounter Pauba Formation, a mitigation measure would be required to reduce a potentially significant paleontological resources impact to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

MM CUL-3 During grading activities, excavation of areas identified as containing subsurface Pauba Formation sediments shall be monitored by a qualified paleontological monitor. If paleontological resources are discovered during project grading, work shall be halted in that area until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find. The project paleontologist shall monitor remaining earth-moving activities in the Pauba Formation and shall be equipped to record and salvage fossil resources that may be unearthed during grading activities. The paleontologist shall

be empowered to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow recording and removal of the unearthed resources.

Any fossils found shall be evaluated in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and offered for curation at the Western Science Center in Hemet. A report of findings, including, when appropriate, an itemized inventory of recovered specimens and a discussion of their significance, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above and submitted to the Mt. San Jacinto Community College District (MSJCCD). This measure shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the MSJCCD.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM CUL-3 would reduce impacts related to cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM CUL-3 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

Impact 5.4-3: The Proposed Project could impact previously unidentified tribal cultural resources.

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 requires a tribe to submit a written formal request to relevant lead agencies if it wishes to be notified of projects. MSJCCD did not receive a formal written request from any California Native American tribes to be notified of projects for which the MSJCCD is the lead agency. Therefore, no formal notification pursuant to AB 52 was sent to specific tribes, and MSJCCD is not subject to AB 52 consultation requirements. However, as part of the scoping process, MSJCCD sent NOPs on December 7, 2015, notifying the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, Pechanga Band of Mission Indians, and the NAHC that an EIR would be prepared for the Proposed Project. A response was received from Ebru Ozdil, a representative from Pechanga Band of Mission Indians, requesting to be included in the future progress of the project but without specific comments for the Proposed Project. The MSJCCD is in compliance with the provisions of AB 52.

Regardless of the consultation requirements under AB 52, the EIR must disclose significant impacts on TCRs and discuss feasible alternatives or mitigation that avoid or lessen the impact. As part of that effort, met with the Pechanga Band of Mission Indians in September 2016 and with the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians in August 2016. The Pechanga Band of Mission Indians stated that the Project Site falls within the bounds of Pechanga's tribal traditional use areas, and the tribe would like to be involved in the EIR process.

Because the Proposed Project did not include a General Plan amendment, no tribal consultation pursuant to Senate Bill 18 and Government Code 65352.3 was initiated.

PRC Section 21074 defines "tribal cultural resources" as 1) resources that are listed or determined to be eligible for listing on the national, state, or local register of historic resources; or 2) a resource that the lead agency chooses, in its discretion, to treat as a tribal cultural resource. In the second instance,

the lead agency must determine that the resource meets the criteria for listing in the state register of historic resources pursuant to PRC Section 5024.1.

A Sacred Lands File search was requested from the NAHC, who responded that there were no known sacred lands within a one-mile radius of the Proposed Project area. The Project Site is not considered sensitive for subsurface tribal cultural resources. However, because the Project Site is undeveloped and previously unidentified tribal cultural resources could be uncovered during construction, and because the Pechanga Band has indicated its interest in protecting the history and artifacts of its ancestors, a mitigation measure has been included for ground-disturbing activities. Provided that this mitigation measure is implemented, the Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

Mitigation Measure

See MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-2.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-2 would reduce impacts related to cultural resources to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM CUL-1 and MM CUL-2 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

NOISE

Impact 5.9-1: Construction activities would create temporary noise increases in the vicinity of the Proposed Project and result in exceedance of applicable noise standards.

Phase I

The sensitive uses in the vicinity of the Phase I Project Site include the residential community 1,000 feet to the east of the Project, the Clinton Keith Veterinary Hospital approximately 650 feet to the west, the Santa Rosa Apartments approximately 1800 feet to the south, and a residential area approximately 2,500 feet to the northeast.

Short-term noise can be associated with site preparation, grading, and building construction of the proposed land uses, since, in general, the largest and most powerful equipment is used during these activities. Thereafter, application of architectural coatings, paving, and landscaping activities typically generate substantially less noise than grading activities do. However, despite the variety in the type and size of construction equipment, similarities in the dominant noise sources and patterns of operation allow construction-related noise ranges to be categorized by work stage. Noise levels from project-related construction activities were calculated from the simultaneous use of all applicable construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the center of the Phase I construction area) to the property line of the closest receptors, and are summarized in Table 5.9-9, *Phase I Project Related Construction Noise Levels*, of the DEIR. Although construction may occur across

the entire site, the area around the main building locations best represents the potential average construction-related noise levels to the various sensitive receptors during the overall construction portion of Phase I.

Phase II

The distances to the nearest receptors in Phase II would be different from the Phase I portion of the Project. The sensitive uses in the vicinity of the Phase II area include the residential community 1,000 feet to the east, the Clinton Keith Veterinary Hospital approximately 800 feet to the west, the Santa Rosa Apartments approximately 2,300 feet to the south, a residential area approximately 2,050 feet to the northeast, and the new on-campus receptors from Phase I development occupying the building approximately 270 feet away. Noise levels from project-related construction activities were calculated from the simultaneous use of all applicable construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the center of the phase II construction area) to the property line of the closest receptors, and are summarized in Table 5.9-10, *Phase II Project-Related Construction Noise Levels*, of the DEIR.

Phase III

Due to the location of the Phase III development on the Project Site, the distances to the nearest receptors would be different than for the Phase I and Phase II portions of the Project. The sensitive uses in the vicinity of the Phase III Project Site include the residential community 1,000 feet to the east of the Project, the Clinton Keith Veterinary Hospital approximately 1,000 feet to the west, the Santa Rosa Apartments approximately 2,700 feet to the south, a residential area approximately 1,850 feet to the northeast, and a new set of on-site receptors including the existing campus buildings that were constructed during phase I and II, that are approximately 350 feet from the center of the Phase III construction site. Noise levels from Project-related construction activities were calculated from the simultaneous use of all applicable construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the center of the Phase III construction area) to the property line of the closest receptors, and are summarized in Table 5.9-11, *Phase III Project-Related Construction Noise Levels*, of the DEIR.

Phase IV

Due to the location of the Phase IV development on the Project Site, the distances to the nearest receptors would be different than for the previous three phases of the Project. The sensitive uses in the vicinity of the Phase IV Project Site include the residential community 200 feet to the east of the Project, the Clinton Keith Veterinary Hospital approximately 1,400 feet to the west, the Santa Rosa Apartments approximately 3,200 feet to the south, a residential area approximately 1,500 feet to the northeast, and a new set of on-site receptors including the campus buildings that were constructed during Phases I through III, located approximately 500 feet away from Phase IV construction. Noise levels from project-related construction activities were calculated from the simultaneous use of all applicable construction equipment at spatially averaged distances (i.e., from the center of the Phase IV construction area) to the property line of the closest receptors, and are summarized in Table 5.9-12, *Phase IV Project-Related Construction Noise Levels*, of the DEIR.

Construction activities would generate average noise levels, at times, would be above the existing ambient conditions, may be readily perceptible to nearby residential uses, and would be greater than averaged noise levels modeled as described in Tables 5.9-9 through 5.9-12 for Phase I through Phase

IV. Additionally, at times when individual equipment items are at closer positions than the spatially averaged aggregate results above, noise levels from construction processes could potentially, but sporadically and intermittently, result in excursions into the low-80's dBA L_{eq} at a small set of receptors. This exceeds the noise standards shown in Table 5.9-6, Community Noise and Land Use Compatibility, and Table 5.9-7, Stationary Source Land Use Noise Standards. However, it is important to note that construction activities within the City of Wildomar are not subject to these standards, provided that such activities are conducted during the allowable hours (per Section 15.04.101 City of Wildomar Municipal Code). All construction will occur during the City of Wildomar's allowable hours of construction (i.e., 6:30 AM to 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday; with no exemption on Sundays or holidays); pursuant to PDF N-1. Nonetheless, in consideration of the length of overall project development to buildout across four phases and the relatively quiet ambient conditions in the semi-rural area, construction noise impacts at off-campus receivers are considered to be potentially significant.

Mitigation Measure

MM N-1 The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall ensure that the following measures take place during all construction phases:

- At least 30 days prior to commencement of demolition or any other construction activities, including all grading activities (on-site & off-site) for each phase, notification shall be given to all residents or businesses within a 1,000-foot radius of the property boundaries regarding the planned construction activities. The notification shall include a brief description of the project, the activities that would occur, and the duration and hours when construction would occur. The notification shall also include the telephone number of the construction contractor's authorized representative to respond in the event of a vibration or noise complaint. Further, all construction signage for every phase of the project shall comply with Chapter 15.04.030 of the Wildomar Municipal Code related to on-site construction signage.
- Fourteen (14) days prior to the beginning of construction activities, a construction sign notice shall be posted along Clinton Keith Road, Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth Lane, clearly visible to the public, that contains a contact name and telephone number of the construction contractor's authorized representative to respond in the event of a vibration or noise complaint. Further, all construction signage shall comply with Chapter 15.04.030 of the Wildomar Municipal Code. If the authorized representative receives a complaint, he/she shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action to the Community College District Facilities Manager, as well as the City of Wildomar Building Official.
- Construction hours shall comply with Chapter 9.48 of the Wildomar Municipal Code at all times which limit construction hours to 6:30 AM to 6:00 PM between June to September, and 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM between October to May (Monday through Saturday) with no construction occurring on Sundays or holidays.
- All heavy construction equipment used on the Proposed Project shall be maintained in good operating condition, with all internal combustion, engine-driven equipment fitted with intake and exhaust mufflers, air intake silencers,

and engine shrouds no less effective than as originally equipped by the manufacturer.

- Electrically-powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatically-powered or internal-combustion-powered equipment where feasible.
- All stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far away as possible from neighboring property lines, with particular attention paid to the residential areas to the north and east of the Project Site, and business to the west of the Project Site.
- All idling of internal combustion engines –both on the site and at nearby queuing areas – shall be limited to no more than five minutes for any given vehicle or machine. Signs shall be posted at the job site and along queueing lanes, construction site lay-down, loading, haul-in, and haul-off staging areas to reinforce the prohibition of unnecessary engine idling. Further, no idling of internal combustion engines—both on the Project Site and at nearby queuing areas—shall occur along the eastern project boundary to minimize noise impacts on the residential neighborhood east of the project site.
- The use of noise producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only. To the extent that the construction contractor has control over individual vehicle configurations, smart back-up alarms, which automatically adjust the alarm level based on the background noise level, shall be employed at the project site. Alternatively, if such adjustment is not possible, back-up alarms shall be turned off and replaced with human spotters.
- Route all construction-related trips (including worker commuting, material deliveries, and debris/soil hauling) so as to minimize pass-bys or residential areas around the Project Site; to the extent feasible.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM N-1 would reduce impacts related to construction noise to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM N-1 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Impact 5.11-3: Adequate parking would be provided for the Proposed Project during all phases of project implementation with the exception of Phase III with 7,000 FTE.

The proposed campus consists of the campus core with access from Salida Del Sol via four driveways. Two additional driveways would be created along Elizabeth Lane to access the community parking, athletic field, multipurpose courts, and gymnasium on the east side of the site.

All access driveways would be constructed to the city's standards. Vehicle traffic would not pass internally from the campus core to the recreational facilities on the east. Instead, there would be two pedestrian bridge connections from the campus core, to access the preserved open space area, which includes the hill and scrub habitat in the northern portion of the site, and the existing natural drainage courses on the eastern portion of the site. Implementation of the Proposed Project would provide approximately 1,883 parking stalls on five parking lots in four phases. Based on the planned student population numbers and parking ratios from the ITE Parking Generation Manual (4th Edition, 2010), the Proposed Project would provide adequate parking supply at buildout. As shown in Table 5.11-28, the Proposed Project would provide adequate parking capacity to accommodate the anticipated number of FTE students in each phase except during Phase III where there would be a shortage of 145 spaces in Future year 2030. Provided that the enrollment is anticipated to reach or exceed 7,000 FTE upon completion of Phase III, additional parking provisions will be required until full buildout. There is adequate area within the project boundary to provide additional parking capacity. Provision of additional parking spaces during Phase III would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure

MM TRAN-6 In the event that the anticipated full-time equivalent student (FTE) during Phase III exceeds 6,194 students, Mt. San Jacinto Community College Districts shall provide additional 145 spaces to maintain or exceed the peak period parking demand of 0.18 per FTE until Phase IV development occurs. Additional parking spaces shall be provided by reconfiguring or restriping the existing parking lots, or developing new parking areas within the limits of Phase IV boundary prior to development of Phase IV.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM TRAN-6 would reduce impacts related to parking to a less than significant level.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM TRAN-6 is feasible, and they are therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

C. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The following is a summary of the significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project, where mitigation measures were found to be infeasible or would not reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 5.3-7: The Proposed Project would not be consistent with one of the MSHCP objective.

The Project Site is in the Elsinore Area Plan of the Western Riverside MSHCP's criteria cells 5558 and 5455 (Cell Group L'), Subunit 4, Sedco Hills Area. The criteria cells were proposed to be part of the development of Linkage 8. Therefore, MSJCCD has conducted a Habitat Assessment, MSHCP Consistency Analysis, and field surveys for least Bell's vireos, burrowing owls, and CAGN.

MSJCCD would disturb approximately 38.7 acres of the 80.32-acre site, preserving approximately 41.7 acres of open space. MSJCCD is required to comply with Section 6.1 of the MSHCP by completing the Phase I Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Strategy (HANS) process. The HANS process is used by the County of Riverside to implement portions of the MSHCP by identifying and delineating conservation areas on specific properties. A biologist included in the Riverside County Environmental Programs Division's Authorized Biological Consultant Listing would review the application and perform the HANS analysis order to determine whether all or part of the property is needed for inclusion in the MSHCP Conservation Area. When it is determined that all or part of the property is needed for inclusion in the MSHCP Conservation Area or subjected to MSHCP Conservation Criteria, the parties may enter into negotiations on the terms under which the property or any part thereof will be acquired. If it is determined that all or a portion of the property is not needed for inclusion in the MSHCP Conservation Area, any subsequent development application covering the property released would not be required to comply with the MSHCP Conservation Criteria. The Proposed Project would be developed in compliance with the terms of the HANS negotiation as required under the MSHCP.

As part of the Habitat Assessment, a MSHCP consistency analysis was performed, which reviewed the consistency of the Proposed Project on the following goals of the MSHCP:

The consistency analysis determined that the Proposed Project would be consistent with the MSHCP objectives except for one objective as described below: f

Figure 5.3-1, *MSHCP Conservation Lands and Open Space in Project Vicinity*, shows the vacant lands and existing county-designated open spaces on an aerial photo of the Project Site and criteria cells in the vicinity. The parcels within Cell Group L' currently consist of a residential development in the southwestern corner, with small areas of nondesignated open space; a residential development in the northeastern corner, with approximately 60 acres of designated open space; a vacant parcel in the northwestern corner; and the Project Site, encompassing a total of 320 acres. It should be noted that the Cell Group L' boundaries do not exactly align with the Project Site's western boundary; therefore, only 76.42 acres of the 80.32-acre site are within Cell Group L'. The current open space area within Cell Group L' is 217.3 acres, representing 67.9 percent of the total Cell Group L'. Therefore, the conservation goal of 60 to 70 percent is being met. However, the Proposed Project would convert approximately 37.7 acres of existing open space in Cell Group L' at buildout, therefore decreasing the current open space area from 217.3 acres to 179.6 acres, or from 67.9 percent to 56.1 percent. Therefore, the Proposed Project would adversely affect the objective of meeting the 60 to 70 percent conservation target in the MSHCP.

Although the Proposed Project has been designed to preserve approximately 41.66 acres of the 80.32-acre site, representing 51.9 percent of the Project Site, approximately 9.54 additional acres would need to be preserved to maintain the MSHCP's objective for 60 percent conservation target. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be consistent with the conservation target objective for Cell Group L'.

The Proposed Project would conserve open space in the northern part of the Project Site, which is most important for reserve assembly within Cell Group L', in particular for conservation of Linkage 8, and MSJCCD will be subject to a Joint Powers Review process, as described in Section 6.6.2 of the MSHCP. It should be noted that the Reserve Assembly process incorporates flexibility to enable new information and data to be incorporated as part of the long-term MSHCP implementation process. Implementation of MM BIO-1 through BIO-8, RR BIO-1, and PDF BIO-1 would provide on and offsite mitigation that would collectively work together to reduce impacts associated with biological resources within the Project Site. However, even with compliance with the required regulations, project design features, and mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would result in conversion of open space to urban uses and decrease in conservation area target within Cell Group L' to below the target level. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be consistent with the MSHCP's Reserve Assembly objective.

Mitigation Measure

MM Same as MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-8.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-8, RR BIO-1, and PDF BIO-1 would reduce impacts related to biological resources impact.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-8 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

However, even with compliance with the required regulations, project design features, and mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would result in conversion of open space to urban uses and decrease in conservation area target within Cell Group L' to below the target level. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be consistent with the MSHCP's Reserve Assembly objective. Therefore, biological resources impact would remain significant and unavoidable, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

LAND USE

Impact 5.8-2: The Proposed Project would conflict with one objective of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

The Proposed Project has been designed to preserve approximately 41.66 acres of the 80.32-acre site, representing 51.9 percent of the Project Site. In order to meet the MSHCP's target open space goal, MSJCCD can only develop 29.1 acres of the Project Site, which represents 36.2 percent of the Project Site. If MSJCCD implements only Phase I through Phase III of the I-15 Corridor Campus Master Plan, and eliminate the proposed foot trails and pedestrian bridges, then the target 60 percent open space would be met. However, such mitigation would change the description of the Project and would not meet the Project's objectives of providing necessary recreational amenities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be consistent with the conservation target objective for Cell Group L'.

There is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level. Impact 5.8-2 would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

MM Same as MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-8.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-8, RR BIO-1, and PDF BIO-1 would reduce impacts related to biological resources impact.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM BIO-1 through MM BIO-8 is feasible, and it is therefore adopted (Pub. Res. Code § 21081[a][1]; Guidelines § 15091[1]).

However, even with compliance with the required regulations, project design features, and mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would result in conversion of open space to urban uses and decrease in conservation area target within Cell Group L' to below the target level. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not be consistent with the MSHCP's Reserve Assembly objective. Therefore, land use and planning impact would remain significant and unavoidable, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

NOISE

Impact 5.9-2: Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in operational traffic-related noise impacts at buildout.

A single segment of roadway (i.e., Salida Del Sol between La Estrella Street and Clinton Keith Road) was identified to experience substantial increases in traffic noise due to the implementation of the project. The segment of Salida Del Sol between La Estrella Street and Clinton Keith Road is the main roadway serving the campus and traffic flow noise would increase by 10.7 dB as a result of the campus development (at full build-out). No individual measure and no set of feasible or practical mitigation measures are available to reduce project-generated traffic noise to less than significant levels along the Salida Del Sol segment adjacent to the campus. Thus, traffic noise impacts along the single segment of Salida Del Sol between La Estrella Street and Clinton Keith Road would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

No feasible mitigation measures have been identified.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that there is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce operational traffic noise impacts.

Operational traffic noise levels would at times could exceed the significance thresholds and impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Impact 5.11-1: Project-related trip generation would adversely impact levels of service for the traffic study area intersections and roadway segments.

Existing (Year 2016) With Project Intersection LOS Analysis

A level of service analysis was conducted to evaluate addition of project traffic to the Existing Year (2016) intersection operating conditions during the weekday AM and PM peak hours. In order to determine any direct project impacts, the full buildout traffic from the project (10,000 FTEs) was added to existing traffic volumes. All study area intersection lane configurations are assumed to remain unchanged from Existing conditions. The Proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following 8 intersections during one or both peak hours:

Signalized

- 1) Palomar Street/Clinton Keith Road (#1)
- 2) Arya Road/Clinton Keith Road (#5)
- 3) Via Madrid/Clinton Keith Road (#14)
- 4) Greer Road/Clinton Keith Road (#15)
- 5) Murrieta Oaks Avenue/Clinton Keith Road (#16)
- 6) Whitewood Road/Clinton Keith Road (#20)

Unsignalized

- 7) Salida Del Sol/Clinton Keith Road (#8)
- 8) Elizabeth and Clinton Keith (#9)

Opening Year (2022) With Project Intersection LOS Analysis

Project traffic associated with Phase I (1,500 FTEs) was added to Opening (Year 2022) traffic volumes. All study area intersection lane configurations are assumed to remain unchanged from Existing conditions. The Proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following four intersections during one or both peak hours:

Signalized

- 1) Palomar Street/Clinton Keith Road (#1)
- 2) Via Madrid/Clinton Keith Road (#14)

Unsignalized

- 3) Salida Del Sol/Clinton Keith Road (#8)
- 4) Elizabeth and Clinton Keith (#9)

Interim (Year 2024) With Project Intersection LOS Analysis

Project traffic associated with Phase II (2,800 FTEs) was added to Interim (Year 2024) traffic volumes. All study area intersection lane configurations are assumed to remain unchanged from Existing conditions. The Proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following six intersections during one or both peak hours:

Signalized

- 1) Arya Road/Clinton Keith Road (#5)
- 2) Via Madrid/Clinton Keith Road (#14)
- 3) Greer Road/Clinton Keith Road (#15)
- 4) Whitewood Road/Clinton Keith Road (#20)

Unsignalized

- 5) Salida Del Sol/Clinton Keith Road (#8)
- 6) Elizabeth and Clinton Keith (#9)

Future (Year 2030) With Project Intersection LOS Analysis

Project traffic associated with Phase III (7,000 FTEs) was added to Future (Year 2030) traffic volumes. All study area intersection lane configurations are assumed to remain unchanged from Existing conditions. The Proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following 12 intersections:

Signalized

- 1) Palomar and Clinton Keith (#1)
- 2) Hidden Springs and Clinton Keith (#2)
- 3) I-15 SB Ramps and Clinton Keith (#3)
- 4) Arya and Clinton Keith (#5B)
- 5) George and Clinton Keith (#6)
- 6) Inland Valley and Clinton Keith (#7A)
- 7) Via Madrid and Clinton Keith (#14)
- 8) Greer and Clinton Keith (#15)
- 9) Murrieta Oaks and Clinton Keith (#16)
- 10) Whitewood and Clinton Keith (#20)

Unsignalized

- 11) Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith (#8)
- 12) Elizabeth and Clinton Keith (#9)

Buildout (Year 2035) With Project Intersection LOS Analysis

Project traffic associated with Phase IV (10,000 FTEs) was added to Buildout (Year 2035) traffic volumes. The Proposed Project would result in potentially significant impacts to the following 17 intersections during one or both peak hours.

Signalized

- 1) Palomar and Clinton Keith (#1)
- 2) Hidden Springs and Clinton Keith (#2)
- 3) I-15 SB Ramps and Clinton Keith (#3)
- 4) Arya and Clinton Keith (#5B)
- 5) George and Clinton Keith (#6)
- 6) Inland Valley and Clinton Keith (#7A)
- 7) Copper Craft and Clinton Keith (#11)
- 8) Nutmeg and Clinton Keith (#12)
- 9) Via Madrid and Clinton Keith (#14)
- 10) Greer and Clinton Keith (#15)
- 11) Murrieta Oaks and Clinton Keith (#16)
- 12) McElwain and Clinton Keith (#17)
- 13) Whitewood and Clinton Keith (#20)
- 14) California Oaks and Jackson (#22)

Unsignalized

- 15) Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith (#8)
- 16) Elizabeth and Clinton Keith (#9)
- 17) I-15 SB Ramps and Baxter (#28)

Existing Year (2016) With Project Roadway Segment Analysis

The roadway segment analysis is used as a planning tool to evaluate the adequacy of existing roadway segment capacities. A V/C ratio of greater than 1.01 to 1.25 suggests that it potentially exceeds capacity and additional review is required; however, if adjacent intersections provide the lanes needed to achieve acceptable peak hour LOS, then segment capacity improvements between key intersections may not be needed. A V/C ratio greater than 1.26 is considered exceeding capacity.

Table 5.11-17 of the DEIR summarizes the Existing (2016) With Project v/c ratio at the study area roadway segments. As shown, the two segments—Clinton Keith between Inland Valley and Salida Del Sol (#B) and Clinton Keith between Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth (#C)—exceed the average daily vehicle capacity thresholds, which are the same two segments exceed the thresholds without the Proposed Project. And one segment—Clinton Keith between Greer and Murietta Oaks (#E)—potentially exceeds capacity. However, if adjacent intersections provide the lanes needed to achieve acceptable peak hour LOS, then segment capacity improvements between intersections may not be needed. The adjacent intersections for roadway segments are #7, #8, #9, #15, and #16. As shown in Table 5.11-12 of the DEIR, two adjacent intersections (i.e., #8 and #9) are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS without mitigation.

Opening Year (2022) With Project Roadway Segment LOS Analysis

Table 5.11-18 of the DEIR provides a summary of the Opening (Year 2022) Conditions roadway segment capacity analysis. As shown on Table 5.11-18 of the DEIR, 3 out of the total of 8 study area roadway segments (i.e., Clinton Keith between Inland Valley and Salida Del Sol (#B), Clinton Keith between Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth (#C), and Clinton Keith between Greer and Murietta Oaks

(#E)) exceed or potentially exceed the average daily vehicle capacity thresholds under Opening (Year 2022) Conditions. The same three segments already exceed or potentially exceed the threshold capacity under no project condition. Although three segments exceed or potentially exceed roadway capacity threshold, if adjacent intersection provide the lanes needed to achieve acceptable peak hour LOS, then segment capacity improvements between key intersection are not required. The adjacent intersections for roadway segments are #7, #8, #9, #15, and #16. As shown in Table 5.11-13 of the DEIR, two adjacent intersections (i.e., #8 and #9) are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS without mitigation.

Interim (Year 2024) With Project Roadway Segment LOS Analysis

Table 5.11-19 of the DEIR summarizes the Interim (Year 2024) With Project level of service at the study area roadway segments. As shown on Table 5.11-19, 3 out of the total of 8 study area roadway segments (i.e., Clinton Keith between Inland Valley and Salida Del Sol (#B), Clinton Keith between Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth (#C), and Clinton Keith between Greer and Murietta Oaks (#E)) exceed or potentially exceed the average daily vehicle capacity thresholds under Interim (Year 2024) Conditions. However, the same three segments already exceed or potentially exceed the threshold capacity under no project condition. The adjacent intersections for roadway segments are #7, #8, #9, #15, and #16. As shown in Table 5.11-14 of the DEIR, three adjacent intersections (i.e., #8, #9, and #15) are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS without mitigation.

Future Year (2030) With Project Roadway Segment LOS Analysis

Table 5.11-20 of the DEIR summarizes the Future (2030) With Project level of service at the study area roadway segments. As shown on Table 5.11-20, 3 out of the total of 8 study area roadway segments (i.e., Clinton Keith between Inland Valley and Salida Del Sol (#B), Clinton Keith between Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth (#C), and Clinton Keith between Greer and Murietta Oaks (#E)) exceed the average daily vehicle capacity thresholds under Future (Year 2030) Conditions. However, the same three segments already exceed or potentially exceed the threshold capacity under no project condition. As shown in Table 5.11-15 of the DEIR, five adjacent intersections (i.e., #7, #8, #9, #15 and #16) are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS without mitigation.

Buildout (Year 2035) With Project Roadway Segment LOS Analysis

Table 5.11-21 of the DEIR summarizes the Buildout (Year 2035) With Project level of service at the study area roadway segments. As shown on Table 5.11-21, 4 out of the total of 8 study area roadway segments (i.e., Clinton Keith between Palomar and Hidden Springs (#A), Clinton Keith between Inland Valley and Salida Del Sol (#B), Clinton Keith between Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth (#C), and Clinton Keith between Greer and Murietta Oaks (#E)) exceed the average daily vehicle capacity thresholds under Buildout (Year 2035) Conditions. However, the same three segments already exceed the threshold capacity under no project condition. As shown in Table 5.11-16 of the DEIR, seven adjacent intersections (i.e., #1, #2, #7, #8, #9, #15 and #16) are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS without mitigation.

Although MSJCCD will be implementing the following project design features (PDFs) and regulatory requirement (RR), additional mitigation measures would be necessary reduce project traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

PDF TRAN-1 MSJCCD will coordinate with the City of Wildomar to install appropriate offsite signage and markings, including, but not limited to the following:

- No Stopping Anytime sign on Clinton Keith Road between Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth Lane
- No Parking sign on Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth Lane between Clinton Keith Road and La Estrella
- No Parking sign on La Estrella between Salida Del Sol and Elizabeth Lane.

RR TRAN-1 The Proposed Project's construction activities within the public street rights-of-way will be conducted in accordance with the City of Wildomar Municipal Code Title 12, Streets, Sidewalks and Public Places, Section 12.08.020, Encroachments and Excavation.

Mitigation Measures

Existing (Year 2016) With Project Intersection Impacts

MM TRAN-1 The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall coordinate with the City of Wildomar and pay an appropriate fair-share amount to provide the following traffic improvements. The fair share contribution amount shall be, at a minimum, the percentage identified in the Wildomar Campus Master Plan Traffic Study, IBI, September 2016.

- #1. Palomar and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #5a. Arya and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time to eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #14a. Via Madrid and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a shorter overall cycle length.
- #15a. Greer and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a shorter overall cycle length.
- #16. Murrieta Oaks and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal split to increase eastbound green time and decrease westbound green time and vice versa for reverse peak hour.
- #20. Whitewood and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #8a. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Meets Federal Highway Administration's Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).
- #8b. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Restripe westbound approach to provide one through lane and one right-turn lane.

- #9. Elizabeth and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Does not meet MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour), however, roadway widening or addition of lanes does not adequately address delay on the minor street approach.

Opening (Year 2022) With Project Intersection Impacts

MM TRAN-2 The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall coordinate with the City of Wildomar and pay an appropriate fair-share amount to provide the following traffic improvements. The fair share contribution amount shall be, at a minimum, the percentage identified in the Wildomar Campus Master Plan Traffic Study, IBI, September 2016.

- #1. Palomar and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #14a. Via Madrid and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a shorter overall cycle length
- #8a. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Meets the Federal Highway Administration’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).
- #9a. Elizabeth and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Does not meet MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour), however, roadway widening or addition of lanes does not adequately address delay on the minor street approach.

Interim (Year 2024) With Project Intersection Impacts

MM TRAN-3 The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall coordinate with the City of Wildomar and pay an appropriate fair-share amount to provide the following traffic improvements. The fair share contribution amount shall be, at a minimum, the percentage identified in the Wildomar Campus Master Plan Traffic Study, IBI, September 2016.

- #5a. Arya and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time to eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #14a. Via Madrid and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a shorter overall cycle length.
- #15b. Greer and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing and splits to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #20. Whitewood and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #8a. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Meets the Federal Highway Administration’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).

- #9a. Elizabeth and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Does not meet MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour), however, roadway widening or addition of lanes does not adequately address delay on the minor street approach.

Future (Year 2030) With Project Intersection Impacts

MM TRAN-4 The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall coordinate with the City of Wildomar and pay an appropriate fair-share amount to provide the following traffic improvements. The fair share contribution amount shall be, at a minimum, the percentage identified in the Wildomar Campus Master Plan Traffic Study, IBI, September 2016.

- #1. Palomar and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #2. Hidden Springs and Clinton Keith: Modify eastbound and westbound left-turns from protected to permitted and optimize cycle length.
- #3a. I-15 SB Ramps and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time to the southbound approach.
- #5b. Arya and Clinton Keith: Modify eastbound and westbound left-turns from protected to permitted and optimize cycle length.
- #6. George and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time to eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #7a. Inland Valley and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time to eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #14b. Via Madrid and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time for eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #15b. Greer and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing and splits to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #15c. Greer and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide additional green time to the eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #16. Murrieta Oaks and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal splits to increase eastbound green time and decrease westbound green time and vice versa for reverse peak hour.
- #20. Whitewood and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #8a. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Meets MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).
- #8b. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Restripe westbound approach to provide one through lane and one right-turn lane.

- #9b. Elizabeth and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Meets MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).

Buildout (Year 2035) With Project Intersection Impacts

MM TRAN-5 The Mt. San Jacinto Community College District shall coordinate with the City of Wildomar and pay an appropriate fair-share amount to provide the following traffic improvements. The fair share contribution amount shall be, at a minimum, the percentage identified in the Wildomar Campus Master Plan Traffic Study, IBI, September 2016.

- #1. Palomar and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #2. Hidden Springs and Clinton Keith: Modify eastbound and westbound left-turns from protected to permitted and optimize cycle length.
- #3b. I-15 SB Ramps and Clinton Keith: Install eastbound free right-turn lane.
- #5b. Arya and Clinton Keith: Modify eastbound and westbound left-turns from protected to permitted and optimize cycle length.
- #6. George and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time to eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #7b. Inland Valley and Clinton Keith: Restripe northbound approach to provide one left-turn lane and one shared left/right-turn lane.
- #11. Copper Craft and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time to eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #12. Nutmeg and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #14b. Via Madrid and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer green time for eastbound and westbound approaches.
- #15b. Greer and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer cycle time.
- #16. Murrieta Oaks and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal splits to increase eastbound green time and decrease westbound green time and vice versa for reverse peak hour.
- #17. McElwain and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal splits to increase eastbound green time and decrease westbound green time and increase overall cycle length.
- #20. Whitewood and Clinton Keith: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.
- #22. California Oaks and Jackson: Optimize signal timing to provide a longer overall cycle length.

- #8a. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Meets MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).
- #8b. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Restripe westbound approach to provide one through lane and one right-turn lane.
- #8c. Salida Del Sol and Clinton Keith: Add second westbound through lane.
- #9b. Elizabeth and Clinton Keith: Install traffic signal. Meets MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).
- #28. I-15 SB Ramps and Baxter: Install traffic signal. Meets MUTCD signal warrant criteria (Warrant 3, peak hour).

The summary of intersection improvements and associated fair share percentages for the Proposed Project for Impact 5.11-1 is shown in Table 5.11-30.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that MM TRAN-1 through MM TRAN-5 would reduce impacts related to the Proposed Project's traffic impacts.

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR. These changes are identified in the form of mitigation measures as presented above. MSJCCD hereby finds that implementation of MM TRAN-1 through MM TRAN-5 are feasible. However, the ability to implement these mitigation measures are subject to the review and approval of the City of Wildomar and Caltrans, and are thus dependent on factors beyond the control of MSJCCD. Therefore, MSJCCD cannot guarantee implementation of identified mitigation measures, and impacted intersections could remain significant. Impact 5.11-1 would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

Impact 5.11-2: The Proposed Project would adversely impact freeway mainline segment at southbound I-15 North of Clinton Keith Road (AM peak hour) for Interim (Year 2024), Future (Year 2030) and Buildout (Year 2035) conditions.

Existing Year (2016) With Project Freeway Mainline LOS Analysis

A level of service analysis was conducted to evaluate addition of project traffic to the Existing (Year 2016) freeway mainline conditions. In order to determine any direct project impacts, the full buildout traffic from the project was added to existing traffic volumes. Table 5.11-22, *Existing Year (2016) With Project Freeway Mainline Analysis*, of the DEIR summarizes the Existing (2016) With Project level of service at the study area freeway mainline segments. As shown, all freeway mainlines are forecast to operate at LOS D or better, not exceeding the threshold of unacceptable LOS F. Impacts would be less than significant.

Opening Year (2022) With Project Freeway Mainline LOS Analysis

A level of service analysis was conducted to evaluate addition of project traffic to the Opening (Year 2022) freeway mainline conditions. In order to determine any project impacts, Phase I traffic from

the project was added to existing traffic volumes. Table 5.11-23, *Opening Year (2022) With Project Freeway Mainline Analysis*, of the DEIR summarizes the Opening (Year 2022) With Project level of service. As shown, all freeway mainlines are projected to operate at acceptable LOS E or better, with the exception of I-15 northbound (north of Clinton Keith) in the PM peak hour which adds approximately 40 peak hour trips to an already deficient location. Since the threshold for a freeway impact is an addition of 100 trips or more, impacts would be less than significant.

Interim Year (2024) With Project Freeway Mainline LOS Analysis

A level of service analysis was conducted to evaluate addition of project traffic to the Interim (Year 2024) freeway mainline conditions. In order to determine any project impacts, Phase II traffic from the project was added to existing traffic volumes. Table 5.11-24, *Interim Year (2024) With Project Freeway Mainline Analysis*, of the DEIR summarizes the Interim (Year 2024) With Project level of service at the study area freeway mainline segments. As shown, four freeway mainlines are projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F. Since the project contributes to an already deficient freeway segment and adds 100 or more peak hour trips at I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road (southbound direction, AM peak hour), the impact would be considered potentially significant. The project does not add 100 or more trips at the other freeway mainline locations that operate unacceptably.

- Southbound I-15 North of Clinton Keith Road (AM Peak)

Future Year (2030) With Project Freeway Mainline LOS Analysis

A level of service analysis was conducted to evaluate addition of project traffic to the Future (Year 2030) freeway mainline conditions. In order to determine any project impacts, Phase III traffic from the project was added to existing traffic volumes. Table 5.11-25, *Future Year (2030) With Project Freeway Mainline Analysis*, of the DEIR summarizes the Future (Year 2030) With Project level of service at the study area freeway mainline segments. As shown, four freeway mainline segments are anticipated to operate at unacceptable LOS F. Since the project contributes to an already deficient freeway segment and adds 100 or more peak hour trips at I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road (southbound direction, AM peak hour), the impact would be considered potentially significant. The project does not add 100 or more trips at the other freeway mainline locations that operate unacceptably.

- Southbound I-15 North of Clinton Keith Road (AM Peak)

Buildout (Year 2035) With Project Mainline LOS

A level of service analysis was conducted to evaluate addition of project traffic to the Buildout (Year 2035) freeway mainline conditions. In order to determine any project impacts, Phase IV traffic from the project was added to existing traffic volumes. Table 5.11-26, *Buildout Year (2035) With Project Freeway Mainline Analysis*, of the DEIR summarizes the Buildout (Year 2035) With Project level of service at the study area freeway mainline segments. Since the project contributes to an already deficient freeway segment and adds 100 or more peak hour trips at I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road (southbound direction, AM peak hour), the impact would be considered potentially significant. The project does not add 100 or more trips at the other freeway mainline locations that operate unacceptably.

- Southbound I-15 North of Clinton Keith Road (AM Peak)

As shown in Table 5.11-27 of the DEIR and below, the freeway segments that would operate at LOS F with project conditions are also anticipated to operate at LOS F without the project. However, the Proposed Project would add 100 trips to one freeway segment, the southbound I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road during AM peak, that already operate at LOS F during Phase II, III, and IV of the Master Plan implementation. Therefore, this is considered a potentially significant impact.

Table 5.11-27 Summary of Impacted Freeway Mainline Segments

	Mainline Segment		Without Project			With Project			Change in Volume
Phase I – 2022									
NB	I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road	PM	6,502	45.3	F	6,542	46.1	F	40
Phase II – 2024									
NB	I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road	PM	6,717	45.7	F	6,757	46.1	F	40
SB	I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road	AM	6,717	45.7	F	6,817	46.2	F	100
NB	I-15 south of Clinton Keith Road	PM	6,717	45.7	F	6,797	46.2	F	80
SB	I-15 south of Clinton Keith Road	AM	6,717	45.7	F	6,737	46.2	F	20
Phase III – 2030									
NB	I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road	PM	7,364	50.4	F	7,404	51.1	F	40
SB	I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road	AM	7,364	50.4	F	7,464	52.2	F	100
NB	I-15 south of Clinton Keith Road	PM	7,364	50.4	F	7,444	51.8	F	80
SB	I-15 south of Clinton Keith Road	AM	7,364	50.4	F	7,384	50.8	F	20
Phase IV – 2035									
NB	I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road	PM	7,902	61.5	F	7,942	62.5	F	40
SB	I-15 north of Clinton Keith Road	AM	7,902	61.5	F	8,002	64	F	100
NB	I-15 south of Clinton Keith Road	PM	7,902	61.5	F	7,982	63.5	F	80
SB	I-15 south of Clinton Keith Road	AM	7,902	61.5	F	7,922	62	F	20

The Proposed Project would result in significant freeway mainline impact at southbound I-15 North of Clinton Keith Road (AM peak hour) for Interim (Year 2024), Future (Year 2030) and Buildout (Year 2035) conditions.

Freeway mainlines are under the jurisdiction of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and physical improvements on Caltrans’ right-of-way to reduce impact is beyond the control of MSJCCD. Additionally, any right-of-way acquisition would require substantial funding and would result in numerous impacts to adjacent properties. Therefore, freeway mainline improvements would not be economically and socially feasible. The ability to provide freeway mitigation is dependent on factors beyond the control of MSJCCD and no mitigation measure is available. Therefore, project’s freeway mainline impacts under Interim (Year 2024), Future (Year 2030) and Buildout (2035) conditions would remain significant and unavoidable.

Existing (Year 2016) and Opening (Year 2022) With Project Freeway Mainline Impact

No freeway mainline impact has been identified and no mitigation measures were necessary.

Interim (Year 2024), Future (Year 2030) and Buildout (2035) With Project Freeway Impact

The Proposed Project would result in significant impact at southbound I-15 North of Clinton Keith Road (AM peak hour) for Interim (Year 2024), Future (Year 2030) and Buildout (Year 2035) conditions.

Freeway mainlines are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans, and physical improvements on Caltrans' right-of-way to reduce impact is beyond the control of MSJCCD. Additionally, any right-of-way acquisition would require substantial funding and would result in numerous impacts to adjacent properties. Therefore, freeway mainline improvements would not be economically and socially feasible. The ability to provide freeway mitigation is dependent on factors beyond the control of MSJCCD and no mitigation measure is available. Therefore, project's freeway mainline impacts under Interim (Year 2024), Future (Year 2030) and Buildout (2035) conditions would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure

Freeway mainlines are under the jurisdiction of the Caltrans and improvements in the Caltrans' right-of-way would require approval that is beyond MSJCCD's discretionary power. Mitigation measure involving right-of-way acquisition or other improvements would require substantial funding from Caltrans and would result in numerous impacts to adjacent properties, therefore, would be economically and socially infeasible. Therefore, MSJCCD determined freeway mainline impacts to have no feasible mitigation.

Finding

MSJCCD finds, based on the Final EIR and the whole of the record, that there is no feasible mitigation measure to reduce impacts to freeway mainlines. Additionally, freeway mainlines are under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and physical improvements to Caltrans facilities require approvals beyond the control of MSJCCD. Therefore, impacts to freeway mainlines would remain significant. Impact 5.11-2 would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

D. Alternatives To The Proposed Project

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED DURING THE SCOPING/PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS

The following is a discussion of the alternatives considered during the scoping and planning process and the reasons why they were not selected for detailed analysis in the EIR.

1. Alternative Development Areas

CEQA requires that the discussion of alternatives focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project. The key question and first step in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR (Guidelines Sec. 15126[5][B][1]).

MSJCCD considered the following alternative locations to develop the proposed I-15 Corridor Campus but rejected as being infeasible:

- **Murrieta Education Center:** A location in the City of Murrieta near the I-15 and I-215 corridors was considered. This alternative location was introduced by a developer interested in constructing a campus and leasing the structure to MSJCCD. The campus would be comprised of 34,326 square feet and was to be leased to MSJCCD at an agreed amount of approximately \$1.18 million per year. However, this alternative site had insufficient land area to provide adequate parking to accommodate MSJCCD's needs and the required tenant improvements were in excess of \$1.5 million without a purchase option for MSJCCD. Therefore, this alternative was considered but rejected as infeasible.
- **Temecula Education Center:** A location in the City of Temecula near I-15 corridor was considered. This alternative location was introduced by a developer interested in constructing a campus and leasing the structure to MSJCCD. The campus would be comprised of 50,000 square feet and was to be leased to MSJCCD at an agreed amount of approximately 1.16 million per year. However, as with the Murrieta Education Center alternative, this alternative site had insufficient land area to provide adequate parking to accommodate MSJCCD's needs and the required tenant improvements were in excess of \$1.5 million without a purchase option for MSJCCD. Therefore, this alternative was considered but rejected as infeasible.
- **Lake Elsinore Campus:** A location east of I-15 off Nichols Road as part of a residential development in the City of Lake Elsinore was considered by MSJCCD. This undeveloped alternative site was comprised of two major parcels, with the northern portion in the City of Lake Elsinore and the southern portion in the unincorporated Riverside County. However, this alternative site location was not an ideal location for the target student population for MSJCCD. And this alternative site was bisected by the Stovepipe Creek streambed. Therefore, development of similar size and type of community college as the Proposed Project would have substantially the same environmental impact as the Proposed Project, while not serving the targeted student population, and potentially increasing vehicle miles traveled for students. Therefore, this alternative was considered but rejected for further consideration.

2. Alternative Site Design

In addition to the alternative development sites, MSJCCD evaluated various design options in an effort to reduce environmental impacts while accommodating necessary programs and meeting project objectives. MSJCCD reviewed a design alternative with three parking structures instead of surface parking lots and two baseball fields instead of a football field and track. This design alternative is shown in Figure 7-1, Alternative Parking Design Alternative. One of the designs considered by District in the early stage of planning included three multi-story parking structures. However, this alternative was determined as having greater impact due to the size of the buildings and grading amount. This design alternative would have substantially greater impacts on aesthetics, air quality, and noise. Therefore, this alternative was considered but rejected for further consideration.

ALTERNATIVES SELECTED FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS

The following alternatives were determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives with the potential to feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.

1. Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative

Under the No Project/ No Development alternative, the Project Site is not developed and no other development occurs on site. Conditions onsite remain as they are; that is undeveloped land with natural terrain and vegetation. This alternative would limit presence of MSJCCD to the areas with the largest student population in MSJCCD. Enrollment growth from the southwest region of MSJCCD has outpaced all other regions in the MSJCCD's 1,700 mile boundary. This growth over the last two decades has resulted in the inability to increase course offerings at the Menifee Valley Campus with all classroom and lab facilities scheduled to capacity. Waitlists for students in this portion of MSJCCD are several thousand, and they would likely to travel to Palomar College or Riverside Community College for access to the courses.

This alternative would lessen environmental impacts in all areas except in GHG emissions and operational air quality, and would avoid all significant and unavoidable impacts (i.e., biological resources, land use, noise, and transportation and traffic). Therefore, this alternative is considered environmentally superior when compared to the Proposed Project.

Finding

MSJCCD finds that the No Project Alternative is less desirable than the Proposed Project and rejects this alternative (Public Resources Code § 21081[a][3], Guidelines § 15091[a][3]).

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f], the “alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.” Additionally, among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.” [Guidelines Sec. 15126.6(c)] No Project Alternative would fail to meet most of the basic project objectives.

2. Alternative 2: Reduced Student Capacity Alternative

In this alternative, student capacity would be reduced by 30 percent to 7,000 students instead of 10,000 students. Therefore, under this alternative, the maximum student enrollment capacity would be reached in Phase III with 7,000 students. This reduced student capacity would also reduce the total building area by 47,000 square feet, from 495,000 square feet to 448,000 square feet, by eliminating the need to construct one general classroom building and the reduced student capacity would also reduce the required number of parking spaces. Phase IV development would include supporting facilities such as the maintenance & operations building and STEM building on the west main campus and athletic facilities on the east campus.

This alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of construction air quality, biological resources, noise, public services, transportation and traffic, utilities and service system, and

energy. Impacts in the areas of aesthetics, cultural resources, hazards, hydrology and water quality, and land use and planning would be similar to the Proposed Project. Long-term operational air quality and GHG emissions impact would be greater than the Proposed Project. This alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of biological resources, land use and planning, noise, and transportation and traffic, but impacts would remain as significant and unavoidable. The same mitigation measures would be required as the Proposed Project. This alternative is considered environmentally superior compared to the Proposed Project but would not eliminate any of the significant and unavoidable impacts.

Finding

MSJCCD finds that the Reduced Student Capacity Alternative is less than desirable than the proposed project and rejects this alternative. (Pub. Res. Code 21081[a][3]; Guidelines §15091[a][3]).

Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.” [Guidelines Sec. 15126.6(c)] Reduced Stadium Capacity Alternative would not result avoidance of significant and adverse construction air quality impact.

3. Alternative 3: No East Campus Development

In this alternative, only the core campus on the west side of the Project Site would be developed and the east side would remain undisturbed to reduce biological resources impact and to increase open space percentage within the Project Site. The area to be disturbed would be limited to 29.1 acres and the student capacity would remain at 10,000 FTE students at buildout. Therefore, under this alternative, the football field and track, gymnasium, two tennis courts, community parking, pedestrian bridges and foot hiking trails on the east side of the campus would not be developed. This alternative would reduce the total building area by 42,000 square feet, from 495,000 square feet to 453,000 square feet, by eliminating the gymnasium.

This alternative would lessen environmental impacts in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, GHG emissions, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, and transportation and traffic. Impacts in the areas of hazards, utilities and service system, and energy would be similar to the Proposed Project. However, the same mitigation measures as the Proposed Project would be required to reduce potential impacts. This alternative would eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts related to biological resources and land use and planning but significant impacts in the areas of operational noise and transportation and traffic would remain. This alternative would eliminate two of the four significant and unavoidable impacts, and would be considered environmentally superior.

Finding

MSJCCD finds that the No East Campus Alternative is less than desirable than the proposed project and rejects this alternative. (Pub. Res. Code 21081[a][3]; Guidelines §15091[a][3]).

Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid

significant environmental impacts.” [Guidelines Sec. 15126.6(c)] Reduced Stadium Capacity Alternative would not result avoidance of significant and adverse construction air quality impact.

III. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and the Guidelines Section 15093, MSJCCD has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the following unavoidable adverse impact associated with the Proposed Project and has adopted all feasible mitigation measures with respect to the impacts related to biological resources, land use, noise, and transportation and traffic. MSJCCD also has examined alternatives to the Proposed Project, none of which both meet the Project objectives and is environmentally preferable to the Proposed Project.

The Statement of Overriding Considerations, CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 provides:

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

A. Background

CEQA requires decision makers to balance the benefits of the Proposed Project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[a]). CEQA requires the lead agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 [b]). The agency’s statement is referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The following sections provide a description of each of the Proposed Project’s significant and unavoidable adverse impacts and the justification for adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

B. Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

The following adverse impacts of the Proposed Project are considered significant, unavoidable, and adverse based on the Final EIR and the findings discussed in Section II, *Findings of Fact*, of this document. The following effects of the project have been determined to be significant, adverse, and unavoidable even after implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

Biological Resources

- Impact 5.3-7: The Proposed Project would not be consistent with one of the MSHCP objective for Group Cell L.

Land Use

- Impact 5.8-2: The Proposed Project would conflict with one objective of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

Noise

- Impact 5.9-2: The Proposed Project would result in adverse traffic-related noise impacts at buildout.

Transportation and Traffic

- Impact 5.11-1: Project-related trip generation would adversely impact levels of service for the traffic study area intersections and roadway segments.
- Impact 5.11-2: The Proposed Project would adversely impact freeway mainline segment at southbound I-15 North of Clinton Keith Road (AM peak hour) for Interim (Year 2024), Future (Year 2030) and Buildout (Year 2035) conditions.

C. Considerations in Support of the Statement of Overriding Considerations

After balancing the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the Proposed Project, MSJCCD has determined that the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified above may be considered “acceptable” due to the following specific considerations, which outweigh the unavoidable, adverse environmental impacts of the Proposed Project.

The Board of Trustees finds that each of the following benefits is an overriding consideration— independent of the other benefits—that warrants approval of the Project notwithstanding the Project’s significant unavoidable impacts. Provision of the needed campus development would provide the following benefits:

Implements the Objectives Established for the Proposed Project:

1. Further the MSJCCD's mission to enhance access to higher education and lifelong learning for the growing population in southwestern Riverside County;

2. Further the State's identified mission and function of a community college in an area where there is a marked demand for two-year degree programs, vocational training, and other educational opportunities for the community;
3. Provide increased opportunities for education, create new jobs, and accommodate planned growth in the region;
4. Create a campus that is compatible with surrounding land use and that provides both passive and active recreational opportunities for the community;
5. Create a state-of-the-art, modern, full-service campus with an emphasis on science and technology, and
6. Conserve valuable biological resources on-site consistent with goals and objectives of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan.

Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled: I-15 Corridor Campus would accommodate the needed higher educational and lifelong learning opportunities needs for the growing population in the southwestern Riverside County, which include the City of Wildomar and other nearby communities. Providing a community college option for this area of MSJCCD would alleviate the unmet demands who would otherwise attend institutions farther away such as MSJCCD's Temecula Campus, Menifee Valley Campus, and/or San Jacinto Campus, or other colleges such as Palomar College in the City of San Marcos or colleges within the Riverside Community College District. Therefore, without the project development, students near I-15 Corridor would have to travel greater distance to seek out other learning opportunities. Therefore, the Proposed Project would have positive impact on the overall vehicle miles traveled in compliance with Senate Bill (SB) 375.

Social and Economic Benefits: The Proposed Project would utilize the undeveloped area of the City while preserving close to 42 percent of the Project Site, including Rattlesnake Hill. The Proposed Project would serve as a valuable asset to the community as an educational facility while providing both passive and active recreational opportunities through various athletic facilities and walking trails. There are three city parks in the City of Wildomar, totaling just over 15 acres. However, these parks are all located west of I-15 Corridor. Therefore, providing usable open space and recreational facilities as part of the Proposed Project would be social benefit to the community. Additionally, the City considered a "housing rich" community with the job-housing ratio of 0.72 (see Section 3.13(b) of the Initial Study), where recommended range is from 1.3 to 1.7, although these number vary by different jurisdictions. Therefore, additional employment opportunities created by the construction workers as well as permanent MSJCCD faculty and staff would positively affect the jobs-housing balance, while also improving the VMT. The I-15 Corridor Campus would be a state-of-the-art full service campus with an emphasis on science and technology. This type of institution and students with strong science and technology background would likely improve the image of the community and promote economic growth by attracting businesses and employers catering to such institution and population base.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, implementation of the I-15 Corridor Campus Master Plan would contribute toward reducing the VMT while complying with SB 375, and provide social and economic growth benefits in longer term, all of which would outweigh the unavoidable environmental impacts.