

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FORM: INITIAL STUDY

Environmental Assessment (E.A.) Number: 38575
Project Case Type (s) and Number(s): Surface Mining Permit No. 00205
Lead Agency Name: County of Riverside Planning Department
Address: 4080 Lemon Street, 9th Floor
Contact Person: Wayne Harrison, Chief Engineering Geologist
Telephone Number: (909) 955-3211
Applicant's Name: Gary Butler
Applicant's Address: P.O. Box 98, Thousand Palms, CA 92276

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Description: Surface Mining of fill material as well as sand and gravel material for Redi-mix concrete, asphaltic concrete, and other construction end-uses. No processing of materials will be performed on-site. Mining will take place in two phases over a period of approximately 5 to 25 years. Reclamation will be performed on a continual basis and the final reclaimed site will consist of six graded building pads.

B. Type of Project: Site Specific ; Countywide ; Community ; Policy .

C. Total Project Area: 18.83 acres (Total Gross Acreage)

Residential: Acres	;	Lots	;	Units	;	Projected No. of Residents	.None
Commercial: Acres	;	Lots	;	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area	;	Est. No. of Employees	
Industrial: Acres	;	Lots	;	Sq. Ft. of Bldg. Area	;	Est. No. of Employees	

Other: Surface Mining of Fill Dirt, Sand and Gravel

D. Assessor's Parcel No(s): 670-040-005

E. Street References: North of Vista Chino Road, Varner Road and Interstate 10, South of Dillon Road, westerly of Rio del Sol Road.

F. Section, Township & Range Description or reference/attach a Legal Description: The West 1/2 of the West 1/2 of the East 1/2 of the Southeast 1/4 of Section 1, Township 4 South, Range 5 East of the San Bernardino Base and Meridian.

G. Brief description of the existing environmental setting of the project site and its surroundings: The project site is located in a desert wash area approximately 1 mile north-northwest of the Community of Thousand Palms.

II. APPLICABLE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE POLICIES AND ZONING

A. Open Space and Conservation Map Designation(s): Areas Not Designated

B. Land Use Planning Area (L.U.P.A.) Information

- 1. **L. U. P. A. Name(s):** Upper Coachella Valley
- 2. **Subarea, if any:** n/a
- 3. **Community Policy Area, if any:** Western Coachella Valley Plan (M)

C. Community Plan Land Use Allocation Map Information

- 1. **Community Plan, if any:** Western Coachella Valley Plan (M)
- 2. **Community Plan Land Use Designation, if any:** M

D. Adopted Specific Plan Information

- 1. **Name and Number of Specific Plan, if any:** Not within a Specific Plan
- 2. **Specific Plan Planning Area, and Policies, if any:** n/a

E. Existing Zoning: M-SC (Manufacturing - Service Commercial)

F. Proposed Zoning, if any: n/a

G. Adjacent and Surrounding Zoning: W-2, M-SC

III. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below () would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

IV. DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS NOT PREPARED

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project, described in this document, have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

A PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/NEGATIVE DECLARATION WAS PREPARED

- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment **NOTHING FURTHER IS REQUIRED** because all potentially significant effects (a) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.
- I find that although all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration pursuant to applicable legal standards, some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist. An **ADDENDUM** to a previously-certified EIR or Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be considered by the approving body or bodies.
- I find that at least one of the conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162 exist, but I further find that only minor additions or changes are necessary to make the previous EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation; therefore a **SUPPLEMENT TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required that need only contain the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised.

I find that at least one of the following conditions described in California Code of Regulations, Section 15162, exist and a **SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required: (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; (2) Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR or negative declaration;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives; or,

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR or negative declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measures or alternatives.

Signature

Date

Wayne A. Harrison

For Ron Goldman, Interim Planning Director

Printed Name

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES ASSESSMENT

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 - 21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the proposed project to determine any potential significant impacts upon the environment that would result from construction and implementation of the project. In accordance with California Code of Regulations, Section 15063, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the County of Riverside, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or an Environmental Impact Report is required for the proposed project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed project.

Potential Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Significant Impact
------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------

AESTHETICS Would the project

1. Scenic Resources

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial effect upon a scenic highway corridor within which it is located? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings and unique or landmark features; obstruct any prominent scenic vista or view open to the public; or result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Sources: Riverside County Comprehensive General Plan (CGP) Fig. VI.45; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The mine will be, to a small extent, visible from Interstate 10 (a designated scenic corridor). The distance from Interstate 10 to the project site is approximately 1.9 miles.

Mitigation: Implementation of the Reclamation Plan - that is re-vegetation using a native seed mix will enable the site to blend in with the natural landscape.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with the approved Mining Plan.

2. Mt. Palomar Observatory

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Interfere with the night time use of the Mt. Palomar Observatory, as protected through Riverside County Ordinance No. 655? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Source: GIS data base, Ord. No. 655, CGP Fig. II.27

Findings of Fact: The project site is approximately 42 miles from Mt. Palomar and located outside the zones as defined by the Riverside County Ordinance No. 655. Potential light and glare from this project will not impact the night time use of this major astronomical facility.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

3. Other Lighting Issues

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Expose residential property to unacceptable light levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The proposed Mine will not contain exterior nor interior lighting.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES Would the project

4. Agriculture

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing agricultural use, or a Williamson Act (agricultural preserve) contract (Riv. Co. Agricultural Land Conservation Contract Maps)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Cause development of non-agricultural uses within 300 feet of agriculturally zoned property (Ordinance No. 625 Right-to-Farm)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: CGP Fig. VI.34-VI.35, Ordinance No. 625; GIS database.

Findings of Fact: The project site is not directly affected by agriculture programs and land use standards of the CGP. The project site is not designated as farm land of any type (Fig. VI34 of the CGP). The project is not adjacent to or within 300 feet of agricultural zones (A-1, A-2, C/V, A-D, and A-P0. The project site is not within or adjacent to an agricultural preserve established pursuant to the Williamson Act..

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

AIR QUALITY Would the project

5. Air Quality Impacts

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors which are located within 1 mile of the project site to project substantial point source emissions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve the construction of a sensitive receptor located within one mile of an existing substantial point source emitter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan.

Findings of Fact: The project is a direct dig and haul operation with no processing or stockpiling (other than topsoil for reclamation) of materials on site.

Mitigation: Regular application of water for dust control, stop work at wind speeds in excess of 20 mph, as indicated in the Fugitive Dust Emission Control Plan.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by Riverside County Mining Inspector and periodic unannounced inspections.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project

6. Wildlife & Vegetation

a) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any endangered, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (Sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (Sections 17.11 or 17.12)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

f) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

g) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: CGP Fig. VI.36-VI.40; A General Biological Resources Survey and Baseline Vegetation Study for the 20+/-Asphalt MD, Sand and Gravel Mine, Thousand Palms, Riverside County, CA, prepared by L&L Env. Inc., July 2002 (PDB02157).

Findings of Fact: No state or federally-listed, endangered or threatened plant or wildlife species were observed on the project site. The site is located in the Coachella Valley Fringe-toed Lizard fee area.

Mitigation: Payment of Fringe-toed Lizard fee.

Monitoring: None required.

CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project

7. Historic Resources

a) Alter or destroy an historic site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: CGP Fig. VI.32-VI.33 & VI.46-VI.48; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); An Archaeological Assessment Report prepared by L&L Environmental, Inc., March 12, 2002 (PDA03077).

Findings of Fact: The archeological resource assessment report prepared for this project indicates that no historic or prehistoric resources were observed on the project site, and that the potential for discovery of buried historic or prehistoric resources is considered low to none. No further cultural resources investigations or monitoring are recommended.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures recommended by the archaeology report, include procedures for the unexpected event of discovery of cultural resources, human remains, significant and/or unique archaeological or historical deposits, and/or prehistoric deposits. In that event, the operator will cease work in that area, contact the necessary government agencies and a qualified Archaeologist to perform a field evaluation.

Monitoring: None required.

8. Archaeological Resources

a) Alter or destroy an archaeological site.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. VI.32-VI.33 & VI.46-VI.48; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); An Archaeological Assessment Report prepared by L&L Environmental, Inc., March 12, 2002 (PDA03077).

Findings of Fact: The archeological resource assessment report prepared for this project indicates that no historic or prehistoric resources were observed on the project site, and that the potential for discovery of buried historic or prehistoric resources is considered low to none. No further cultural resources investigations or monitoring are recommended.

Mitigation: Mitigation measures recommended by the archaeology report, include procedures for the unexpected event of discovery of cultural resources, human remains, significant and/or unique archaeological or historical deposits, and/or prehistoric deposits. In that event, the operator will cease work in that area, contact the necessary government agencies and a qualified Archaeologist to perform a field evaluation.

Monitoring: None required.

9. Paleontological Resources

Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Source: CGP Paleontological Sensitivity Resources Map (Nov. 1986); An Archaeological Assessment Report prepared by L&L Environmental, Inc., March 12, 2002 (PDA03077). Southland Engineering.

Findings of Fact: The project site is contained within an area of potential paleontological resource. The site exhibits alluvial and sloping topography, and has a low probability of containing non-renewable paleontological resources and the nature of the proposed grading will not likely encounter buried paleontological resources. No unique geological features exist within the project boundaries.

Mitigation: In the event paleontological resources are encountered at the site, the operator will cease work in that area, contact the necessary government agencies and a qualified Paleontologist to perform a field evaluation.

Monitoring: By project paleontologist, as required.

GEOLGY AND SOILS

Definitions for Land Use Suitability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Land Use Suitability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable S - Generally Suitable PS - Provisionally Suitable
 U - Generally Unsuitable R - Restricted

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

10. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or County Fault Hazard Zones

Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

A-P Zones NA PS U R

CFH Zones NA PS U R

Source: CGP Fig. VI.1 - VI.3, GIS database; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The project site is situated along the southern base of the Indio Hills. The Banning Fault of the San Andreas fault system lies approximately 1-mile northeast of the subject site cutting the northwestern Indio Hills in two. The present mine site is located in Groundshaking Zone VC. Human occupancy structures are not proposed within the A-P zone. Future mining and reclamation activities should not be impacted severely by earthquake-related phenomenon such as ground shaking, landslides, mudflows, liquefaction, or settlement.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

11. Liquefaction Potential Zone

Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

NA S PS U R

Source: CGP Fig. VI.1 and Fig.VI.4, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project is not located in a liquefaction potential zone. Liquefaction is not expected to occur during an earthquake because of the depth of the groundwater table which is in excess of 200 feet.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

12. Groundshaking Zone

Strong seismic ground shaking?

NA S PS U R

Source: CGP Fig. VI.1

Findings of Fact: The project site lies within Groundshaking Zone (VC) and being located approximately 1 mile Southwest of the San Andreas Fault Zone, severe seismic shaking can be expected. No structures for human occupancy are proposed to be constructed for the mining or reclamation operations.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

13. Landslide Risk

Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, collapse, or rockfall hazards?

NA S PS U R

Source: Riv. Co. 800 Scale Seismic Maps, CGP Fig. VI.6, SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); County Slope Stability Report No. 636.

Findings of Fact: The project is not affected by landslide or rockfall risks as the project site is not adjacent to any cliffs or boulder covered slopes. All mining/reclaimed slopes will be final-graded to no steeper than 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical).

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

14. Ground Subsidence

Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in ground subsidence?

Source: GIS Database

Findings of Fact: The project is not affected by ground subsidence.

Mitigation: Final end use of the reclaimed areas shall require a geotechnical report for all future buildings when proposed and prior to permit.

Monitoring: None required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

15. Other Geologic Hazards

Such as seiche, mudflow or volcanic hazard?

Source: County Seismic/Geologic Maps

Findings of Fact: The project is not affected by geological hazards such as seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard as it is not located near the ocean, a large body of water, or an active volcano.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

b. Would the project:

16. Slopes

a) Change topography or ground surface relief features?

b) Create cut or fill slopes greater than 2:1 or higher than 10 feet?

c) Result in grading that affects or negates subsurface sewage disposal systems?

Source: SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); County Slope Stability Report No. 636; Southland Engineering Response to Comments, December 12, 2002.

Findings of Fact: Proposed cut slopes were analyzed and found to be grossly (static and pseudostatic) stable up to 1.5:1 inclination. No onsite sewage disposal proposed.

Mitigation: The slopes will be kept at a maximum of 1.5:1 during the mining operations in conformance with the Mining and Reclamation Plan. Slopes will be constructed, planted and maintained as recommended in County Slope Stability Report No. 636 and Southland Engineering's December 12, 2002 Response to Comments.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with Riv. County Ord. 555, MSHA regulations and the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan.

17. Soils

a) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

b) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Source: Table 18-1-B, Uniform Building Code Volume 1, 1994; U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey, Coachella Valley Area; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: According to the USDA, the majority of the site is underlain by "Badland" type soil. This unit consists of steep, drained, and severely eroded areas broken by numerous deeply entrenched channels with many steep side drainages that have raw bands of freshly exposed material. It is nearly

barren of vegetation. The erosion hazard is high. Soils on the project site are shallow and poorly developed.

Mitigation: Compliance with the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan for the project.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with Riv. County Ord. 555 and the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan.

18. Erosion

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Change deposition, siltation or erosion which may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed of a lake? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in any increase in water erosion either on or off site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Source: U.S.D.A. Soil Conservation Service Soil Survey, Coachella Valley Area; USGS Topographic Map, Cathedral City, California, 1981; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The subject site would not be impacted by drainage issues as identified in the CGP. There are no blueline streams on the project site or within the watershed area of the site. Water falling into the site that does not percolate into the ground will be collected and channeled by grading contours and slope drains and then discharged from the mine along the southern boundary of the site.

Mitigation: Compliance with the mining and reclamation plan and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the site.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with Riv. County Ord. 555 and the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan and SWPPP requirements.

19. Wind Erosion and Blowsand from project either on or off site

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Be impacted by or result in an increase in wind erosion and blowsand, either on or off site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Source: CGP Fig. VI.1-VI.2, Ord. 460, Sec. 14.2 & Ord. 484, SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The project is within an active blowsand area boundary. Blowsand is a maintenance concern as it creates drifting sand dunes and also acts as an abrasive on metal, glass and wood surfaces such as cars, windows, and siding of existing buildings. Air Quality and PM10 concerns are addressed in Section No. 5, above.

Mitigation: Implementation of Fugitive Dust Emissions Control Plan.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with Riv. County Ord. 555 and the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project

20. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: Hazardous Waste Site Disclosure Statement; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The project is not anticipated to generate hazardous waste. The project operations will utilize fuels, lubricants, coolants, and solvent degreasing agents for periodic equipment maintenance. These materials will not be stored on-site, rather, they will be delivered to the site as needed.

Mitigation: None Required

Monitoring: Monitoring will be provided by the Building and Safety, Health and Fire Departments and through Ordinance Nos. 457,615, 617, and 651.

21. Airports

a) Result in an inconsistency with an Airport Master Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require review by the Airport Land Use Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, or heliport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. II.18.2-II.18.4, II.18.8-II.18.10 & IV. 27-IV.36; Comprehensive Land Use Plans for Thermal, Chiriaco Summit, Desert Center, and Blythe Airports.

Findings of Fact: The project is not within an airport influence area boundary or otherwise affected by airport issues as identified in the CGP.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

22. Hazardous Fire Area

Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Source: CGP Fig. VI.30 - VI.31, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project is not in a High Fire Area as identified by Ordinance No. 546.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project

23. Water Quality Impacts

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

b) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

c) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

g) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Source: SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project may have a effect on water quality issues identified in the CGP, such as erosion-sedimentation. Water is provided by a private water well on-site. The groundwater table is

Less than
Potentially Significant Impact Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

approximately 300 feet below ground surface. The project not is within the FEMA 100 year Flood Plain. The site is not within a groundwater recharge area.

Mitigation: Compliance with Mining and Reclamation Plan and SWPPP.

Monitoring: Monitoring will be provided by annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with Riv. County Ord. 555 and the approved Mining and Reclamation Plan and the SWPPP.

24. Floodplains

Degree of Suitability in 100-Year Floodplains. As indicated below, the appropriate Degree of Suitability has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable U - Generally Unsuitable R - Restricted

a) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Changes in absorption rates or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam (Dam Inundation Area)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. VI.7 & CGP Fig. VI.8; FIRM, Community Panel Number 1585B, September 30, 1988 (Revised Zone C to Zone D, June 10, 1998; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); GIS database.

Findings of Fact: The southern portion of the project site is within flood zone B while the northern portion is in Flood Zone C according to the GIS database. Flooding is not expected to be significant. Water flows only occur during rainfall events. The project is not affected by a dam inundation area.

Mitigation: Compliance with approved Mining and Reclamation Plan

Monitoring: Monitoring to be provided by the Department of Building and Safety

LAND USE/PLANNING Would the project

25. Land Use

a) Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect land use within a city sphere of influence and/or within adjacent city or county boundaries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Figs. II 18.7 & II 18.12 - WCVP

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Findings of Fact: The project is not located within the WCVF.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

26. Planning

a) Be consistent with the site's existing or proposed zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Be compatible with existing surrounding zoning?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be compatible with existing and planned surrounding land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be consistent with the land use designations and policies of the Comprehensive General Plan (including those of any applicable Specific Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: GIS database; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003); Figure II.18.12 - WCVF.

Findings of Fact: The project is not located within the WCVF.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project

27. Mineral Resources

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource in an area classified or designated by the State that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be an incompatible land use located adjacent to a State classified or designated area or existing surface mine?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or property to hazards from proposed, existing or abandoned quarries or mines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Source: CGP Fig. VI.41-VI.42; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The Riverside County Mineral Resources Map, dated April 1988, shows the project area as a MRZ-2 (designated) zone and near sand and gravel resources. The project will impact the available mineral resources of the area through extraction by mining activities, which is a positive beneficial use for the resource. The project is located within a State of California Designated Mineral Resource Zone.

Less than
Potentially Significant Impact Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The only mineral commodities to be mined are sand and gravel and fill soils. Sand and gravel have been mined intermittently at this site, The proposed project will comply with all federal and state mine safety regulations concerning operating standards, and safety berms along elevated inter-quarry roads. After reclamation is completed, the site will be developed as commercial/industrial property.

Mitigation: Mitigation through compliance with approved Mining and Reclamation Plan.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with Riv. County Ord. 555 and conditions of approval.

NOISE Would the project result in

Definitions for Noise Acceptability Ratings

Where indicated below, the appropriate Noise Acceptability Rating(s) has been checked.

NA - Not Applicable A - Generally Acceptable B - Conditionally Acceptable

C - Generally Unacceptable D - Land Use Discouraged

28. Airport Noise

a) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA A B C D

b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

NA A B C D

Source: CGP Fig. II.18.5, II.18.11 & Vi.121984;

Findings of Fact: The project will not be effected by airport noise.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

29. Railroad Noise

NA A B C D

Source: CGP Fig. VI.11, VI.13 - VI.16

Findings of Fact: The project will not be effected by railroad noise.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

30. Highway Noise

NA A B C D

Source: CGP Fig. IV.9, VI.11, VI.17 - VI.29

Findings of Fact: The project will not be effected by highway noise.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

31. Other Noise

NA A B C D

Source: N/A

Findings of Fact: N/A

Mitigation: N/A

Monitoring: N/A

32. Noise Effects on or by the Project

a) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

b) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

c) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

d) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Source: CGP Fig. VI.11; Southland Engineering.

Findings of Fact: The project will not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Mining and reclamation activities may result in a minor temporary increase in ambient noise levels and groundborne vibration at the site.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

33. Housing

a) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a demand for additional housing, particularly housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the County's median income?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect a County Redevelopment Project Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Source: USGS 7.5 Minute West Berdoo Canyon, CA Quadrangle (1988); GIS printout

Findings of Fact: The project will not displace existing housing or people. The project will not result in substantial population growth in the area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

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

34. Fire Services

Source: CGP Fig. IV.16-IV.18, GIS database.

Findings of Fact: The project is not located in a high fire hazard area. An existing County fire station is located close to the site.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

35. Sheriff Services

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18, GIS database

Findings of Fact: The project will not impact sheriff services.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

36. Schools

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18, SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The project is located within Palm Springs Unified #18 School District, but will not directly impact schools.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

37. Libraries

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18

Findings of Fact: The project will not impact libraries.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

38. Health Services

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18

Findings of Fact: The project will not impact health services.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

RECREATION

39. Parks and Recreation

a) Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

b) Would the project include the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

c) Is the project located within a C.S.A. or recreation and park district with a Community Parks and Recreation Plan (Quimby fees)?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Source: CGP Fig. IV.19-IV.20, Ord. No. 460, Section 10.35, Ord. No. 659; GIS printout

Findings of Fact: The project will not impact parks or recreational facilities. The project site is not within a County Service Area.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

40. Recreational Trails.

Source: CGP Fig. IV.19-IV.24, Riv. Co. 800 Scale Equestrian Trail Maps, Open Space and Conservation Map for Western County trail alignments

Findings of Fact: The project will not impact recreational trails.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project

41. Circulation

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

b) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

c) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated road or highways?

d) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

e) Alter waterborne, rail or air traffic?

f) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g. , sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

g) Cause an effect upon, or a need for new or altered maintenance of roads?

h) Cause an effect upon circulation during the project's construction?

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

i) Result in inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

j) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: CGP Fig. IV.1-IV.11;

Findings of Fact: Traffic levels may increase. The project is located within the TUMF fee area.

Mitigation: Compliance with Condition No. 80 TRANS 3- payment of TUMF fees in accordance with Ord. No. 673.

Monitoring: by Transportation Department.

42. Bike Trails	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: CGP Fig. IV.12-IV.3

Findings of Fact: The project will not impact bike trails.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

UTILITY AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project

43. Water

a) Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: CGP Fig. IV.14 - IV.15; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The project is to be served by an existing offsite groundwater well.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: Health Department per permit requirements.

44. Sewer

a) Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities, including septic systems, or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may service the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: CGP Fig. IV.14; Southland Engineering.

Findings of Fact: The project is to be served by portable toilet facilities. No onsite septic system is to be installed.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: Health Department.

45. Solid Waste

a) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid wastes (including the CIWMP (County Integrated Waste Management Plan)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Source: CGP Fig. IV.17-IV.18; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The project is not expected to generate a significant amount of solid waste. All solid waste generated at the site will be stored in a closed trash dumpster. The solid waste will be removed from the site on a weekly basis by the operator to an approved landfill.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required.

46. Utilities

Would the project impact the following facilities requiring or resulting in the construction of new facilities or the expansion of existing facilities; the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

a) Electricity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Natural gas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Communications systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Storm water drainage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Street lighting?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Other governmental services?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

h) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?

Source: CGP Fig. IV.25-IV.26; SMP00205 Mining and Reclamation Plan, Southland Engineering, February 15, 2002 (Final Corrections June 30, 2003).

Findings of Fact: The project will be served by existing utilities. No new utility construction required.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: Annual inspections by the Department of Building and Safety shall ensure compliance with the approved Mining Plan.

OTHER

47. Other:

Source: Staff review.

Findings of Fact: No other significant issues were identified.

Mitigation: None required.

Monitoring: None required

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

50. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare, or endangered plant or animal to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Source: Staff review, project application materials.

Findings of Fact: The project does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare, or endangered plant or animal to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

51. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)

Source: Staff review, project application materials.

Findings of Fact:

52. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects as defined in California Code of Regulations, Section 15130)?

Source: Staff review, project application materials.

Findings of Fact:

53. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Source: Staff review, project application materials.

Findings of Fact: The project does not have environmental effects which will substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

VI. EARLIER ANALYSES

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. California Code of Regulations, Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

Earlier Analyses Used, if any: No previous studies/analyses.

Location Where Earlier Analyses, if used, are available for review: Not applicable.