

**MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL  
IMPACT REPORT**  
*for the*  
**GENERAL PLAN**  
*of the*  
**MARCH JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY**

---

*State Clearinghouse Number 97071095*

**Prepared for and by:**

***March Joint Powers Authority***

3430 Bundy Avenue, Suite 107

MAFB CA

P. O. Box 7480

Moreno Valley CA 92552

***FINAL - September 1999***

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

## SECTIONS

1	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....	1-1
0.1	Project Overview .....	1-1
0.2	Purpose and Use of the Master EIR.....	1-6
0.3	Review Process.....	1-7
0.4	Summary of Master EIR.....	1-8
2	PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	2-1
0.1	Project Location .....	2-1
0.2	Proposed General Plan.....	2-5
0.3	Related Future Actions .....	2-17
0.4	Relationship to Regional and Local Plans.....	2-17
0.5	Relationship to Base Reuse Plan and EIS.....	2-18
0.6	Relationship to Redevelopment Plan and EIR.....	2-19
0.7	Discretionary Approvals.....	2-19
2.1	Area of Cumulative Impact Analysis .....	2-20
3	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS .....	3-1
0.1	Land Use and Planning.....	3-3
0.2	Population and Housing .....	3-13
0.3	Earth and Geology.....	3-23
0.4	Water and Hydrology .....	3-31
0.5	Air Quality .....	3-39
0.6	Transportation and Circulation .....	3-59
0.7	Biological Resources.....	3-71
0.8	Energy and Mineral Resources .....	3-99
0.9	Hazards and Risk of Upset.....	3-103
0.10	Noise.....	3-113
0.11	Public Services .....	3-127
0.12	Utility and Service Systems.....	3-135
0.13	Aesthetics .....	3-153
0.14	Cultural Resources .....	3-157
0.15	Recreation .....	3-171

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

4	EARLIER ANALYSIS .....	4-1
	0.1 March AFB Disposal EIS.....	4-1
	0.2 March AFB Redevelopment Program EIR.....	4-2
	0.3 CAA General Conformity Determination.....	4-2
5	MANDATORY ELEMENTS.....	5-1
	0.1 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	5-1
	0.2 Long-term Disadvantages to Environment .....	5-3
	0.3 Direct or Indirect Adverse Effects.....	5-4
	5.1 Growth Inducing Impacts .....	5-4
6	PLAN ALTERNATIVES .....	6-1
	0.1 No Project Alternative.....	6-2
	0.2 Development Constrained Alternative .....	6-4
	0.3 Conclusion .....	6-11
7	PREPARERS OF EIR .....	7-1
	0.1 Preparers of EIR.....	7-1
	0.2 Sources .....	7-2
	0.3 References/Individuals & Entities Consulted.....	7-2
8	<b>RESPONSES TO COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>8-1</b>
	8.1 Responding Agencies .....	8-1
	8.2 Responses to Comments .....	8-2

## APPENDICES

- A. Notice of Preparation(NOP)
- B. Responses to NOP
- C. Traditional Cultural Property Report
- D. Air Quality Analysis
- E. Traffic Noise Technical Report
- F. Transportation Study Technical Report
- G. Notice of Completion/Availability

## **1.1 PROPOSED**

### **SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

March Air Force Base (AFB) realigned to March Air Reserve Base (ARB) April 1, 1996. Conversion of March AFB from an active duty military installation to an air reserve base results in the disposal and reuse of approximately 4,400 acres of land and existing facilities, with approximately 2,100 acres retained as the ARB. Realignment of the base resulted in a significant impact to the local economy. The impacts are measured in direct loss of 10,000 military and civilian jobs, loss of contract spending by the base, and loss of indirect economic activity as a result of the changes.

#### **Background**

On March 11, 1997, the County of Riverside transferred local land use authority to the March Joint Powers Authority (JPA) for all unincorporated territory that prior to base realignment in April 1, 1996 was March AFB. Through the federal base realignment process, a March AFB Master Reuse Plan and Environmental Impact Statement was prepared for March AFB, with the Air Force as the Lead Agency. While these documents include a preferred land use plan and analysis of environmental impacts of base reuse, they do not meet the California state statutes to satisfy local land use authority requirements. Summarily, the March JPA has undertaken the preparation of a General Plan and associated California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document.

Given the March JPA's unique opportunity to be the local land use authority, the proposed March JPA General Plan is designed to be a tool of implementation of the March AFB Master Reuse Plan. Many of the General Plan elements stem from the preferred land use pattern of the March AFB Master Reuse Plan as well as other elements of the Plan. Although the March AFB Master Reuse Plan and Environmental Impact Statement do not meet California state statute, applicable elements and components of these documents are incorporated into the General Plan and this associated environmental impact report (EIR).

**Exhibit 1-1  
Project Area**

MEIR 1-2

---

## **Planning Area**

The *March Joint Powers Authority Planning Area* (the "Planning Area") is defined as the area formerly known as March AFB. Located within the western Riverside County sub-region of Southern California, March AFB encompassed approximately 6,500 acres. The Planning Area is bisected by Interstate 215 (Highway 395), approximately 3 miles south of State Highway 60. The surrounding communities include the cities of Moreno Valley, Perris and Riverside, and unincorporated areas of Riverside County.

## **March Joint Powers Authority - Lead Agency**

As previously noted, the County of Riverside transferred land use authority to March JPA March 11, 1997 pursuant to a non-codified legislative declaration. With the formal transfer of local land use authority from County of Riverside to March JPA, March JPA is the lead agency for the development of a General Plan, and associated environmental documentation to satisfy the requirements of CEQA. The formulation of the General Plan will set the baseline to actuate development and base reuse in accordance with state statutes.

## **March JPA General Plan**

Through the Department of Defense, March JPA prepared the March Air Force Base Master Reuse Plan which identified means of revitalizing or redeveloping the realigned military installation in a beneficial manner. The March AFB Master Reuse Plan serves as the basis, or premises of the March JPA General Plan. In summary, the General Plan is an implementation tool of the Master Reuse Plan, and will fulfill the requirements of California state law in facilitating base reuse and development. The JPA General Plan formally addresses base reuse and development opportunities within the March JPA Planning Area which includes; planning and implementing new uses for currently vacant lands, reuse of existing facilities, and joint use of the airfield in cooperation with the reserves for civilian aviation.

As a local entity with land use authority, March JPA is preparing a General Plan to regulate the physical development of the March JPA Planning Area, establish a pattern for the orderly development of land, and outline policies and programs to guide decision-making for the March JPA. The proposed General Plan consists of six elements: Land Use, Transportation, Noise/Air Quality, Housing, Resource Management, and Safety/Risk Management. These elements will embody the JPA's

goals, policies and programs for base reuse and development in the Planning Area. The major goals of the proposed General Plan are:

- 1 Plan for economic use, reuse, and joint use of those areas of the March JPA Planning Area.
- 2 Planning and development of the March JPA Planning Area in a manner that supports the military mission of the Air Force Reserves, and the importance of March ARB as a military installation to the overall needs of national defense.
- 3 Protect the interest of and existing commitments to adjacent resident, property owners, and local jurisdictions in the development and reuse of the March JPA Planning Area.
- 4 To promote planned and managed development and redevelopment, and the preservation and maintenance of important resources.
- 5 Facilitate the provisions of public services, and public safety, to be provided in an efficient and cost-effective manner.
- 6 Maximize joint use opportunities for aviation related facilities.
- 7 Maximize the development potential as a regional Inter-modal Transportation Facility to support both the movement of goods and persons.
- 8 Maximize the available assets of the Planning Area in a beneficial manner, which focuses on the establishment of an employment center within the housing rich environment of western Riverside County sub-region

March JPA is the "Lead Agency" in accordance with Section 15050 of State CEQA Guidelines. The Lead Agency is "the public agency with the greatest responsibility for supervising or approving the project as a whole." As the Lead Agency, March JPA has the authority to adopt the proposed March Joint Powers Authority General Plan and implement its programs. In conformance with the CEQA and locally adopted CEQA Guidelines, a Master Environmental Impact Report (MEIR) has been prepared to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed General Plan, and its implementation.

The adoption of the General Plan will not, in itself, result in any change to the environment or in adverse impacts. Rather, the General Plan will regulate land use and future development which could have impacts on the environment. The MEIR for the proposed March JPA General Plan addresses the environmental impacts associated with future development, as allowed under the proposed Land Use and Transportation Plans. Public infrastructure projects may also have environmental impacts. Other components of the proposed General Plan include administrative and operational programs which are not expected to result in any physical development or environmental impacts.

Copies of the Profile Reports and General Plan were made available for review at the Office of the March Joint Powers Authority and at the following local libraries:

***Moreno Valley Library***  
25480 Alessandro Boulevard  
Moreno Valley CA 92533

***City of Riverside***  
*Central Library*  
3581 Mission Inn Avenue  
Riverside CA 92501

***City of Perris***  
*Cesar E. Chavez Library*  
163 San Jacinto Avenue  
Perris CA 92570

If more information is needed, please contact March JPA Assistant Director Chris Carlson Buydos, AICP at the offices of the March JPA or at (909) 656-7000.

## **1.2 PURPOSE AND USE OF THE**

The purpose of this MEIR is to inform the Lead Agency, responsible agencies, decision makers, and the general public of the environmental effects anticipated with the adoption and implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan. Key elements of the proposed March JPA General Plan provide for land development which could impact the environment. These include the following:

MEIR 1-5



- 1 ***Land Use Plan.*** The Land Use Element indicates the location and extent of future development and reuse of the former active-duty base property and joint use of the airfield. Potential development arising from the implementation of the proposed Land Use Plan could result in environmental impacts.
- 2 ***Transportation Plan.*** The Transportation Element indicates the right-of-way for future roads and roadway improvements. The element also indicates means of multi-modal transportation facilities, transit and goods movement opportunities. Future roadway development and transportation facilities could have environmental impacts.
- 3 ***Public Facilities and Infrastructure.*** The construction of infrastructure and public facilities could result in growth inducing impacts and potential environmental impacts.

Because no specific developments will occur with adoption of the proposed General Plan, the MEIR for the proposed General Plan focuses on the effects that may be expected with new development and base reuse allowed under the General Plan, especially the Land Use Plan. The MEIR will analyze the impacts of future projects in the March JPA Planning Area, as outlined above.

As a MEIR, this document provides a broader analyses of impacts than would a project-specific EIR. It looks at the overall change in the environment with future development and build-out of the project area. This MEIR also considers cumulative impacts on a broader scale and allows the use of March JPA Planning Area-wide mitigation measures. Future development projects will be subject to project level environmental review, tiering the analysis in this MEIR, as appropriate.

Mitigation measures set forth in this MEIR and General Plan shall be imposed on future development projects to reduce their impacts. Project specific measures shall also be required for individual projects, where feasible.

## **1.3 REVIEW**

The Initial Study for the proposed General Plan identified areas of issue that require closer evaluation in the MEIR (Appendix A). Based on the results of the preliminary environmental

assessment, buildout under the proposed March JPA General Plan will have environmental impacts on the different areas of the environment. The March JPA has completed a Notice of Preparation to inform responsible and trustee agencies, special districts, surrounding cities, and other agencies that it intended to prepare a MEIR for the proposed General Plan. The purpose of the notice was to solicit guidance from those agencies on the scope and content of the environmental information in the MEIR. A list of responsible, trustee and interested agencies is provided as a list in Appendix A.

### **Areas of Potential Concern**

Areas of potential controversy were identified from responses received during the NOP period and through scoping meetings. They include:

- 1        **Transportation** - Traffic and congestion on March JPA Planning Area streets are expected to accompany future growth and development. The proposed Land Use Plan will promote development in the March JPA Planning Area which will increase traffic volumes within both the March JPA Planning Area, and the sub-regional transportation system. However, the establishment of an employment center will reduce the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) originating in Riverside County, and has the potential to alleviate already congested regional transportation systems which currently are a result of the jobs-housing imbalance of the area. Therefore, the project could have a positive impact on transportation in the area.
  
- 2        **Availability of Infrastructure** - While the existing facilities within the March JPA Planning Area are adequately served by existing utilities and infrastructure, development in vacant land particularly within the West March Planning Subarea requires the extension and upgrading of services and infrastructure. Expansion of existing facilities will also be necessary.
  
- 3        **Cultural Resources** - Through the Section 106 consultation process, an area of approximately 2,500 acres of previously non-surveyed property has been surveyed for archaeological and cultural significance by the U.S. Air Force. Native American tribes and bands have been consulted and ethnographic research performed by the U.S. Air Force in accordance with the requirements of Section 106 and Federal Bulletin No. 38 regarding Traditional Cultural Properties. The March JPA conducted ethnographic consultations relative to traditional cultural properties within the Planning Area. The archaeological sites within the 2,500 acres are not determined by SHPO to be of significance.

- 4 **Biological Resources** - Under the governance of the US Air Force, the Planning Area contains habitat for the federally endangered Stephens= kangaroo rat. Section 7 Consultation in accordance with the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), has been undertaken to identify and establish appropriate mitigation and agreement through the US Air Force and the US Fish & Wildlife Service. All federally listed species are addressed in the draft Biological Opinion (BO) issued April 1999, including Least Bell=s vireo.

These issues are addressed in the MEIR. The public has the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft MEIR through a 45-day public review period following its completion. The preparers of the Draft MEIR will respond in writing to comments received during the public hearings, and to written comments from interested individuals. The comments and the responses to comments were be compiled into the Final MEIR, which was prepared after the 45-day public circulation period for the Draft MEIR ended.

## **1.4 SUMMARY**

The MEIR for the proposed March JPA General Plan shows that environmental impacts can be expected from future development allowed under the Plan. These impacts can substantially be mitigated through Planning Area-wide programs identified in the proposed General Plan. Other impacts would have to be mitigated through project specific measures. Future environmental review of specific proposals will identify additional feasible mitigation measures on a case by case basis. Table MEIR 1-1 provides a summary of the impacts and mitigation measures for the proposed March JPA General Plan.

TABLE MEIR 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS		
Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<b>3.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING</b>		
<p>The March JPA General Plan proposes density of development and land use intensity for areas of the March JPA Planning Area.</p> <p><u>Land Use Compatibility:</u> The Land Use Plan is designed to provide compatibility with existing facilities and land uses within the March JPA Planning Area, and to minimize impact with surrounding land uses. The buildout densities are comparable with surrounding land use designations and densities.</p> <p><u>Consistency with Regional Plans &amp; Policies:</u> The Land Use Plan and corresponding goals and policies of the General Plan are consistent with, and furthers the regional plans and policies.</p> <p><u>Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan:</u> The Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan historically designated the Planning Area as a federal installation and as such has not been subject to local land use planning and control. Sub-regional plan will need to be updated to take into consideration the BRAC action. Formulation of the March JPA General Plan and its elements were done in compliance with the goals and objectives as contained within the Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan, inclusive of improving jobs/housing balance.</p> <p><u>SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan:</u> The Land Use Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the regional plan, as incorporated within the sub-regional plan, with the basic premises of creating an employment center within the housing-rich environment of the Inland Empire.</p>	<p>The Land Use Element of the proposed March JPA General Plan contains the Land Use Plan for the March JPA Planning Area. While this will serve as the primary instrument for guiding future development in the Planning Area, there are policies and implementation programs in the Element which alleviate land use incompatibilities and conflicts. The Land Use Element is the first section of the March JPA General Plan. Policies and programs in the other elements of the General Plan which address the prevention of land use impacts are listed below:</p> <p>Transportation Element policies 1.3, 2.2, 3.2, 3.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.3, 8.8, 9.2, 9.3, 13.5, 13.6, 13.7, 13.8, and 14.4, and the following programs:</p> <p>Project Review                      Transportation Demand Management program                      Riverside County Congestion Management Program                      Airport Layout Plan and Development Plan                      Noise/Air Quality Element, Noise Section goals 1 and 2 in their entirety with policies, policies 3.1, 3.4, and 3.5; and Air Quality Section policies 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 6.6, 7.3 and 8.2, and the following programs from the Noise /</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The proposed Land Use Plan has been designed to prevent adverse impacts on land use, by proposing complementary land use designations, and land use intensities that are consistent with the subregion. Also, programs have been developed to maximize the opportunities and assets of the March JPA Planning Area, while minimizing the disruption of the character. The changes in land uses with the development buildout of the March JPA Planning</p>
<p><u>Air Force Policies Affecting Adjacent Land Uses:</u> The DOD has developed the AICUZ. Land use recommendations are based</p>	<p>Resource Management Element policies 1.1, 3.1, 5.4, 7.5, 9.1, and 9.8, and the following programs:                      Environmental Review</p>	

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>on 1) land use compatibility with exposure to aircraft noise, and 2) safety considerations. The March JPA General Plan is consistent with the 1998 AICUZ report that accounts for both the military and civilian operations projected and permitted to occur at March ARB.</p> <p><u>March AFB Master Reuse Plan</u>: Under the BRAC process, the <u>March AFB Master Reuse Plan</u> was prepared. The General Plan and the associated Land Use Plan are a local land use implementation tools of the master reuse plan.</p>	<p>Environmental Regulations Biological Resources Consultation &amp; Section 7 Consultation -SKR Land Trade Cultural Awareness Program Cultural Resource Management Plan Parks Plan March JPA Land Use Element Safety\Risk Management Element policies 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 5.3, 7.1, and 7.2, and the following programs: Flood Plain Ordinance Hazardous Material Regulations Reconstruction Ordinance Aviation Use Compatibility</p>	

**3.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING**

<p>The Land Use Plan for the March JPA General Plan focuses on the creation of an employment center within the housing rich environment of the subregion. At full buildout, the Land Use Plan is estimated to have a projected employment of 38,558 jobs. The impacts of recapturing employment and employment growth are indirectly related to the</p>	<p>The Land Use Element goals and policies specify measures that will assist the subregion with the jobs/housing balance, by providing adequate land and infrastructure for job generating land uses. Additionally, the proposed project supports a regional planning approach to this issue. Relevant policies and programs are as follows: Land Use Element</p>	<p>The March JPA General Plan and its programs will assist the region in growing toward a more equitable population and housing availability to jobs ratio for the subregion. Impacts of the proposed project to housing and population, with the application of the policies and programs as noted as mitigation</p>
---	---	---

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>environment due to the urbanization process. The creation of jobs within an area that has an imbalanced jobs/housing ratio has contributing factors for improving the regional environment (i.e., reduced vehicle miles traveled). Implementation of the General Plan will result in positive impacts upon existing and projected housing conditions within the region, by bringing job opportunities to a housing rich environment.</p> <p>Job growth will mean an increase in the demand for public services and infrastructure capacity, transportation, services, and public facilities. These issues are addressed separately in sections 3.4, 3.6, 3.11 and 3.12 of this MEIR.</p>	<p>policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 3.1, 4.7, 5.1, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 7.6 and 9.2.</p> <p>Transportation Element policies 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, 5.1, 8.6, 10.1, 12.2, and 15.1, and the Riverside County Congestion Management Program.</p> <p>Noise/Air Quality Element, noise policies 1.2 and 1.4, air quality policies 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, and the following programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Air Quality Programs</li> <li>Public Transit</li> <li>Relationship of Jobs to Housing</li> <li>Noise Programs</li> <li>Aviation Noise and other Noise Sources.</li> </ul> <p>4. Housing Element incorporates the March JPA=s four member jurisdiction housing elements, each which is certified by the Department of Housing and Community Development. Each housing element cites adequate housing sites for all segments of population.</p> <p>5. Safety/Risk Management Element policy 7.2 and Response Coordination Program.</p>	<p>measures, are considered to be less than significant. The proposed project will not have a significant adverse impact on population and housing. Furthermore, the project will have a beneficial impact to population and housing, due to the current jobs/housing in-balance of the Inland Empire and the sub-region of Western Riverside County. The creation of an employment center will benefit the region and subregion by providing areas upon which quality jobs can be developed, where at the local and future population could be employed. Currently, the Inland Empire=s greatest export is its labor force.</p>
<p><b>3.3 EARTH AND GEOLOGY</b></p>		
<p>The environmental impacts of new development under the</p>	<p>A number of policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan,</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles</p>

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>proposed Land Use Plan on earth and geology include exposure of structures and their users to geologic and seismic hazards present in the area. Other impacts involve the disturbance of existing soil cover and changes in the natural terrain of the area. Future development means that more people and structures will be exposed to the geologic and seismic hazards in the March JPA Planning Area.</p>	<p>in particular the Safety/Risk Management Element, address the geologic and seismic hazards that are present in the Planning Area. These policies and programs will mitigate the impacts associated with new development under the proposed Land Use Plan. Policies and programs that address impacts on earth and geology are listed below:</p> <p>2 Land Use Element policies 8.1 and 8.4, and the following programs:</p> <p>a. Development Code</p> <p>b. Specific Plans</p> <p>3 Noise/Air Quality Element, air quality policies 9.1 and 9.3, and Construction-Related Emissions program.</p> <p>4 Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 5.5 and 10.3, and the following programs:</p> <p>a. Preservation and Managed Production of Natural Resources</p> <p>b. Grading Standards</p> <p>c. Environmental Review</p> <p>d. Environmental Regulations</p> <p>5 Safety/Risk Management Element policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 6.1 and 8.11, and the following programs:</p> <p>a. Seismic Design</p>	<p>for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it exposes persons or structures to major geologic hazards. The impact of earth resources and geology is considered to be less than significant, based upon the mitigation measures and implementation programs.</p> <p>Any adverse impacts on earth and geology that will occur with future development are expected to be mitigated with the policies and programs listed herein. Geologic hazards can be successfully mitigated by land use controls and building and engineering methods. Seismic hazards can be reduced to minimize injury and property damage, to an impact considered less than significant.</p>

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
	b. Grading c. Response Coordination	

**3.4 WATER AND HYDROLOGY**

<p>Implementation of the proposed General Plan Land Use Plan, will create an increased amount of impervious surface within the undeveloped portions of the March JPA Planning Area, thereby increasing storm and surface runoff into the storm drain systems. The proposed Land Use Plan has land use assumptions that closely match what was used for the master drainage plan hydrology calculations; therefore, there is no significant impact on master drainage plan facilities.</p>	<p>The proposed General Plan addresses the need to conserve groundwater resources in the Resource Management Element. General Plan policies and programs that deal with water quality and area hydrology call for the preservation and enhancement of water resources and the abatement of flood hazards in the Planning Area. They are as follows:                      Land Use Element policies 4.2, 8.4, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 14.1, 14.3, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.4, 17.5, 17.6 and 17.7, and the following programs:</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it substantially degrades water quality, interferes with groundwater recharge, or results in substantial flooding, siltation, or erosion.</p>
<p>Future development will reduce areas of ground percolation and recharge of the groundwater. New development/uses must adhere to regulations which prevent soil and groundwater contamination. Monitoring and the regulatory processes are expected to prevent water contamination from future developments.                      Groundwater quality, may be impacted during construction. Long-term ground</p>	<p>a. Infrastructure Master Plans                      b. Capital Improvement Program                      c. Service Capacity Monitoring                      2. Resource Management Element policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 5.1, and the following programs:                      a. Water Quality Protection                      b. Water Conservation Ordinance                      c. Preservation and Managed Production of Natural Resources                      d. Landscaping Guidelines                      e. Environmental Review                      f. Environmental Regulations                      3. Safety/Risk Management Element policies 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7, and the following programs:                      a. Master Flood Control and Drainage Plan                      b. Flood Plain Ordinance</p>	<p>Buildout of the area, as allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan, will result in an increase of impervious surfaces; thereby increasing the amount of non-point surface run off. Buildout and uses within the March JPA Planning Area are subject to the NPDES and the BMPs to maximize storm water pollution control. Supplement "A" to the Riverside County Drainage Management Plans/New Development Guidelines and Attachment to Supplemental "A" Selection and Design of Stormwater Quality control issued by RCFC&amp;WCD will be implemented within the March JPA Planning Area. Flood hazards can be reduced through infrastructure projects and implementation of the Master Flood Control and Drainage Plan to a less than significant level. The potential</p>



**Section 1: Introduction and Summary (continued)**

<b>TABLE MEIR 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS</b>		
<b>Environmental Impacts</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>	<b>Significant Adverse Impacts</b>
<p>water contamination is more likely to occur from the general operations of an airfield and industrial users, than construction activities. Regulations over the use and handling of hazardous materials makes the probability of hazardous spills and containments very unlikely. The existing contaminated plume and its clean up are under the responsibility of the DOD, through the IRP.</p>		<p>impacts to ground water resources can be mitigated to a level considered to be less than significant, through the implementation of policies and programs as outlined within the proposed March JPA General Plan.</p>
<p><b>3.5 AIR QUALITY</b></p>		
<p>The adoption of the proposed March JPA General Plan will permit development and activities within the project area which could generate pollutant emissions. Potential air quality impacts will be generated by public and private developments in the Planning Area. Air quality impacts are generally classified as short-term and long-term.</p> <p><b>Short-term Impacts.</b> Short-term impacts refer to temporary emissions that cease after a given activity is completed. Short-term emissions will occur during the construction phases of individual projects allowed under the Plan.</p>	<p>The Air Quality/Noise Element of the proposed March JPA General Plan contains goals, policies, an air quality plan and implementation programs which will help improve air quality in the area and reduce the emissions from existing land uses and proposed developments. The policies and implementation programs of the Air Quality Section will reduce pollutant emissions from new development and vehicle trips. Transportation Element policies 2.1, 2.2, 3.6, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.5, 8.1, 8.2, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.9, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5 and 13.3, and the Transportation Demand Management Implementation Program and Riverside County Congestion Management Program will also reduce emissions associated with vehicle use.</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it violates any ambient air quality standards, contributes substantially to an existing or projected air quality exceedance, or exposes sensitive persons to substantial concentrations of air pollutants.</p>
<p><b>Long-term Impacts.</b> Long-term emissions refer to emissions that are likely to continue over the life of the project. The adoption and implementation of the proposed General Plan will result in new development which will generate long-term air quality impacts.</p>	<p>Project mitigation measures to lessen air quality impacts are provided by SCAQMD, the cognizant local regulatory agency, through the consultation process. Project level mitigation measures shall be applied to projects, on a project-by-project basis, to reduce General Plan related construction and operation emissions, as feasible.</p>	<p>Development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan will generate pollutant emissions that will exceed established thresholds of the SCAQMD. These standards of threshold are set because the project is located in a non-attainment area. Therefore, any activity will contribute to exceedance.</p> <p>The Air Quality/Noise Element will reduce these impacts and offset new emissions but cannot remove existing air quality violations. If the March Joint Powers Commission approves the project, it must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations.</p>
<p><b>3.6 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b></p>		
<p>The environmental impacts of future development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan include increases in the number of vehicle trips to and from the Planning Area and added congestion along Planning Area streets, and roadways within the vicinity of the Planning Area. The traffic forecasts were based on the</p>	<p>Aside from the Transportation Plan, the Transportation Element of the March JPA General Plan contains policies and implementation programs (Truck Routes, Transportation Demand Management, County Congestion Management Plan, Regional Transportation Systems, Public Transportation, Intersection Design</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The</p>

**Section 1: Introduction and Summary (continued)**

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>RIVSAN CTP subregional travel demand forecasting model developed and maintained by SCAG. The CTP model is consistent with the SCAG regional model, with greater detail focused in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. The CTP model was refined for the March JPA to provide additional local details for the purpose of analyzing intersection volumes and capacity in the March JPA Planning Area.</p> <p>Buildout of the proposed plan is estimated to generate a total of approximately 220,000 daily vehicle trips, compared with 37,000 daily trips generated by the former active duty March AFB. With improvements, roadways and intersections in the March JPA Planning Area are projected to operate at LOS AD@ or better with planned development.</p>	<p>Standards, and Aviation Transportation) which outline ways to address transportation and circulation needs for the March JPA. Transportation Plan serves as the major mechanism for ensuring that future transportation needs in the Planning Area and vicinity will be handled by an adequate transportation system.</p> <p>The policies and programs in the Transportation Element and other elements of the proposed General Plan which address transportation concerns are listed below:</p> <p>2. Land Use Element policies 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 12.2, 12.3, and the following programs:</p> <p>a. Infrastructure Master Plans b. Capital Improvement Program c. Service Capacity Monitoring d. Development Fees e. Airport Layout &amp; Development Plans</p>	<p>proposed Transportation Plan and implementation programs will reduce the impacts caused by future increases in traffic volumes on March JPA Planning Area streets. Levels of service will improve to "D" with the proposed mitigation. The adjacent jurisdictions considers LOS AD@ to be an acceptable service level; therefore, the project as mitigated is consistent with acceptable standards. Based upon the project and associated transportation improvements and programs to be implemented as a result of the project, the impact to transportation is considered to be less than significant.</p>
<p>Full detailed analysis is found within the March JPA Transportation Study Technical Report, Appendix F of this MEIR.</p> <p>Aviation operations and facilities are governed by FAA and DOD. March JPA has an approved ALP and technical documents for the joint use and operation of civilian aviation at March. Civilian operations, as to capacity under the current State Implementation Plan (SIP), 21001, with 54,000 military. The annual service volume (unconstrained by SIP) is 200,000 annual operations. Airspace at MIP is unconstrained.</p>	<p>2. Noise/Air Quality Element, Noise Section policies 2.1, 2.4, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.9; and Air Quality Section policies 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.9 and 6.7, and the following programs from the Noise / Air Quality Element:</p> <p>a. Noise Ordinance b. Acoustical Analyses c. Public Transit Program d. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities e. Traffic Safety Programs f. Traffic Signals. g. Relationship of Jobs to Housing h. Civilian Aviation</p> <p>3. Safety/Risk Management Element policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 8.5, and the following programs:</p> <p>a. Evacuation Routes b. Aviation Use Compatibility</p>	<p>It is important to note that regional and cumulative traffic impacts without the project and its associated transportation improvements would result in significant impacts to the transportation system of the sub-region. Thus, traffic and circulation impacts are expected to be reduced to insignificant levels with the policies and programs listed herein</p>
<p><b>3.7 BIOLOGICAL</b></p>		
<p>Development allowed under the proposed March JPA General Plan and associated Land Use Plan could adversely affect biological resources primarily through a potential loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat. Direct losses to some species may occur from construction and other activities in newly developed areas. Urban development could increase runoff of storm water from developed areas to non-developed areas. Development of the West March Planning Subarea could affect grasslands and wetlands that support animal species.</p>	<p>The Resource Management Element discusses the biological resources of the March JPA Planning Area. Policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan that have been developed to protect biological resources include:</p> <p>1. Land Use Element policies 8.2, 8.4 and 8.5, and the following implementation program:</p> <p>a. Specific Plans 2. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 9.1, 9.2, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6 and 9.7, and the following programs:</p> <p>a. Preservation and Managed Production of Natural Resources.</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for CEQA compliance, a project will normally have a significant impact on the environment if it substantially affects a rare or endangered species of animals or plants or the habitat of the species. Development of the March JPA Planning Area's undeveloped areas will lead to the loss of native plant and animal communities. Rare, endangered, and threatened plant and animal species could be destroyed by urban development.</p>

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>A draft BO issued by the USFWS for the disposal of portions of March AFB (the Planning Area) April 1999, addresses biological resources through a formal Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and the U.S. Air Force. The draft BO issued by the USFWS in April 1999 is incorporated herein by reference. Based upon the draft BO issued April 1999, SKR and Least Bell=s vireo are the only two federally listed species identified that may be impacted by the proposed project.</p>	<p>b. Environmental Review c. Environmental Regulations d. Biological Resources Consultation e. Section 7 Consultation - SKR Land Trade. f. Open Space Preservation</p> <p>Based upon the draft BO issued in April 1999 by the USFWS, the proposed March JPA General Plan will implement the conservation and minimization measures as contained in the BO.</p>	<p>The preservation and conservation programs in the Resource Management Element will help protect sensitive species. Significant impacts on sensitive plant or animal species are expected to be mitigated with implementation of the policies and programs listed above. Based upon the draft BO, the proposed General Plan is likely to adversely affect SKR even with the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures.</p>
<p>The mountain plover, determined in February 1999 as a proposed for listing species by USFWS, in the past has been sited within the Planning Area.</p>	<p>Additional potential project mitigation measures shall be applied to projects, on a project-by-project basis.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures and encumbrances alleviate adverse impacts to Least Bell=s vireo to less than significant, and no other listed species are likely to be adversely affected.</p> <p>Based upon the status of the SKR on former March AFB properties, impacts will be significant and unavoidable if complete buildout of the Planning Area is achieved. Thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, would have to be adopted.</p>
<p><b>3.8 ENERGY/MINERAL RESOURCES</b></p>		
<p>Development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan could identify the presence of natural mineral resources, as well as require the commitment of energy resources. Impacts on energy resources are discussed in Section 3.12 of this MEIR. Specific impacts on energy and mineral resources will depend upon individual development projects as they occur under the proposed General Plan. The impacts of the commitment of aggregate resources for construction will be incremental until buildout of the March JPA Planning Area is achieved. This is not expected to be significant.</p>	<p>The protection and conservation of mineral resources is addressed in the Resource Management Element. The Resource Management Element contains a conservation program for the areas' identified natural resources (water, biological, land, cultural, and energy resources). These issues are analyzed in greater detail in Section 3.12 of this MEIR. Policies and implementation programs that achieve protection and conservation of mineral resources facilities include:</p> <p>Land Use Element policies 3.1 and 8.4. Noise/Air Quality Element polices 6.8, 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3, and the Energy Conservation program. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 3.3, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, and the following programs: Preservation and Managed Production of</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have an adverse impact on mineral resources if it will conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located. With development occurring individually and over a long period of time, the impacts on mineral resources will not be significant or adverse.</p>

TABLE MEIR 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS		
Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
	Natural Resources Energy Conservation	Where significant adverse impacts are expected, they can be mitigated to levels of insignificance by implementing the policies and programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan.
<b>3.9 HAZARDS AND RISK OF UPSET</b>		
<p>Implementation and development as projected under the proposed General Plan may have adverse environmental impacts associated; however, due to the regulatory nature of the Elements of the General Plan, any risk may be minimal.</p> <p>There are fire safety measures that are incorporated into new structures which prevent the creation of fire hazards and facilitate emergency response in case of a fire.</p>	<p>The Safety/Risk Management Element directly addresses the issue of risk to exposure and hazards in the March JPA Planning Area. The Safety/Risk Management Element of the proposed March JPA General Plan contains a Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Plan for the March JPA Planning Area.</p>	<p>According to the CEQA Law and Guidelines, a project will normally have a significant impact on the environment if it creates a potential health hazard or involve the use, production, or disposal of materials which pose a hazard to people, animal, or plant populations in the affected area.</p>
<p>Hazardous materials will continue to pose threats to public safety in the future and new development will be exposed to these hazards. Also, new development may involve hazardous materials use or generation which could increase safety hazards in the Planning Area.</p> <p>There are regulations at all levels (federal, state, regional, special district) which protect public health and prevent threats to the safety of individuals. Also, the proposed General Plan promotes health and safety. In particular, promoting a safe environment for development, and operation of an aviation field in the Planning Area.</p>	<p>While this will serve as the primary instrument for addressing hazards and minimizing risk of upset within the Planning Area, there are policies and implementation programs in the Element which promote a safe environment and minimize exposure, incompatibilities and conflicts with hazards.</p> <p>The Safety/Risk Management Element is the sixth or last section of the March JPA General Plan. Policies and programs in the other elements of the General Plan which address the minimization of risk of upset and promotes a safe environment are as follows:</p> <p><b>Land Use Element</b> policies 1.9, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.6, 7.7, 8.3, 8.4 and 15.1,</p>	<p>The potential impacts on human health that may occur with new development can be mitigated by programs in the March JPA General Plan, as well as by State, Federal and regional laws and regulations. With mitigation, the impacts associated with the</p>

TABLE MEIR 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS		
Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
	<p>and the following programs:                      Service Capacity Monitoring                      Utility and Service Providers                      Airport Layout and Development Plans                      Transportation Element policies 2.5, 2.6, 4.1, 13.5, 13.6 and 13.8, and the Airport Layout Plan and Development Plan program.                      Resource Management Element policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 6.4 and 9.8, and the following programs:                      Environmental Regulations                      Open Space through Land Use Restrictions                      Public Health &amp; Safety Regulations</p>	<p>project relative to hazards and risk of upset are considered to be at a level less than significant.                      The potential for disaster brought by development under the proposed March JPA General Plan will be mitigated by the programs listed herein. Impacts associated with aviation operations are mitigated with adherence to military and FAA aviation standards and regulations. No significant adverse impacts will occur with the project, through implementation of the identified mitigation measures.</p>
<b>3.10 NOISE</b>		
<p>Future development in March JPA Planning Area will lead to short-term noise impacts associated with demolition, excavation, earth-moving, and construction activities. These would be found along major roadways, the railroad tracks, industrial areas, commercial areas and places which can accommodate large groups of people.</p>	<p>The major goal of the Noise Section of the Noise/Air Quality Element is to prevent the creation of noise problems in the Planning Area and mitigate existing noise sources. Policies and implementation programs in the Noise Element will serve to reduce future noise impacts in the Planning Area. This Element is Section 3 of the March JPA General Plan. Policies and programs</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will result in a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas. New development will increase traffic volumes</p>

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>There are two primary sources of noise in the March JPA Planning Area: 1) aircraft noise and aviation operations associated with use of the airfield; and 2) traffic on Interstate 215 and major roadways. These noise sources impact development along major transportation routes and in and around the aviation field.</p>	<p>in other elements of the General Plan which would reduce noise impacts include: 4. Land Use Element policies 1.9 and 6.4, and the following programs: a. Development Code b. Airport Layout and Development Plans 2. Transportation Element policies 2.8 and 13.6.</p>	<p>and the intensity of urban activities in the March JPA Planning Area. This will lead to increases in existing noise levels. While extreme noise impacts will be prevented, through identified programs, ambient noise levels are expected to be greater at buildout than existing levels.</p>
<p>With application of California Public Resources Code Section 21083, the noise contour footprints for March AFB/MIP, is significantly less than what was permitted and emitted by March AFB prior to base realignment in 1996. Any long-term increase in noise levels caused through the implementation of the General Plan will only occur at levels permitted within the March JPA Development Code. These noise levels are generally seen as acceptable conditions within the parameters of the March JPA Planning Area's urban setting provided that sensitive noise receptors are not significantly impacted.</p>	<p>3. Resource Management Element Environmental Review program and Public Health &amp; Safety Regulations program. 4. Safety/Risk Management Element policy 7.1 and the Aviation Use Compatibility program. Mitigation measures will be applied as conditions of approval for implementing development projects, as appropriate.</p>	<p>Noise impacts from future development can be mitigated to a level less than significance through implementation of the identified noise reduction and mitigation programs. Based upon California Public Resources Section 21083, the project will not have a significant adverse impact on aviation noise, as the project aviation noise forecasted is less than the baseline noise contours.</p>

**3.11 PUBLIC SERVICES**

Future development in the project area will	The impacts of new development on public	In accordance with generally
---	--	------------------------------

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>require the provision of public services and infrastructure such as fire protection, police protection, school services, and other governmental services. While the Planning Area has these services, future development will require the expansion of service areas and increases in staffing and equipment in order to meet greater demand.</p> <p>The demand for fire protection is directly related to the presence of fire hazards and emergency situations in the Planning Area. Fire flow will be maintained in accordance with the UFC for new development. Crimes, traffic and traffic accidents will increase proportionally with the increase in development. Adjustments in fire and police department staffing and equipment will be necessary as new development occurs in the Planning Area.</p> <p>School services will not be impacted by the proposed project, as no new housing is proposed.</p>	<p>services may be reduced by through application of the policies and implementation programs that call for the provision of adequate services to serve new development in the Planning Area. These include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land Use Element policies 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 10.1, 10.4, 11.1 and 11.2, and the following programs:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Service Capacity Monitoring</li> <li>b. Development Fees</li> <li>c. Utility and Public Service Providers</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. The Environmental Review Program of the Resource Management Element.</li> <li>3. Safety/Risk Management Element policies 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 5.5 and 7.3, and the following programs:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Fire Hazard Mitigation</li> <li>b. Emergency Fireflow</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will have a significant adverse impact on public services if it results in a significant increase in the resident population or creates a condition where essential public service levels cannot be maintained. Under the proposed March JPA General Plan, any impact of new development on public services can be mitigated to a level considered to be less than significant.</p> <p>The application of the mitigation measures and employment of the implementation programs of the proposed General Plan will assure that the necessary levels of service for public services be maintained and that any impact to services will be less than significant. Timely provision of services, as development takes place, will prevent deterioration in existing service levels or inadequate services.</p>

**3.12 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

<p>Implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan will support additional development, which will result in an increase in water consumption and waste water generation. The increase in water consumption is 3.97 MGD for both potable and non-potable water, and approximately 2.27 MGD of waste water will be generated at full buildout. Water conservation measures can reduce the amount of water consumption and sewage generation.</p> <p>New development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan will require additional resources. Short term demand for power will also occur for individual construction projects in the Planning Area. Natural gas consumption will increase with new development. New development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan will require additional power resources. Energy conservation practices and energy-efficient equipment will require less energy and extend the availability of energy sources in the region.</p> <p>Undeveloped areas will require new storm drain facilities when development occurs. These facilities shall be designed and provided with future development. New structures and the paving of vacant land will increase storm runoff and may require the upgrade of drainage pipes downstream. New development will require telephone and</p>	<p>Adverse impacts on energy and utilities can be mitigated by policies and programs that deal with the provision of adequate infrastructure and utility services. The proposed March JPA General Plan includes policies to reduce solid waste impacts. The policies and programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan that addresses utilities and service systems are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land Use Element policies 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11.1, 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 13.1, 13.3, 14.2, 14, 15.2, 16.4, 16.5, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.4, 17.5 and 17.6, and the following programs:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Infrastructure Master Plans</li> <li>b. Capital Improvement Program</li> <li>c. Service Capacity Monitoring</li> <li>d. Development Fees</li> <li>e. Utility and Service Providers</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Transportation Element policy 3.7.</li> <li>3. Resource Management Element policies 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3, and the following programs:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Water Conservation Ordinance</li> <li>b. Environmental Review</li> <li>c. Energy Conservation</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. The following program of the Safety/Risk Management Element:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Master Flood Control and Drainage Plan.</li> </ol>                             The following are potential project mitigation measures that shall be applied to projects, on a project-by-project basis:                         </li> </ol>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will have a significant adverse impact on energy, utilities and infrastructure if it results in a substantial demand for energy resources or the development of a new energy source; in the deterioration of service levels or creates a demand which existing utility services cannot meet; or breaches published national, state or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control. The impact of new development on energy and utility services can be mitigated with programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan. The expansion of infrastructure and facilities to meet the demand of individual developments will ensure that essential utility services are available at all times. Water and energy conservation programs will help reduce adverse impacts to less than significant levels after mitigation.</p> <p>The impact to solid waste generating will be reduced with the application of mitigation measures. Nonetheless, impacts will be significant and unavoidable due to the uncertain availability of sufficient regional land fill and other solid waste management</p>
--	--	---

**TABLE MEIR 1-1  
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
<p>cable television services. This will mean the extension of existing lines in the area and upgrade to existing facilities.</p> <p>New development in the March JPA Planning Area will lead to increases in solid waste generation. Given the current capacity of landfills impacts to solid waste could result at buildout.</p>	<p>1. Projects shall be evacuated by the March JPA to determine their impact on flood control/drainage and water quality. No project shall be approved unless there is adequate on-site drainage and no significant impacts to water quality.</p> <p>2. All structures shall be protected against 100-year flood by building design or other flood proofing measures.</p>	<p>facilities if complete build-out of the Planning Area is achieved. Thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, will have to be prepared.</p>
<p><b>3.13 AESTHETICS</b></p>		
<p>Future development of the March JPA Planning Area will consist of an industrialized character. Development could reduce the sense of openness and the existing undeveloped quality of the area. Design review, landscaping, height restrictions, site orientation, and setbacks will assist with reducing visual incompatibilities that could otherwise occur with new development.</p> <p>The proposed General Plan further recognizes the visual qualities of the March JPA Planning Area, and through the General Plan implementation programs, provides for open space, scenic vistas and corridors, and gateways. Special design guidelines and standards will lessen any impact development may have to areas considered to have a scenic quality.</p> <p>New development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan will result in greater intensity and density of development in the Planning Area than which currently exists, but no more intense than surrounding land uses with similar designations.</p>	<p>The March JPA General Plan sets forth both a blueprint for future development, as well as definition of the tone for development within the Planning Area. Many policies and programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan address the visual and aesthetics qualities of the environment. These will serve a mitigation measures for the aesthetic impacts of future development under the Plan. The Resource Management Element of the March JPA General Plan, Open Space and Recreation Plan recognizes and designates Scenic Corridors/Vistas. Policies and implementation programs of the March JPA General Plan that address the aesthetic quality of the Planning Area include:</p> <p>Land Use Element policies 1.4, 2.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8, 8.1, 8.2 and 9.4, and the following programs:</p> <p>Development Code Specific Plans Area Design Plans Design Review Transportation Element policies 1.2 and 2.8. Noise/Air Quality Element, noise policies 1.4 and 3.1. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 7.3, 7.4, 9.1, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5, and the following programs: Landscaping Guidelines Environmental Review Scenic Corridors</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will result in a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect. The proposed General Plan provides for standards of development that are consistent with the sub-region and neighboring jurisdictions, particularly floor area ratios.</p> <p>Regional elements and standards, such as the designation of scenic boulevards/corridors in the proposed General Plan are consistent with local plans of the jurisdictions and sub-regional plans for trails and corridors. Development intensity and standards are consistent with the sub-region, and therefore,</p>



TABLE MEIR 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS		
Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
		are considered to be a less than significant impact. New development does not equate to an aesthetic impact of a plan. Implementation of the General Plan with the a fore-mentioned measures will not result in any significant impacts.
<b>3.14 CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		
<p>Future developments allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan have the potential to affect existing historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. The area may contain other archaeological/paleontological resources, aside from those recovered in the past.</p>	<p>Execution of mitigation measures consistent with 36 CFR 800 as they relate to protection, mitigation, and documentation of cultural resource sites will ensure that all potential impacts to unknown cultural resource values will be reduced to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>According to the CEQA Law and Guidelines, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site, or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social groups, or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study.</p>
<p>The Northeast Planning Subarea has a Historic District. The Conservation Plan in the Resource Management Element calls for site investigations and the development of sensitivity maps, in order to preserve the area's cultural resources to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, the Cultural Resource Management Plan for the Historic District will preserve the integrity of the district, through implementation of the Plan. A Native American Tribe stated that the Planning Area contains Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP). After extensive ethnographic research and consultation with tribes of the region, no TCPs were determined to be within the Planning Area. Outside of the Historic District, there is currently no other cultural resources determined by SHPO to be of significance.</p>	<p>Policies and programs that will help preserve the paleontological, archaeological and historical resources in the Planning Area include the following:  <b>Land Use Element policies 4.2, 4.3, 8.2, 8.4, 9.1, 9.3 and 9.4, and the following programs:</b>                      Specific Plans                      Area Design Plans                      Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 7.1, 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, and 10.3, and the following programs:                      Environmental Review                      Environmental Regulations</p>	<p>Significant adverse impacts on cultural resources means the destruction and demolition of archaeological, paleontological and historical resources in March JPA Planning Area. The proposed General Plan does not have any impacts to Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Areas, or Areas of Special Concern to any Native American group. Impact levels will be less than significant with implementation of the proposed conservation/preservation programs.</p>

TABLE MEIR 1-1 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS		
Environmental Impacts	Mitigation	Significant Adverse Impacts
	Cultural Awareness Program Cultural Resource Management Plan	
<b>3.15 RECREATION</b>		
<p>Increase in development typically increases the demand for recreational and open space opportunities in an area. The proposed Land Use Plan will not cause an increase in population, as a direct result of the proposed land uses for the March JPA Planning Area. Furthermore, approximately 777 acres of Parks/ Recreation/Open Space have been designated within the proposed Land Use Plan. The acreage designated as Parks/Recreation/Open Space on the proposed Land Use Plan will contribute to the recreational opportunities of the sub-region, particularly regional-type recreational facilities.</p>	<p>The Resource Management Element deals with open space and recreation issues in the March JPA Planning Area. Policies and implementation programs that achieve recreational and open space facilities include: Land Use Element policies 1.7, 1.8 and 9.3. Transportation Element policies 12.3, 12.4, and 12.5. Noise/Air Quality Element Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities program. Resource Management Element policies 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5 and 10.3, and the following programs: Parks Plan Open Space Preservation Private Recreation and Open Space Facilities Joint Use of Facilities Bikeways and Trail Development Plan</p>	<p>In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will be in conflict with established recreational uses of the area. No impacts are related to recreational opportunities or services; therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact to parks and recreation.</p>

**Statement of Overriding Considerations:**

The following significant adverse impacts were identified for the proposed March JPA General Plan which could not be adequately reduced through mitigation measures to a less than significant impact:

- Air Quality - Due to the region's existing air quality condition and the amount of emissions generated from activities permissible through the development and implementation of the March JPA General Plan, the proposed project is not consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan. Cumulative impacts to air quality remain significant as the proposed project will contribute emissions within a non-attainment area.
  
- Biological Resources - Buildout of the Planning Area requires the trade and/or replacement of habitat for SKR. Based upon the status of the SKR within the Planning Area, impacts will be significant and unavoidable if complete buildout of the Planning Area is achieved.
  
- Utility & Service System: Solid Waste - The impact to solid waste generation will be reduced with the application of mitigation measures; however, impacts will be significant and unavoidable due to the uncertain availability of sufficient regional land fill capacity and other solid waste management facilities if complete build-out of the Planning Area is achieved.

Based upon the environmental impact analysis (Section 3 of this MEIR), the proposed March JPA General Plan could contribute significant unavoidable impacts to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Utility & Service Systems-Solid Waste, if complete build-out of the Planning Area is achieved. Thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, will have to be prepared.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

## SECTION 2: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### 2.1 PROJECT LOCATION & BACKGROUND

The *March Joint Powers Authority Planning Area* (the "Planning Area") is defined as the area formerly known as March Air Force Base (AFB). Located within the western Riverside County region of Southern California, March AFB encompassed approximately 6,500 acres. The planning area is bisected by Interstate 215 (Highway 395), approximately three miles south of State Highway 60. The surrounding communities include the cities of Moreno Valley, Perris and Riverside, and Riverside County unincorporated areas of Mead Valley and Woodcrest. The project setting is addressed for each environmental assessment area in section 3 of the MEIR.

March AFB, a military installation almost continually since 1918, served as an active duty aerial refueling and deployment base, as well as home for Air Force Reserve (AFRES) and California Air National Guard (CANG) units. March AFB was one of the bases recommended by the 1993 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission for realignment. The Commission's recommendation included departure of the active duty wing, with AFRES and other federal agency units remaining within a military cantonment area. The Commission's recommendations were accepted by the President and submitted to Congress on July 2, 1993. Since Congress did not disapprove the recommendations within the time period provided under the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act, the recommendations became law. March AFB converted to March ARB April 1, 1996.

#### **March Joint Powers Authority**

With the announcement of base realignment at March, the adjacent jurisdictions immediately formed a joint powers authority. March Joint Powers Authority (JPA) is a public entity created for the purpose of addressing the use, reuse, and joint use of realigned March AFB. The four individual public entities that cooperatively formed the JPA are the cities of Perris, Moreno Valley and Riverside, and the County of Riverside. The JPA was created by separate resolutions of the four jurisdictions in September 1993.

The JPA is governed by the provisions of the Joint Powers Agreement that established the Authority. The JPA Agreement created the March Joint Powers Commission (JPC). This Commission is the decision and policy making body for the Authority. It consists of eight elected officials (two from each of the four jurisdictions). In addition to completing the organizational requirements of initiating a new governmental jurisdiction, the JPA quickly assumed the leadership position in looking toward the future of March. The March JPA is the designated and recognized Local Redevelopment Agency (LRA) for the base reuse process by the Department of

MEIR 2-1

Defense, established the March Joint Powers Redevelopment Agency and March Inland Port Airport Authority, and accepted local land use authority over the former active-duty base property.

### **March AFB Master Reuse Plan**

Conversion of March AFB from an active duty military installation to an air reserve base (ARB), resulted in the disposal and reuse of approximately 4,400 acres of land. The reserves retained approximately 2,100 acres under the function of March ARB. The March AFB Master Reuse Plan addressed the portions of the base that are not required for use by the Department of Defense (DOD). Through the reuse process, planning and implementing new uses for currently vacant lands, reuse of existing facilities, and joint use of the aviation field were undertaken.

The primary function of the March AFB Master Reuse Plan was to identify, through the solicitation process, property disposition for reuse and generation of a plan to implement the reuse and revitalization opportunity as identified by the LRA. The Plan identified a means of revitalizing or redeveloping the realigned military installation in a beneficial manner, or otherwise revitalizing community and the economies of said communities; in short, to facilitate economic recovery resulting from base realignment.

In accordance with DOD requirements, the March AFB Master Reuse Plan and associated National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation was prepared for the realigned military installation. The March AFB Master Reuse Plan includes the following elements; land use, circulation/transportation, homeless assistance, property disposition, environmental impact analysis, joint use aviation, and marketing strategy. The purpose and function of the Land Use component of the March AFB Master Reuse Plan are specific to the regulations of the DOD for reuse assessment, inclusive of providing a baseline analysis to satisfy the requirements of NEPA. Pursuant to the Base Closure Community Assistance Action, the primary objective of the Land Use Plan was to develop a land use pattern that would implement the reuse and revitalization opportunities as identified by the LRA. In short, the Land Use Plan identified the reuse land use pattern to facilitate base redevelopment and realize the economic opportunities available from the March's changed military mission.

### **Base Master Reuse Plan - Land Use Plan**

The creation of a Land Use Plan for the March AFB Master Reuse Plan was a Phase One component of the three phased Base Reuse Implementation Process. The Land Use Plan delineates the spatial distribution and land use pattern for base property not

within the Cantonment Area, of which an analysis was incorporated into the environmental assessment completed for the March AFB Master Reuse Plan comprehensively.

The goals and policies from which the preferred land use plan was derived from are comprehensive, and analogous to base reuse and development. The planning team, with representatives from each member jurisdiction, incorporated the following objectives within the land use plan: support continued operation of the military base; emphasize job creation; maximize joint use of airfield for civilian aviation; create noncompeting land uses; support public service facilities; preservation of historic and environmental character; and maximize potential reuse and economic development opportunities. The concluding phase of the base reuse planning process was the creation of a Preferred Community Land Use Pattern, which was presented to the Air Force. It is this land use pattern which was analyzed within the base reuse documents, inclusive of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

### **Land Use Authority**

On March 11, 1997 land use authority was transferred to March JPA from the County of Riverside. With the formal transfer of local land use authority from the County of Riverside to March JPA, it is necessary for March JPA to develop a General Plan and associated environment documentation to satisfy the requirements of CEQA. The March JPA General Plan is designed to implement the March Air Force Base Master Reuse Plan, which includes the development, use and redevelopment of the area formerly known as March AFB.

**Exhibit 2-1  
Regional Location of the Project**



## 2.2 PROPOSED

The proposed *March Joint Powers Authority General Plan* is designed to be a long range comprehensive plan that outlines and delineates use and development within the planning area, which is the area formerly known as March AFB. The General Plan defines development, use and redevelopment opportunities of the planning area, while preserving the environmental quality. The General Plan contains goals, policies, and programs to guide future development and change within the planning area. The goals and policies of the General Plan will serve as the constitutional framework for March JPA, provide planning direction for JPA operations and programs, and function as guidelines for all decision-making concerning use and development of the planning area.

The state statutes specify seven mandatory elements for general plans. *Section 63202 et seq. of the California Government Code* requires that a general plan contain seven mandatory elements: 1) Land Use, 2) Circulation, 3) Noise, 4) Housing, 5) Safety 6), Open Space, and 7) Conservation. Furthermore, optional elements may be included within a general plan to address specific components of the community. The March JPA General Plan will contain the seven elements, with the requirement for open space and conservation elements combined under the Resource Management Element.

The following elements comprise the March Joint Powers Authority General Plan in accordance with the State General Plan Guidelines:

**Land Use Element** - This element is based upon the March AFB Master Reuse Plan preferred land use pattern. This element delineates the general location and distribution, extent of existing and proposed land uses for March JPA, and development criteria for development intensity.

**Transportation Element** - This element identifies the multiple transportation and circulation components of the plan, inclusive of: roads, trails, rail, multi-modal, transit, aviation and goods movement services. The extent of necessary facilities, adequacy of service levels and transportation demand management measures, along with general location and infrastructure facilities are delineated.

**Exhibit 2-2  
Proposed Land Use Plan**

<b>TABLE MEIR 2-1 LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATIONS BUILDOUT MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA</b>				
Land Use Designation	Acres GROSS	Density		Buildout Capacity*
		MAX.	AVG.	
<b>INDUSTRY</b>				
Business Park	1278	.75	.20	7,793,755 sf
Industrial	433	.60	.15	1,980,455 sf
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				9,774,210 sf
<b>COMMERCE</b>				
Office	104	.75	.30	951,350 sf
Mixed Use	360	.60	.25	2,744,280 sf
Commercial	45	.60	.30	411,642 sf
Destination Recreation	135	.50	.25	1,029,105 sf
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				5,136,377 sf
<b>PUBLIC</b>				
Park/Recreation/ Open Space	777	.25	.025	592,307 sf
Public Facility	449	.50	.10	1,369,091 sf
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				1,961,398 sf
<b>SPECIAL</b>				
Military Operations	2102	n/a	n/a	2,500,000 sf
Aviation	316	.40	.15	1,445,321 sf
Historic District	58	2 <sub>du/ac</sub>	2 <sub>du/ac</sub>	111 units
AFVW Expansion	75	.60	.30	686,070 sf
Cemetery Expansion	160	.10	.005	24,394 sf
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				4,655,784 sf 111 units
<b>TOTAL</b>				21,527,769 sf 111 units

ac - acre                      sf - square feet                      du/ac - dwelling unit per acre  
 FAR - floor area ratio                      \* based on average FAR, of net acre

Exhibit 2-3

**Proposed Transportation Plan**

**Noise/Air Quality Element** - This element addresses noise and air quality due to nexus of generators and significance to the plan and region. This element examines the existing and future noise environment and noise generators of the area. The element contains both measures to reduce conflict and maintain a noise compatible environment. Although not a state requirement, the element addresses air quality as it relates to the Air Quality Management Plan of the South Coast Air Basin. The element contains a discussion of local and regional air quality, stationary and mobile emission sources, and programs to reduce generated pollutant emissions.

**Housing Element** - The housing elements of each of the four member jurisdictions are incorporated by reference. The four member jurisdiction housing elements have previously been certified by the Department of Housing and Community Development. The land use plan identifies no new housing areas, and creates an employment center within the housing rich environment of western Riverside County. The concept coincides with prior legislative actions relative to the March AFB Redevelopment Project Area.

**Resource Management Element** - The state mandated requirements of Conservation and Open Space Elements are integrated comprehensively into one-single element. The element provides for the conservation, development, and use of natural, historical and cultural resources. In addition, the element details plans and measures for the preservation of open space designed to promote the management of natural resources, outdoor recreation and public health and safety.

**Safety/Risk Management Element** - The Safety/Risk Management Element identifies and establishes standards and plans for the protection of the planning area from a variety of hazards including earthquakes, flooding, fire, geological, and airport compatibility conditions.

Table MEIR 2-2 illustrates the relationship between the General Plan's six elements and the seven State-mandated elements. The March JPA General Plan contains goals, policies and programs which are intended to guide land use and development decisions into and throughout the twenty-first century.

**TABLE MEIR 2-2  
RELATIONSHIP OF MARCH JPA GENERAL PLAN  
TO STATE-MANDATED ELEMENTS**

MANDATORY ELEMENTS	MARCH JPA GENERAL PLAN ELEMENT	ELEMENT COMPONENTS
LAND USE	LAND USE	Based upon reuse plan preferred pattern of federally prepared master reuse plan.
CIRCULATION	TRANSPORTATION	Circulation, aviation, transit, multi-modal, infrastructure, and goods-movement.
HOUSING	HOUSING	Adoption of the four member jurisdiction housing elements by reference.
NOISE	NOISE/AIR QUALITY	Noise and air quality due to nexus of generators (aviation) and significance to our region.
CONSERVATION	RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	Conservation, open space, natural resources, historical and cultural resources.
OPEN SPACE		
SAFETY	SAFETY/RISK MANAGEMENT	Airport compatibility, flooding, seismic, environmental conditions.

Together, the elements of the proposed March JPA General Plan provide an integrated and internally consistent set of goals, policies, and implementation programs that focus on issues that are of the greatest concern to the community. The major goals of the proposed General Plan are provided below:

**Land Use Element**

- GOAL 1: Land Use Plan provides for a balanced mix of land uses that contribute to the regional setting, and capitalize on the assets of the Planning Area, while insuring compatibility throughout the Planning Area and with regional plans.
- GOAL 2: Locate land uses to minimize land use conflict or creating competing land uses, and achieve maximum land use compatibility while improving or maintaining the desired integrity of the Planning Area and subregion.

*Section 2: Project Description (continued)*

---

---

- GOAL 3: Manage growth and development to avoid adverse environmental and fiscal effects.
- GOAL 4: Develop an identity and foster quality development within the Planning Area.
- GOAL 5: Maximize and enhance the tax base and generation of jobs through new, reuse and joint use opportunities.
- GOAL 6: Support the continued Military Mission of March Air Reserve Base, and preservation of the airfield from incompatible land use encroachment.
- GOAL 7: Maximize the development potential as a regional Intermodal Transportation facility to support both passenger and freight-related air services.
- GOAL 8: Preserve the natural beauty, minimize degradation of the March JPA Planning Area, and provide enhancement of environmental resources, and scenic vistas.
- GOAL 9: Preserve the integrity of the historic and cultural resources of the Planning Area and provide for their enhancement.
- GOAL 10: Avoid undue burdening of infrastructure, public facilities, and services by requiring new development to contribute to the improvement and development of the March JPA Planning Area.
- GOAL 11: Plan for the location of convenient and adequate public services to serve the existing and future development of March JPA Planning Area.
- GOAL 12: Ensure, plan, and provide adequate infrastructure for all facility reuse and new development, including but not limited to, integrated infrastructure planning, financing and implementation.
- GOAL 13: Secure adequate water supply system capable of meeting normal and emergency demands for existing and future land uses.
- GOAL 14: Establish, extend, maintain and finance a safe and efficient wastewater collection, treatment and disposal system which maximizes treatment and water recharge, minimizes water use, and prevents groundwater contamination.
- GOAL 15: In compliance with state law, ensure solid waste collection, siting and construction of transfer and/or disposal facilities, operation of waste reduction

and recycling programs, and household hazardous waste disposal programs and education are consistent with the County Solid Waste Management Plan.

GOAL 16: Adequate supplies of natural gas and electricity from utility purveyors and the availability of communications services shall be provided within the March JPA Planning Area.

GOAL 17: Adequate flood control facilities shall be provided prior to, or concurrent with, development in order to protect the lives and property within the March JPA Planning Area.

### **Transportation Element**

GOAL 1: Establish and provide for a comprehensive transportation system that captures the assets and opportunities of the planning area, existing transportation facilities, and planned transportation facilities for the future growth and development of the planning area and sub-region.

GOAL 2: Build and maintain a transportation system which capitalizes on the multi-faceted elements of transportation planning and systems, designed to meet the needs of the planning area, while minimizing negative effects on air quality, the environment and adjacent land uses and jurisdictions.

GOAL 3: Develop a transportation system that is safe, convenient, efficient and provides adequate capacity to meet local and regional demands.

GOAL 4: Provide a balanced transportation system that ensures the safe and efficient movement of people and goods throughout the planning area, while minimizing the use of land for transportation facilities.

GOAL 5: Establish vehicular access control policies in order to maintain and insure the effectiveness and capacity of arterial roadways.

GOAL 6: Facilitate and develop transportation demand management and transportation systems management programs, and use of alternate transportation modes.

GOAL 7: Adequate, affordable, equitably distributed and energy efficient public and mass transit services which promote the mobility to, from and within the planning area shall be provided.



- GOAL 8: Develop measures which will reduce the number of vehicle-miles traveled during peak travel periods.
- GOAL 9: Regulate the travel of trucks on March JPA Planning Area streets.
- GOAL 10: Adequate off-street parking for all land uses shall be provided which requires adequate on-site parking to prevent spill over on the adjacent street system.
- GOAL 11: Plan for and seek to establish an area-wide system of bicycling trails, with linkages within the planning area and with adjacent jurisdictions, and in compliance with sub-regional plans.
- GOAL 12: Promote, preserve and protect the joint use of the aviation field by the Air Force Reserves and civilian aviation.
- GOAL 13: Goods movement through the San Jacinto Rail Branchline shall be capitalized.
- GOAL 14: In accordance with state and federal law, promote and provide mobility for the disabled.

**Noise/Air Quality Element**

***Noise***

- GOAL 1: Ensure that land uses are protected from excessive and unwanted noise.
- GOAL 2: Minimize incompatible noise level exposure throughout the Planning Area, and where possible, mitigate the effect of noise incompatibilities to provide a safe and healthy environment.
- GOAL 3: Work toward the reduction of noise impacts from vehicular traffic, and aviation and rail operations.

***Air Quality***

- GOAL 1: Promote alternative modes of travel.
- GOAL 2: Reduce emissions associated with vehicle miles traveled by enhancing the jobs/housing balance of the subregion of western Riverside County.

*Section 2: Project Description (continued)*

---

---

- GOAL 3: Reduce air pollution through proper land use, transportation, and energy use planning.
- GOAL 4: Pursue reduced emissions for stationary and mobile sources through the use and implementation of new and advancing technologies.
- GOAL 5: Maximize the effectiveness of air quality control programs through coordination with other governmental entities.
- GOAL 6: Reduce emissions associated with vehicle/engine use.
- GOAL 7: Reduce emissions associated with energy consumption.
- GOAL 8: Reduce air pollution emissions and impacts through siting and building design.
- GOAL 9: Reduce fugitive dust and particulate matter emissions.

**Resource Management Element**

- GOAL 1: Conserve and protect surface water, groundwater, and imported water resources.
- GOAL 2: Control flooding to reduce major losses of life and property.
- GOAL 3: Conserve and protect significant land forms, important watershed areas, mineral resources and soils conditions.
- GOAL 4: Conserve energy resources through use of available energy technology and conservation practices.
- GOAL 5: Conserve and protect significant stands of mature trees, native vegetation, and habitat within the planning area.
- GOAL 6: Provide an effective and efficient waste management system for solid and hazardous wastes that is financially and environmentally responsible.
- GOAL 7: Promote cultural awareness through preservation of the planning area's historic, archaeological and paleontological resources.

*Section 2: Project Description (continued)*

---

---

- GOAL 8: Develop and maintain recreational facilities as economically feasible, and that meet the needs of the community for recreational activities, relaxation and social interaction.
- GOAL 9: Create a network of open space areas and linkages throughout the Planning Area that serves to preserve natural resources, protect health and safety, contributes to the character of the community, provide active and passive recreational use, as well as visual and physical relief from urban development.
- GOAL 10: Establish standards for scenic corridors, trails and vistas that contribute to the quality of the planning area.

**Safety/Risk Management Element**

- GOAL 1: Minimize injury and loss of life, property damage, and other impacts caused by seismic shaking, fault rupture, ground failure, and landslides.
- GOAL 2: Minimize grading and otherwise changing the natural topography, while protecting the public safety and property from geologic hazards.
- GOAL 3: Minimize injury, loss of life, property damage, and economic and social disruption caused by flood hazards.
- GOAL 4: Reduce threats to public safety and protect property from wildland and urban fire hazards.
- GOAL 5: Reduce the potential for hazardous material exposure or contamination in the Planning Area.
- GOAL 6: Ensure to the fullest extent practical that, in the event of a major disaster, critical structures and facilities remain safe and functional.
- GOAL 7: Reduce the possible risk of upset, injury and loss of life, property damage, and other impacts associated with an aviation facility.
- GOAL 8: Plan for emergency response and recovery from natural and urban disasters.

The proposed Land Use Plan for the March JPA General Plan is shown in Exhibit 2-2. A breakdown of land use designations is provided in Table MEIR 2-1.

## **2.3 RELATED FUTURE ACTIONS**

The MEIR prepared for the March JPA General Plan is a programmatic document and the foundation for approval of subsequent development to implement the General Plan. If the General Plan is approved, additional review by the March JPA for consistency with the Land Use Plan and certified Final MEIR of future development approvals, (i.e., tentative maps, zoning maps) to implement the March JPA General Plan will be required.

Future development of the March JPA Planning Area shall be consistent with the proposed March JPA General Plan and its elements. The buildout capacity of the planning area pursuant to the proposed project is estimated in Table MEIR 2-1. The environmental impacts of the related projects, together with the proposed General Plan, are examined in Section 3 of this MEIR. The related projects could lead to the development of a maximum of 21.5 million square feet of commercial, industrial, and public facilities space.

If approved, implementing measures of the General Plan will be subject to discretionary approval by March JPA, including review for conformity with the General Plan and MEIR, and incorporation of mitigation measures adopted in certifying the Final MEIR with the General Plan. Projects related to the implementation of the proposed General Plan include: adoption of zoning map and codes for consistency zoning, tentative maps, master plans, capital improvement programs, and General Plan implementation programs.

## **2.4 RELATIONSHIP TO REGIONAL & LOCAL**

The proposed March JPA General Plan will serve as the primary document for the regulation of the physical development of the planning area. Where required by State law, local ordinances shall conform with the goals and policies of the March JPA General Plan. Soon after adoption of the proposed March JPA General Plan, the March JPA shall review existing ordinances for consistency with the policies of the new General Plan. Future ordinances and programs by March JPA shall also be developed in accordance with the goals, policies and programs of the General Plan.

Regional plans have been reviewed and incorporated into the proposed March JPA General Plan. These include the Regional Mobility Plan and Growth Management Plan by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Sub-Regional Comprehensive Plan and Comprehensive Transportation Plan by Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG), the Air Quality Management Plan by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD),

208 Regional Water Quality Control Plan, County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, Congestion Management Plan, Solid Waste Management Elements and other plans of the different county agencies including the Riverside County Transportation and Land Management Department.

Other agencies (such as County Fire Department, Caltrans, Western Municipal Water District, Riverside County Sheriff's Department, Riverside County Transportation Commission, and adjacent cities) have been notified and coordination with these agencies will ensure that inconsistencies and incompatibilities in plans and developments are resolved before they occur.

## **2.5 RELATIONSHIP TO BASE REUSE PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

As mentioned earlier in this section, the March AFB Master Reuse Plan and its associated EIS was prepared as part of the base reuse process under the requirements of the DOD. The reuse plan and EIS, as the forerunners to the General Plan, set the history, base line under California Public Resource Code Section 21083, environmental setting, and activities associated with base reuse. The March JPA General Plan and this MEIR has a relationship of origination with these prior documents.

The General Plan and this MEIR are tools of implementation of the reuse plan and EIS, and therefore provide compliance with California state law, and specifically CEQA, beyond the requirements of the base reuse process and NEPA. The reuse plan and EIS are final documents for property reuse and disposal. The General Plan and MEIR are establishing documents to guide the planning process within the planning area, and can be termed as functioning or "living" documents through their implementation.

## **2.6 RELATIONSHIP TO MARCH AFB REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

The March AFB Redevelopment Plan and Program EIR were adopted and certified by the March Joint Powers Redevelopment Agency in July 1996. The Program EIR assessed potential environmental impacts associated with the redevelopment plan. The environmental analysis

prepared for the establishment and adoption of the redevelopment project area, was the first (CEQA) related document prepared addressing the planning area. Implementation of the General Plan, if part of a redevelopment project or program, will need to be consistent with the redevelopment plan and Program EIR.

## **2.7 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS**

The proposed project involves the adoption of proposed March JPA General Plan and its accompanying elements, including a Land Use Plan and a Transportation Plan. The implementation programs in the General Plan call for the development of ordinances and projects which would be undertaken by the March JPA in the future.

Upon approval of the March JPA General Plan, future development and programs to implement the General Plan will be subject to discretionary approval by the March JPA, including review for conformity with the General Plan, and incorporation of mitigation measures adopted in certifying the Final EIR with the General Plan. Additional approvals required would include: zoning map, master plans, tentative maps, infrastructure master plans, capital improvement programs, grading permits, site reviews, and approvals from utility purveyors and regional regulators including South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), California Department of Fish and Game (CDF&G), Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB), Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD), Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and other applicable regulatory agencies. Further review under CEQA would be required for any nonconforming implementing projects, or for any projects requiring further additional analyses and mitigation as discussed in this MEIR.

## **2.8 AREA OF CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS**

As defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a cumulative impact consist of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with

other projects causing related impacts, or development of a region of influence (ROI). These impacts are defined as the combined affect that, "when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.@ Cumulative impacts are those adverse effects that may by themselves be less than significant, but when considered with impacts occurring from past, present or other reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity would result in a significant impact. As noted in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15065 (c), an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project=s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. Cumulative impact would include the buildout or reasonably projected growth and development within proximity or influence of the March JPA Planning Area.

Related projects to the proposed March JPA General Plan include the buildout of the March JPA Planning Area. Future development in these areas would cumulatively affect the area in terms of Land Use & Planning, Population & Housing, Transportation & Circulation, Water & Hydrology, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Noise, Utilities & Service Systems, and Public Services. The cumulative impacts for each area is addressed in Section 3 of this MEIR. Buildout capacity is estimated in Table MEIR 3-1. Related projects are examined in Section 3 of this MEIR. The related projects will lead to the buildout of a maximum of 21.5 million square feet of commercial, industrial, and public facilities space. The environmental impacts of the related projects, in conjunction with Southern California Association of Government projections for the ROI, are examined herein as cumulative projects.

The March JPA General Plan, as a long-term plan, will result in physical growth and development of the March JPA Planning Area. The overall intent of the proposed Project is to ensure orderly and well-planned growth and development within the March JPA Planning Area and the surrounding jurisdictions as a whole, in accord with the March AFB Master Reuse Plan, the general plans of the surrounding jurisdictions as currently amended, and the applicable State, County, and Federal laws and guidelines.

Implementation of various projects of the March JPA General Plan that will ultimately occur as a result of the proposed project=s adoption could contribute to regionally cumulative impacts. Because the general plans= of other regional jurisdictions direct growth within those jurisdictions, they too could affect potential long-term cumulative impacts.

Evaluation of cumulative impacts contained in Section 3 of this MEIR are based upon growth projections by Southern California Association of Governments for the ROI. The ROI, covering the counties of Riverside and San Bernardino, have growth projections that might occur between the years of 1996-2016. It is difficult to determine the appropriate geographical setting whereby cumulative environmental impacts can be adequately evaluated. The March JPA has considered several scenarios from which to prepare this analysis and has determined that the



*Section 2: Project Description (continued)*

boundaries of the County of Riverside and County of San Bernardino represent a reasonable geographical setting, suitable for assessing project related cumulative impacts for the following reasons: 1) the ROI services a large geographical area with a projected population of 5,794,381 people, projected housing inventory of 1,931,460 and a projected employment base of 2,335,871 people by the year 2016; and 2) quantification of cumulative impacts in this way permits evaluation at a level that is large enough to consider impacts upon issues of sub-regional importance, yet small enough to identify the value of these resources at the local level.

The approach used in this analysis is intended to focus and quantify impacts to appropriate areas. Such analysis is in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (B) which permits an analysis of cumulative impacts to consist of, AA summary of projections contained in an adopted General Plan or related planning document which is designed to evaluate regional or area-wide conditions . . . @ . This analysis complies with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 (b)(3) which requires lead agencies to Adefine the geographic scope of the area affected by the cumulative effects and provide a reasonable explanation. The area-wide or regional setting analyzed within this document will consist of the ROI, which includes Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Listed in Table MEIR 2-3 is the breakdown of the projected growth and yearly average increase for civilian employment opportunities, housing units, and population increases for the ROI.

<b>Table MEIR 2-3 Region of Influence Growth Forecast Riverside and San Bernardino Counties</b>				
	<b>1996</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>Growth Increase</b>	<b>Yearly Average Increase</b>
Housing	1,187,297	1,931,460	744,163	37,208
Population	3,306,623	5,794,381	2,487,758	124,388
Employment	1,209,100	2,335,871	1,126,771	56,339

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, 1996.  
Final EIS Prepared for the Disposal of Portions of March AFB.

The ROI impacts associated with the development of the March JPA Planning Area and the region are discussed below. Based upon the ROI, the issues which represent potentially significant cumulative impacts include: Land Use & Planning, Population & Housing, Transportation & Circulation, Biological Resources, Water & Hydrology, Air Quality, Noise,

*Section 2: Project Description (continued)*

---

Utilities & Service Systems, and Public Services. The other environmental resources/issues addressed in this MEIR have project specific impacts but would not create the potential for significant cumulative effects. The relevant environmental issues are analyzed in Section 3 of this MEIR.

Implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan will provide an estimated 38,588 jobs at buildout. SCAG has projected a total of 2,335,871 jobs for the ROI by 2016, an increase in growth from 1,209,100 in 1996. Based up on the employment growth of the ROI, the project will contribute 4%of the job growth to the ROI. Plan related growth projections represent a very small percentage of projected regional growth; as such, negative impacts appear to be insignificant. It is reasonable to assume that the region can accommodate project related impacts without significant cumulative adverse impacts, with the exception of Biological Resources.

## SECTION 3: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the adoption of the proposed March Joint Powers Authority (JPA) General Plan. All of the environmental issue areas are evaluated for potential impacts by future developments under the proposed March JPA General Plan. The areas analyzed are:

1. Land Use and Planning
2. Population and Housing
3. Earth and Geology
4. Water and Hydrology
5. Air Quality
6. Transportation and Circulation
7. Biological Resources
8. Energy/Mineral Resources
9. Hazards and Risks of Upset
10. Noise
11. Public Services
12. Utilities and Service Systems
13. Aesthetics
14. Cultural Resources
15. Recreation

The environmental setting is a description of existing conditions of the March JPA Planning Area, as they relate to the different issue areas under consideration. The discussion below references the Profile Reports of the proposed March JPA General Plan. Detailed information on existing conditions may be found in the profile reports. The March JPA General Plan Profile Reports are subdivided into the following sections:

- Section 1 - Land Use
- Section 2 - Transportation
- Section 3 - Noise/Air Quality
- Section 4 - Housing
- Section 5 - Resource Management
- Section 6 - Safety/Risk Management

The environmental impact analysis includes an identification and evaluation of potential impacts in qualitative and quantitative terms. While the proposed March JPA General Plan will not result in immediate physical development, projects approved under the proposed General Plan could have potential adverse impacts. The impacts discussed in this section relate to the impacts of future development as allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan; future impacts of roadway improvements under the proposed Transportation Plan, and impacts that would accompany infrastructure and public service development/improvements.

Mitigation measures are outlined to reduce the impacts of development. Because the proposed General Plan contains a number of policies and programs which are designed to reduce the environmental consequences of new development, they will also be used as mitigation measures for new development under the proposed Plan. The policies and implementation programs in the different elements of the proposed March JPA General Plan are listed under each issue area where they may serve as March JPA Planning Area-wide mitigation measures. Detailed discussion of the policies and programs may be found in the pertinent elements of the proposed March JPA General Plan. Like the Profile Reports, the General Plan is divided into the following Elements;

- Section 1 - Land Use
- Section 2 - Transportation
- Section 3 - Noise/Air Quality
- Section 4 - Housing
- Section 5 - Resource Management
- Section 6 - Safety/Risk Management

## 3.1 LAND USE AND

### A. Environmental Setting

Developed areas within the March JPA Planning Area are concentrated with the Northeast Planning Subarea and the area designated as Military Operations and Aviation which incorporates the formal boundaries of March Air Reserve Base (ARB). The West Planning Subarea, essentially the area west of Interstate 215, is primarily vacant with limited development of the golf course, elementary school, chapel, and former Non-Commissioned Officers= Academy which is currently utilized by Riverside County Sheriff's Department as the Ben Clark Public Safety Training Center. Section I - Land Use Profile Report discusses land uses existing within the March JPA Planning Area.

#### *Thresholds of Significance*

The following significance thresholds have been established, as guidelines, by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP)<sup>1</sup> for land use impacts. A project will have significant land use impacts if:

- X Inconsistency/conflict with the environmental goals, objectives or guidelines of a regional, community or general plan occurs.

---

1

The March JPA recognizes the threshold guidelines established by the Association of Environmental Professionals in the Thresholds of Significance Workbook (June 1992), to be reasonable and appropriate measures. Resolution #JPA-99-07, adopted June 16, 1999.

*Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis (continued)*

---

- X Inconsistency/conflict with an adopted land use designation of intensity and indirect or secondary environmental impacts occur.
- X Substantial or extreme use incompatibility.
- X Inconsistency/conflict with adopted environmental plans for an area.

**Exhibit 3-1  
Sub-regional Setting**

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-1 BUILDOUT MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA</b>				
Land Use Designation	Acres <i>GROSS</i>	Density		Full Buildout Capacity*
		<i>MAX.</i>	<i>AVG.</i>	
<b><i>INDUSTRY</i></b>				
Business Park	1278	.75	.20	7,793,755 sf
Industrial	433	.60	.15	1,980,455 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>9,774,210 sf</b>
<b><i>COMMERCE</i></b>				
Office	104	.75	.30	951,350 sf
Mixed Use	360	.60	.25	2,744,280 sf
Commercial	45	.60	.30	411,642 sf
Destination Recreation	135	.50	.25	1,029,105 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>5,136,377 sf</b>
<b><i>PUBLIC</i></b>				
Park/Recreation/ Open Space	777	.25	.025	592,307 sf
Public Facility	449	.50	.10	1,369,091 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>1,961,398 sf</b>
<b><i>SPECIAL</i></b>				
Military Operations	2102	n/a	n/a	2,500,000 sf
Aviation	316	.40	.15	1,445,321 sf
Historic District	58	2 <sup>du</sup> /ac	2 <sup>du</sup> /ac	111 units
AFVW Expansion	75	.60	.30	686,070 sf
Cemetery Expansion	160	.10	.005	24,394 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>4,655,784 sf 111 units</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>21,527,769 sf 111 units</b>
ac - acre                                      sf - square feet                                      du/ac - dwelling unit per acre FAR - floor area ratio                                      * based on average FAR, of net acre				



**Exhibit 3-2  
Proposed Land Use Plan**

**B. Environmental Impacts**

The proposed March JPA General Plan includes a Land Use Plan. This Land Use Plan will be the primary impetus of land use impacts, as it sets forth the basic blueprint for assigning land uses and development within the March JPA Planning Area. The proposed Land Use Plan is presented in pages 1-21 to 1-33 of Section 1 - Land Use Element of the March JPA General Plan. Exhibit 3-2 depicts the proposed Land Use Plan.

Buildout of the March JPA Planning Area will result in the reuse of vacated facilities by the U.S. Air Force and development of vacant, undisturbed land. Project are does not contain agricultural resources or land under Williamson Act contract. Implementation of the General Plan will permit the development of non-residential, employment-based facilities to replace the job-loss experienced with the realignment of March Air Force Base (AFB) to March ARB in April 1996. Both the density of development and land use intensity will increase within the vacant areas of the March JPA Planning Area. Table MEIR 3-1 delineates the buildout scenario of the Land Use Plan.

**Land Use Compatibility**

The proposed Land Use Plan is designed to provide compatibility with existing facilities and land uses within the March JPA Planning Area, and to minimize impact with surrounding land uses. The buildout densities are comparable with surrounding land use designations and densities. The Land Use Element and the associated Land Use Plan propose development in areas that have historically been vacant and undeveloped. Areas within the West March Planning Subarea, near the residential communities of Woodcrest and Orangecrest will address buffers during project review and design stage.

**Consistency with Regional Plans & Policies**

It is necessary that the Land Use Plan and corresponding goals and policies of the proposed March JPA General Plan are consistent with, and furthers the regional plans and policies. This includes intergovernmental responsibility plans, such as those under Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the local council of governments, as well as "local" plans that have regional scope, such as the Department of Defense (DOD) military compatibility plans.

Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan: The Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan (1994) for the Western Riverside County subregion, has historically designated

the planning area as a federal installation: an island devoid of local land use and planning. The March JPA Planning Area, as a federal military installation, had not been subject to local land use planning and control. In proposing the adoption of the March JPA General Plan, inclusive of the Land Use Plan, development standards and intensities will be established, where none existed previously. Sub-regional plans will need to be updated to take into consideration the Base Reuse and Closure Commission (BRAC) action of base realignment and the proposed Land Use Plan; however, formulation of the March JPA General Plan and its elements were done in compliance with the goals and objectives as contained within the Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan.

The goals and objectives of the Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan are to maintain effective growth management within the region. The goals of the Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan include: improving jobs/housing balance; managing growth to ensure the ability to provide public services and infrastructure; and preserving adequate open space for recreation, resource production and public health and safety. The Land Use Plan of the proposed March JPA General Plan, and the goals and policies of the respective elements embody these goals and objectives. The Land Use Element focuses on the need to provide a center of employment within the housing rich environment of western Riverside County, land use compatibility for the continued military mission at March ARB, and establishment of civilian aviation operations through the joint use agreement arrangement of the airfield. The Land Use Plan denotes the distribution and assignment of the land use designations to insure aviation and noise compatibility, public health and safety, and contributing measures to better achieve a jobs/housing balance within the region.

Southern California Association of Governments Regional Comprehensive Plan: The Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan is a component to the SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan. Again the proposed Land Use Plan of the March JPA General Plan is consistent with the goals and policies of the regional plan, as incorporated within the sub-regional plan, with the basic premises of creating an employment center within the housing-rich environment of the Inland Empire, and replacing the economic loss of base realignment. The overall goal of each plan is to manage growth with the provision for necessary public facilities and services.

Air Force Policies Affecting Adjacent Land Uses: The DOD has developed the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) program to minimize

development that is incompatible with aviation operations in areas on and adjacent to military airfields. The AICUZ land use recommendations are based on 1) land use compatibility with exposure to aircraft noise, and 2) safety considerations. Recommended compatible land uses are derived from data on noise contours (noise zones) and safety zones (clear zones and accident potential zones). Noise and safety zones are delineated specifically for each military base, using operational information derived from the base mission. Agencies such as March JPA and cities with jurisdiction over adjacent land use may zone property in accordance with the AICUZ recommendations, but are not required to do so. The proposed March JPA General Plan is consistent with the existing 1992 AICUZ report for March AFB, and consistent with the 1998 AICUZ report that was released mid-1998, that accounts for both the military and civilian operations projected and permitted to occur at March ARB and March Inland Port, a joint use facility.

March AFB Master Reuse Plan: The formulation and establishment of a General Plan and Land Use Plan at the former March AFB are necessary, due to the recent realignment to March ARB in April 1996, coupled with the assignment of land use authority by the County of Riverside to the March JPA in March 1997. The Land Use Plan will be the first local planning document established for the March JPA Planning Area. Under the BRAC process, the March AFB Master Reuse Plan was prepared. The proposed March JPA General Plan and the associated Land Use Plan are local land use implementation tools of the master reuse plan.

**C. Mitigation Measures**

The Land Use Element of the proposed March JPA General Plan contains the Land Use Plan for the March JPA Planning Area. While this will serve as the primary instrument for controlling future development in the planning area, there are policies and implementation programs in the Element which prevent land use incompatibilities and conflicts. The Land Use Element is the first section of the March JPA General Plan. Policies and programs in the other elements of the General Plan which address the prevention of land use impacts are listed below:

1. Transportation Element policies 1.3, 2.2, 3.2, 3.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.3, 8.8, 9.2, 9.3, 13.5, 13.6, 13.7, 13.8. and 14.4, and the following programs:
  - i. Project Review
  - ii. Transportation Demand Management program
  - iii. Riverside County Congestion Management Program
  - iv. Airport Layout Plan and Development Plan
  
2. Noise/Air Quality Element, Noise Section goals 1 and 2 in their entirety with policies, policies 3.1, 3.4, and 3.5; and Air Quality Section policies 1.1, 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 6.6, 7.3 and 8.2, and the following programs from the Noise / Air Quality Element:
  - i. Relationship of Jobs to Housing
  - ii. Civilian Aviation compliance
  - iii. SCAQMD Permit compliance/regulations
  - iv. Noise Standards-review of development projects
  - v. Aviation Noise and Noise Sources-compatibility
  
3. Resource Management Element policies 1.1, 3.1, 5.4, 7.5, 9.1, and 9.8, and the following programs:
  - i. Environmental Review
  - ii. Environmental Regulations
  - iii. Biological Resources Consultation & Section 7 Consultation -SKR Land Trade
  - iv. Cultural Awareness Program
  - v. Cultural Resource Management Plan
  - vi. Parks Plan
  - vii. March JPA Land Use Element
  
4. Safety\Risk Management Element policies 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 5.3, 7.1, and 7.2, and the following programs:

- i. Flood Plain Ordinance
- ii. Hazardous Material Regulations
- iii. Reconstruction Ordinance
- iv. Aviation Use Compatibility

### ***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. The proposed Land Use Plan has been designed to prevent adverse impacts on land use by proposing complementary land use designations, and land use intensities that are consistent with the subregion. Also, programs have been developed to maximize the opportunities and assets of the March JPA Planning Area, while minimizing the disruption of the character. The changes in land uses with the development buildout of the March JPA Planning Area are not expected to result in land use conflicts or incompatibilities. With the implementation of proposed General Plan policies and mitigation measures discussed above, potential impacts to land use will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

Any new development under the proposed General Plan and related projects will mean changes in existing land uses. Adoption of the proposed March JPA General Plan will mean changes in existing land uses, as future development occurs on vacant areas and underutilized property. Land use incompatibility and any conflicts will be mitigated by programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan. The cumulative impact of development in the ROI will include an increase in commerce and industrial development, but with an intensification level consistent with the region. Cumulative impacts to land use and planning are therefore less than significant.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

## **3.2 POPULATION AND**

### **A. Environmental**

#### **Setting**

The current population of the March JPA Planning Area is limited, as March ARB does not have permanent housing for personnel. Under the activities of an air reserve base, the U.S. Air Force is unable to provide housing to personnel on base. The majority of the former housing available on the former March AFB has been deemed unsuitable for occupancy under the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations; this is primarily applicable to the more than 500 units known as Arnold Heights. The former on base housing stock that is reusable is limited to the 111 housing units of Green Acres Estates located within the March Field Historic District. No new housing opportunities are identified within the proposed Land Use Plan due to land use compatibility issues relative to the activities of the Air Force Reserves and aviation operations.

The housing units within the Green Acres Estates portion of the March Field Historic District are the only existing (former base) housing that will be reused. Green Acres Estates is the only available housing stock located within the March JPA Planning Area. The March JPA finalized a lease arrangement with the U.S. Air Force (the present property owner) to sublease the units at market rates in order to gain occupancy of these units. Assuming an average household size for housing stock within the subregion of 2.5 persons per household (Department of Finance estimate), the March JPA Planning Area population can be estimated to be approximately 278 persons with full occupancy of the Green Acres units. Currently, approximately 78% of the units are occupied, with the majority of the occupants either being employed by the U.S. Air Force or DOD.

The subregion of western Riverside County, as with the overall Inland Empire, is an area rich in housing stock and development, yet limited in employment opportunities. Western Riverside County can be characterized as a place where people can afford to live, but for adequate employment opportunities must commute to areas outside the Inland Empire. Adequate housing sites continue to be available within the subregion, as demonstrated through the certified housing elements of each of the March JPA's member jurisdictions.

The demographics of the region reflect this job/housing imbalance through the number of households to jobs ratio. The jobs/housing ratio, based upon 1990 numbers for the subregion is 0.82, less than one full-time job per household. Furthermore, with base realignment of March AFB in 1996 the estimated job loss to the area was 10,000 for direct and indirect jobs



(FEIS, Disposal of Portions of March AFB) . Housing vacancies within the area increased, as did the number of homes being foreclosed. This is further compounded with the base closures of Norton AFB (San Bernardino) in 1994 and George AFB (High Desert) in 1993 within the Inland Empire Region.

The subregion and greater Inland Empire areas have seen dramatic increases in housing development, with limited increases in job opportunities. Between the years 1980 and 1990, Western Riverside County grew from 182,909 to 305,742 households, an increase of 122,833 or 67 percent. The increase in the number of households for the area is projected to continue with estimates for Riverside County and San Bernardino County to increase by 110 percent and 72 percent respectively for the twenty-year period (1990-2010). (SCAG, Regional Comprehensive Plan)

In contrast, the increase in the number of households for other counties within the Southern California Region for the same 20-year time period is estimated at 24 percent for Los Angeles, 24 percent for Orange, 41 percent for Ventura and 118 percent for Imperial. The job growth projections and jobs/housing balances for the same period are estimated at 1,052,346 jobs with a ratio of 1.52 jobs per household for Los Angeles, 614,865 jobs with a ratio of 1.86 jobs per household for Orange; 425,752 jobs with a ratio of 0.93 jobs per household for Riverside; 379,814 jobs with a ratio of 1.08 jobs per household for San Bernardino; 126,466 jobs with a ratio of 1.30 jobs per household for Ventura; and 24,244 jobs with a ratio of 1.08 jobs per household for Imperial. This demarks the east - west imbalance of jobs to housing ratios within the southern California Region.

### *Threshold of Significance*

According to the AEP guidelines established for thresholds of significance, a project would have a significant impact upon population, housing or employment if:

- X It would substantially alter the location, distribution, density or growth rate of the human population planned for an area and result in a demand for housing and public and private services which exceed supply in the short or long term. The displacement of a large number of residents also would be considered a significant effect.
  
- X The project would induce substantial growth, concentration or population either through provision of employment or housing or both. Including if the project's generation of population or employment is inconsistent with the regional

growth management plans.

- X It may substantially alter existing housing types or create an unmitigated, substantial demand for additional housing.
- X It caused...the loss of one or more very low to moderate income housing opportunities through demolition, conversion or other means.
- X The project will have a substantial adverse effect on existing housing, will create a demand for additional housing, or will be inconsistent with the regional growth management plans.

**B. Environmental Impacts**

The Land Use Plan for the March JPA General Plan focuses on the creation of an employment center within the housing rich environment of the subregion. At full buildout, the Land Use Plan is estimated to have a projected employment of 38,588 jobs. The increase in employment is not adverse in its own right. The impacts of recapturing employment and employment growth are indirectly related to the environment due to the urbanization process. Job growth will mean an increase in the demand for public services and infrastructure capacity, transportation, services, and public facilities. These issues are addressed separately in sections 3.4, 3.6, 3.11 and 3.12 of this MEIR.

**Creation of an Employment Center**

With the majority of land being developed within the subregion planned for residential land uses, the land use designations of the Land Use Plan, upon full buildout, will contribute upwards to 10 percent of the employment opportunities of the subregion. The March JPA Planning Area, based upon the proposed Land Use Plan, would contribute greatly to the employment opportunities currently deficient within the subregion. The current jobs/housing ratio imbalance would be lessened, and the goals and policies of the subregion would be furthered. Table MEIR 3-2 denotes the job generation projected through implementation of the general plan. Table MEIR 3-2, denotes the projected job generation of the March JPA Planning Area, based upon a 20-year buildout scenario.

**TABLE MEIR 3-2  
EMPLOYMENT GROWTH**

Number of Jobs Created Per Year Period	<5	5-10	10-15	15+	BUILDOUT
	2,873	11,488	11,097	13,130	38,588

The establishment of an employment center is not a negative impact with proper infrastructure and planning. Further discussion is found in this MEIR under utilities, air quality and public services sections. Conversely, the creation of jobs within an area that has an imbalanced jobs/housing ratio has contributing factors for improving the regional environment (i.e., reduced vehicle miles traveled). Implementation of the general plan will result in positive impacts upon existing and projected housing conditions within the region, by bringing job opportunities to a housing rich environment.

Jobs/Housing Balance: SCAG, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) is promoting jobs/housing balance as a means to solve a number of pressing problems in the Southern California region.

Jobs/housing balance is a concept where a regional balance is achieved if the number of housing units is only slightly less than the employment opportunities, so that most of the people living in the area have employment opportunities within the area. The benefits of such a jobs/housing balance include: less traffic congestion; reduced vehicle miles traveled; fewer vehicle emissions with resulting clean air benefit; decreased commute times; and a reduction in the need for major capital expenditures for the development of mass transit facilities. Overall, an increase in quality of life and environment will result.

A balanced region is technically defined as a region where the ratio of jobs to housing is 1.20 (that is 1.20 jobs for every household) in the year 2010 (SCAG). Job rich regions refer to those that have jobs/housing ratios substantially greater than that for the surrounding region (1.2 for 2010). Housing rich areas have lower ratios than that for the surrounding region. The SCAG definition of jobs/housing balance does not consider housing affordability into the jobs/housing balance equation. Ideally, the jobs/housing balance should also consider the relationship of housing affordability to the prevailing wages of the

locality. SCAG recommends that the match between housing affordability and incomes be considered through the review of individual projects and in the "implementation process."

SCAG has prepared employment, housing and population projections for 24 subregions that comprise the SCAG planning area. The March JPA Planning Area is located in the Central Riverside Subregion. As referenced above, the region had a jobs/housing ratio of 0.82. Thus, the subregion needs more local jobs for its residents.

Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan: The Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan (1994) for the Western Riverside County subarea, has unresolved issues relative to jobs/housing balance within its Growth Management Element. The need for the overall plan to assess the current and projected growth and the continued disparity of jobs to housing ratios may be assisted by the proposed March JPA General Plan. The March JPA Planning Area is located within a region with a large number of households and several entitled large, master planned residential communities. The proposed March JPA General Plan Land Use Plan is predominantly an employment generating land use pattern. Development of business park and industrial areas in the March JPA Planning Area will help increase job opportunities in the area for a better jobs/housing balance.

### **No New Housing Opportunities**

The Land Use Plan of the proposed March JPA General Plan proposes no new housing opportunities. This has been prescribed by the mission at March ARB and reuse efforts of March JPA.

March AFB Master Reuse Plan: The March JPA Planning Area is unique, in that it is comprised entirely of a former active duty AFB, which realigned to an ARB, resulting in the disposal of some 4,400 acres for reuse. Through the federally required reuse planning process, land use patterns were established that furthered the goals and policies of the Local Redevelopment (reuse) Authority (LRA) and the continued military mission at March ARB. This included the recapturing of economic and job loss, while capitalizing on the assets and opportunities that are not currently being met within the subregion. Therefore, no new housing is included, and limited existing housing units are being retained, as required under the historic district.

March AFB Redevelopment Project Area: The March JPA redevelopment counterpart, the March Joint Powers Redevelopment Agency (MJPRRA), adopted a project area that encompasses the entire March JPA Planning Area and approximately an additional 450 acres within the City of Moreno Valley. This redevelopment project area was formulated pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 3769, which was developed to assist "military base conversion redevelopment agencies" with the economic blight associated with closed and realigned military bases in California. Accordingly, the 20 percent housing set aside funds are permitted to be utilized within the March JPA member jurisdictions. Therefore, no requirement was made for housing sites within the project area (March JPA Planning Area).

Assembly Bill 2736: The no new housing status for the March JPA Planning Area was furthered with the passing of AB 2736 by the State of California in 1996. AB 2736 specifically states that "The agency (redevelopment agency) shall not be required to replace barracks or dormitory-style housing or Arnold Heights housing that is adoptively reused, demolished, or removed within the boundaries of March AFB."<sup>2</sup> Given the language of this bill and its status, the loss of existing military housing units is determined to be a less than significant impact.

---

<sup>2</sup> AB 2376 Sec. 16 (b)

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation measures to address population and housing impacts are embodied within the March JPA General Plan. In particular, the Land Use Element and proposed Land Use Plan will assist in alleviating this condition by providing job-generating land uses within the housing rich region of the Inland Empire. The Land Use Element goals and policies specify measures that will assist the subregion with the jobs/housing balance, by providing adequate land and infrastructure for job generating land uses. Additionally, the proposed project supports a regional planning approach to this issue. Relevant policies and programs are as follows:

1. Land Use Element policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 3.1, 4.7, 5.1, 5.3, 5.5, 5.6, 7.6 and 9.2.
2. Transportation Element policies 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, 5.1, 8.6, 10.1, 12.2, and 15.1, and the Riverside County Congestion Management Program.
3. Noise/Air Quality Element, noise policies 1.2 and 1.4, air quality policies 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, and the following programs:
  - i. Air Quality Programs
    - (1) Public Transit
    - (2) Relationship of Jobs to Housing
  - ii. Noise Programs
    - (1) Aviation Noise and other Noise Sources.
4. Housing Element incorporates the March JPA's four member jurisdiction housing elements, each which is certified by the Department of Housing and Community Development. Each housing element cites adequate housing sites for all segments of population.
5. Safety/Risk Management Element policy 7.2 and Response Coordination Program.

### ***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will have a significant adverse impact on the environment if it induces substantial growth or concentration of the population, a significant demand for housing or involves a substantial amount of displacement of persons. The General Plan does not

directly nor indirectly displace persons. Potential development and growth that may occur with new development under the proposed General Plan represent an increase in available employment generating land uses. This growth will occur as the market demand dictates, and said growth is estimated to occur within the projected time-frame to reach buildout. Growth is not adverse if adequate public services are available at each period of growth.

The March JPA General Plan and its programs will assist the region in growing toward a more equitable population and housing availability to jobs ratio for the subregion. The project is consistent with the goals and objectives of the applicable regional and subregional plans, particularly with population and housing, and balance of jobs to housing. Impacts of the proposed project to housing and population, with the application of the policies and programs as noted above as mitigation measures, are considered to be less than significant.

The proposed project will not have a significant adverse impact on population and housing. Furthermore, the project will have a beneficial impact to population and housing, due to the current jobs/housing in balance of the Inland Empire and the subregion of Western Riverside County. The creation of an employment center will benefit the region and subregion by providing areas upon which quality jobs can be developed, where at the local and future population could be employed. Currently, the Inland Empire=s greatest export is its labor force.

*Cumulative Impacts*

The proposed project will provide for new employment opportunities, through the development of currently vacant areas into centers of commerce and industry. The proposed March JPA General Plan will accommodate 21.5 million square feet of employment generating development. It is anticipated that an estimated 38,588 jobs will result through the buildout of the March JPA Planning Area within a 20-year buildout scenario. When compared to the 20-year projection for Riverside County of 425,752 jobs (SCAG), this equates to approximately 9% of the growth projection for Riverside County, and 4.85% of the ROI projected job growth. The impacts of development and employment increase to the region are directly related to the increase in demand for public services and infrastructure, and are therefore, not considered cumulatively considerable.

The establishment of an employment center will contribute considerably to the cumulative impact of the region, but this is not a negative impact with proper infrastructure and planning. Conversely, the creation of jobs within an area that has an imbalanced jobs/housing ratio has contributing factors for improving the regional environment (i.e., reduced vehicle miles traveled). Implementation of the general plan will result in positive impacts upon existing and projected housing conditions within the region, by bringing job opportunities to a housing rich environment. The proposed March JPA General Plan will not create the potential for adverse, significant cumulative effects to population and housing.



***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

## 3.3 EARTH AND

### A. Environmental Setting

March JPA Planning Area at 6,500 acres is bounded by the cities of Riverside, Moreno Valley and Perris, and the unincorporated Mead Valley area of Riverside County. The March JPA Planning Area is located within the northern portion of the Perris Plains, within the Santa Ana basin which covers an area of 2,000 square miles and is part of the Peninsula Ranges Province. Other major geological features in the area are the Pacific Coastal Plain to the west, the Transverse Ranges including the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains and the Mojave Desert to the north, and the San Jacinto Mountains and Mojave Desert to the east.

#### Topography & Soils

The topography of the March JPA Planning Area is generally characterized by rounded ridges and incised drainage in the West March Planning Subarea, and relatively flat slopes east of Interstate 215. Elevations range from approximately 1,760 feet mean sea level (MSL) in the West March Planning Subarea, to about 1,465 MSL in the southeast corner of the March JPA Planning Area. Two major soil associations exist in the March JPA Planning Area: the Cieneba-Rockland-Fallbrook association on the western portion of the planning area, and the Monserate-Arlington-Exeter association on the eastern portion. Soil resources in the area are discussed in pages 5-5 to 5-9 of the Resource Management Profile Report.

#### Geology

The March JPA Planning Area overlies part of the eroded Cretaceous and older crystalline basement rock (Perris Erosional Surface) and the alluvial filled valley (Perris Plain). The West March Planning Subarea is predominantly on the Perris Erosional Surface, with the Northeast Planning Subarea on the Paloma Surface/Perris Plain. The Perris Plain alluvial deposits are composed of alternating layers of varying amounts of clay, silt, sand and gravel. The thickness varies from a few feet to greater than 800 feet. Geological characteristics of the March JPA Planning Area are discussed in pages 5-1 to 5-2 and 5-5 to 5-9 of the Resource Management Profile Report, and the Safety/Risk Management Profile Report in pages 6-1 to 6-7.

#### Seismicity

The March JPA Planning Area is located between two major fault zones: the Elsinore-Whittier, 13 miles to the southwest, and the San Jacinto, 7 miles to the northeast. The area between the two faults is known as the Perris Block or Perris Plains; which is a structural unit within one of the major geological provinces of Southern California. These northwest-trending faults are considered active faults by the California Division of Mines and Geology. The San Jacinto fault is considered to be the most active fault within Southern California and has been a source of numerous earthquakes during this century. As a result, this fault is within an Alquist-Priolo Studies Zone.

The Casa Loma fault is considered to be a potentially active fault. Although an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone has not been established for this fault, a Riverside County "Hazard Management Zone," similar to an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, has been established. The March JPA Planning Area is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. Geological conditions of the planning area are discussed in pages 6-2 to 6-7 of the Safety/Risk Management Profile Report.

### ***Threshold of Significance***

Guidelines for significant thresholds have been established by AEP. A project will cause significant impacts to earth resources and geology if it:

- X Exposes people and structures to major geological hazards.
- X Projects within 500 feet of an active or potentially active fault are considered to have potentially significant geological/geotechnical impacts.

## **B. Environmental Impacts**

The environmental impacts of new development under the proposed Land Use Plan on earth and geology include exposure of structures and their users to geologic and seismic hazards present in the area. Other impacts involve the disturbance of existing soil cover and changes in the natural terrain of the area. Future development means that more people and structures will be exposed to the geologic and seismic hazards in the March JPA Planning Area.

### **Seismic Hazards**

The March JPA Planning Area is at risk from seismic hazards associated with the Elsinore-Whittier and the San Jacinto faults. There are no active faults in the planning area, and the Casa Loma Fault, approximately six miles to the east-northeast is the closest sply of the San Jacinto Fault zone to the March JPA Planning Area. The fault has a maximum credible earthquake magnitude of 7.5. Earthquakes along other major faults in the area, such as the Elsinore-Whittier Fault zone, could also cause major damage to buildings and services. The planning area is located within Seismic Hazard Zone III (ICBO 1994) of the Uniform Building Code (UBC, 1994).

A major earthquake on either fault, as with any earthquake area has a potential for injuries, crowd control problems, hazardous material releases, and structural damage and fires. A major earthquake on these faults must be considered in the development of an emergency response plan. Potential damage to new and existing structures will be slight to moderate, although severe damage to vulnerable buildings cannot be precluded. Injuries and property damage (structural and nonstructural damage to buildings) to other structures in the March JPA Planning Area would be due primarily to strong ground motion.

Seismic design provisions in the Uniform Building Code (UBC) for conventional development, such as commercial and industrial structures, specifies that a building not be susceptible to collapse under seismic loading. Structural and non-structural damage cannot be precluded and it is economically infeasible to design earthquake-resistant structures for conventional development. The key is the enforcement of seismic design provisions with adequate review and inspection to ensure maximum quality construction and optimum design.

**Exhibit 3-3  
Geological Map**

MEIR 3-27

### **Geologic Hazards**

Steep slopes and manufactured slopes may be subject to soil erosion and landslide hazards. Heavy rainfall in these areas can also result in mudflow. The rolling hill areas of the West Planning Subarea are designated primarily for business park development. Hillside construction techniques may be necessary for projects on steep slopes, to avoid geologic hazards such as ground instability, erosion, landslides and weak slopes. Landslide hazards will continue to pose constraints to hillside developments. Areas with potential for liquefaction are another concern in hillside areas, as liquefaction may cause damage to structural foundations and floors. New development in hillside areas may be subject to geologic hazards unless engineering design methods are provided.

Changes in the natural topography will occur with excavation and grading that will accompany new construction. Flat ground is likely to remain flat but sloped areas may be modified to create building pads and manufactured slopes to accommodate development.

The proposed Transportation Plan may have adverse impacts on earth and geology. Roadway and infrastructure projects will require excavation, grading and paving, as well as limited changes in natural topography by hillside roads. These impacts are not expected to be major and will occur in increments over time.

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

A number of policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan, in particular the Safety/Risk Management Element, address the geologic and seismic hazards that are present in the planning area. These policies and programs will mitigate the impacts associated with new development under the proposed Land Use Plan. Policies and programs that address impacts on earth and geology are listed below:

1. Land Use Element policies 8.1 and 8.4, and the following programs:
  - i. Development Code
  - ii. Specific Plans
2. Noise/Air Quality Element, air quality policies 9.1 and 9.3, and Construction-Related Emissions program.
3. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 5.5 and

- 10.3, and the following programs:
- i. Preservation and Managed Production of Natural Resources
  - ii. Grading Standards
  - iii. Environmental Review
  - iv. Environmental Regulations
4. Safety/Risk Management Element policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 6.1 and 8.11, and the following programs:
- i. Seismic Design
  - ii. Grading
  - iii. Response Coordination

### ***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it exposes persons or structures to major geologic hazards. The project's impact to earth resources and geology is considered to be less than significant, based upon the aforementioned mitigation measures and implementation programs.

Any adverse impacts on earth and geology that will occur with future development are expected to be mitigated with the policies and programs listed above. Geologic hazards can be successfully mitigated by land use controls and building and engineering methods. Seismic hazards can be reduced to minimize injury and property damage, to less than significant.

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

The above discussion addresses project specific impacts. The proposed March JPA General Plan will not create the potential for significant cumulative effects to earth and geology. The project site is not known to contain any faults. Based upon the mitigation measures and implementing programs for the project, impacts are not cumulative considerable.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***



## 3.4 WATER AND

### A. Environmental Setting

Water and hydrology includes the natural environment related to surface water and ground water.

#### Surface Water

The March JPA Planning Area is within the San Jacinto watershed. The San Jacinto watershed at 760 acres in size is one geographic area of the three-part Santa Ana Basin. The San Jacinto River represents the watershed's most significant drainage feature. Water and hydrological settings of the March JPA Planning Area are discussed in pages 5-2 to 5-6 of the Resource Management Profile Report.

Surface drainage in and around the March JPA Planning Area include ephemeral streams during periods of rainfall. Surface runoff of existing impervious surfaces such as runways and aviation field, roadways and buildings are collected into manmade drains, which are tributary to the Perris Valley Storm Drain System. Runoff from the aviation field area, in the southern portion of the flight line, is filtered through the main oil/water separator before discharging into the storm drain system. Storm drain and flood control are discussed in pages 6-6 to 6-7 of the Safety/Risk Management Profile Report and pages 5-2 through 5-6 of the Resource Management Profile Report.

Area Drainage Plans: The March JPA Planning Area is located within the limits of the Perris Valley Area Drainage Plan (ADP) and Lake Mathews ADP of the Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD).

Floodplain: The areas of the Heacock and Cactus Channels, along with lands west of Heacock Channel are areas mapped by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for being subjected to 100-year floods. With improvement of the Heacock Channel, RCFC&WCD made preliminary calculations and boundaries for 100-year storm events that extend into the March JPA Planning Area.

**Exhibit 3-4  
Planning Area Hydrology**

### **Ground Water**

In the Perris Valley, coarse-grained alluvial deposits form the main aquifer. Natural recharges to the aquifer occur through infiltration and precipitation, as the deposits of the aquifer are highly permeable and can yield large amounts of water. Artificial recharges occur through irrigation of landscaping within the developed portions of the March JPA Planning Area. Other forms of recharge occur as a result of filtration through unlined flood control channels and drainage areas. Ground water is discussed on page 5-3 to 5-4 of the Resource Management Profile Report.

### **Water Quality**

Within the March JPA Planning Area, water quality is generally considered good. Although surface water quality records are not detailed to the March JPA Planning Area, the samples collected by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) through gaging stations along the Santa Ana River considers the water of good quality, with hard to very hard, with a suspended solid concentration ranging from 274 to 697 parts per million (ppm) (FIES, 1996). The quality of ground water in the northern portions of the Perris Plain and Moreno Valley is good; however, the remaining areas are somewhat questionable. Ground water monitoring within the March JPA Planning Area had identified a variety of compounds within proximity to the airfield and flight line. Due to the ground water contamination that occurred as a result of past military use (TCE plume), the U.S. Air Force is remediating the contamination as part of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP). Water quality is discussed in pages 5-3 to 5-5 of the Resource Management Profile Report.

### ***Threshold of Significance***

The following significant thresholds have been established by the AEP as a guideline for flood control/drainage impacts:

- X If the proposed Project causes substantial flooding, erosion or siltation;
- X If the proposed Project exposes people or structures to major hydrological hazards such as flooding.

## **B. Environmental Impacts**

### **Surface Water**

Implementation of the proposed General Plan Land Use Plan, will create an increased amount of impervious surface within the undeveloped portions of the March JPA Planning Area, thereby increasing storm and surface runoff into the storm drain systems. Additionally, drainage patterns could be established and/or altered to divert runoff away from and around constructed facilities. The proposed Land Use Plan has land use (density/impervious surface) assumptions that closely match what was used for the master drainage plan hydrology calculations; therefore, there is no significant impact on the size of master drainage plan facilities.

Area Drainage Plans (ADP): The Perris Valley ADP assumed land use densities beyond what the March JPA General Plan proposes; therefore, capacity of master flood control facilities is not an issue. Fees assessed within the Perris Valley ADP provide for the construction and development of master flood control facilities. Until downstream facilities are constructed, increased storm runoff from development can impact downstream properties. Development within the March JPA Planning Area must employ properly maintained detention basins or other interim flood control methods until downstream facilities are constructed.

Development within the Lake Mathews watershed is restricted until development of major drainage plan elements are completed in accordance with the ADP for Lake Mathews watershed. Fees assessed within the Lake Mathews ADP cover both master planned infrastructure and water shed pollutant controls relative to Best Management Practices (BMPs). Additionally, the Lake Mathews ADP assumed a less dense land use for the portion of the March JPA Planning Area within the Lake Mathews ADP. Further discussion is included in this MEIR under Section 3.12, Utility and Service Systems, Storm Drain.

Floodplain: There are areas identified as potential flood zones and any new development within these areas will be subject to flood hazards. These areas are limited to the Heacock and Cactus channels and an area immediately west of the Heacock Channel. Development projects within these areas will need to have flood plain review. Implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan includes the adoption of a flood plain management ordinance, and participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) through FEMA. Improvements to master flood control systems will assist in limiting the flood hazard areas. Infrastructure improvements to the storm drainage system in the March JPA Planning Area will result in the elimination of flood hazards.

The Cactus and Heacock Channels are both unlined and designated as "wetlands" (i.e., "waters of the United States"). These unlined drainage channels flow into the Perris Valley Storm Drain. The Cactus Channel has very little capacity and the Heacock Channel is in need of upgrade to accommodate the increased flows attributable to development in the adjacent community of Moreno Valley. Certain modifications to waters of the United States may require the review and approval from the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) through a Section 404 permit or nationwide permit. Pursuant to federal regulations, limited modifications to blue-line streams can be conducted pursuant to a Nationwide Permit. A 1601 or 1603 permit from California Department of Fish & Game may also be required.

### **Ground Water**

Future development will reduce areas of ground percolation and recharge of the groundwater. Also, groundwater contamination may occur with new development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan. Industrial uses, landfills, and other hazardous material users have the potential for groundwater contamination. No specific proposals have been identified for these uses and there are existing regulations to prevent soil and groundwater contamination from urban uses. Monitoring and the regulatory processes are expected to prevent water contamination from future developments.

Roadway and infrastructure projects will impact groundwater resources, as associated with water use for construction activities. This is not expected to be significant and will occur in increments over time.

### Water Quality

Non-point source surface water discharge from the aviation field and other impervious surfaces with heavy types of industry may contain fuels, oils and other residual contaminants that could degrade surface water quality. Storm water discharge could cause higher sediment loads in the drainage system, particularly during construction. Storm drain and treated waste water must comply with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. Development within the March JPA Planning Area is also subject to NPDES permit requirements for storm water discharge during the construction period and during operation.

Issuance of an NPDES permit is contingent upon the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP must be approved by Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWCB). This includes an outline of the storm water drainage system for each discharge point, actual and potential pollutant contact, and surface water locations. Also, included in the SWPPP are storm water management controls and preventive maintenance of facilities.

Standard practices for minimizing the impact of contaminants on the water quality during construction and during operations and maintenance would differ by land use but, generally, may include the following:

- X Performing regular maintenance on storm drainpipes, oil/water separators, waste storage holding tanks, runoff tributaries, pipe culverts, channels, weirs, and swales.
- X Creating and maintaining large areas of impervious surfaces.
- X Monitoring effluent discharge under the established guidelines for Ph, total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations of toxic pollutants, and emission rates of waste streams.
- X Pretreating effluent according to the established guidelines and limiting discharges.

Groundwater quality, as mention previously may be impacted during construction. Long-term ground water contamination is more likely to occur from the general operations of an airfield and industrial users, than construction activities. Regulations over the use and handling of hazardous materials makes the probability of hazardous

spills and containments very unlikely. The existing contaminated plume and its clean up are under the responsibility of the DOD, through the IRP.

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

The proposed General Plan addresses the need to conserve groundwater resources in the Resource Management Element. General Plan policies and programs that deal with water quality and area hydrology call for the preservation and enhancement of water resources and the abatement of flood hazards in the planning area. They are as follows:

1. Land Use Element policies 4.2, 8.4, 13.1, 13.2, 13.3, 14.1, 14.3, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.4, 17.5, 17.6 and 17.7, and the following programs:
  - i. Infrastructure Master Plans
  - ii. Capital Improvement Program
  - iii. Service Capacity Monitoring
  
2. Resource Management Element policies 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 5.1, and the following programs:
  - i. Water Quality Protection
  - ii. Water Conservation Ordinance
  - iii. Preservation and Managed Production of Natural Resources
  - iv. Landscaping Guidelines
  - v. Environmental Review
  - vi. Environmental Regulations
  
3. Safety/Risk Management Element policies 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6 and 3.7, and the following programs:
  - i. Master Flood Control and Drainage Plan
  - ii. Flood Plain Ordinance

### ***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it substantially degrades water quality, interferes with groundwater recharge, or results in substantial flooding, siltation, or erosion. Buildout of the planning area, as allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan, will result in an increase of impervious surfaces; thereby

increasing the amount of non-point surface run off. Buildout and uses within the March JPA Planning Area are subject to the NPDES and the BMPs to maximize storm water pollution control, and thus, these impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level of impact.

Supplement "A" to the Riverside County Drainage Management Plans/New Development Guidelines and Attachment to Supplemental "A" Selection and Design of Stormwater Quality control issued by RCFC&WCD will be implemented within the March JPA Planning Area. Flood hazards can be reduced through infrastructure projects and implementation of the Master Flood Control and Drainage Plan to a less than significant level. The potential impacts to ground water resources can be mitigated to a level considered to be less than significant, through the implementation of policies and programs as outlined within the proposed March JPA General Plan.

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

New development under the proposed March JPA General Plan and related projects will increase the intensity of development in the region. This translates to a greater demand for water and continued need for supply of imported water sources. New development will increase impermeable surfaces and decrease water percolation areas. The area of the ROI to be affected by the proposed project is defined by watershed, or in this case ADP, for hydrological and storm drain impacts. The intensity of development proposed in the general plan is consistent with the area drainage plans by RCFC&WCD, therefore cumulative impacts are considered to be less than significant, with the implementation of the area drainage plans and the installation of storm drains to handle storm flows. Based upon the mitigation measures and implementation programs for the project, impacts are not cumulatively considerable.



## 3.5 AIR

### A. Environmental Setting

Air quality in March JPA Planning Area is characterized by levels of ozone and suspended particulates that exceed clean air standards. Ozone levels are influenced by upwind sources of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) which lead to ozone formation in March JPA Planning Area. Suspended particulates come from vast open areas in the planning area, as well as from grading and other ground-disturbing activities. Section 3 - Air Quality Profile Report discusses air quality regulations, ambient air quality, and pollutant sources in the March JPA Planning Area; and the air quality conformity analysis for joint use aviation at March Inland Port/March ARB.

#### *Threshold of Significance*

For the purposes of evaluating the proposed General Plan, impact on air quality would be considered significant if:

- X The proposed General Plan conflicts with the goals and policies of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Plan, Western Riverside Comprehensive Plan, Growth Management Plan and Regional Mobility Plan.

The following significance thresholds have been established by SCAQMD<sup>3</sup> for assessing air quality impacts:

1. Operation:
  1. 55 pounds per day of reactive organic gas (ROG)
  2. 55 pounds per day of NO<sub>x</sub>
  3. 550 pounds per day of carbon monoxide (CO)
  4. 150 pounds per day of particulate matter equal to or less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>)
  5. 150 pounds per day of sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>)

---

<sup>3</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District

**Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis (continued)**

- 6. State 1-hour or 8-hour standard for CO  
 State: 9.0 ppm or greater for 8-hour; 20 ppm or greater for 1-hour  
 Federal: 9.5 ppm equal to or greater for 8-hour; 35 ppm equal to or greater for 1-hour
  
- 2. Construction:
  - 1. 2.5 tons per quarter or 75 pounds per day of ROG
  - 2. 2.5 tons per quarter or 100 pounds per day of NO<sub>x</sub>
  - 3. 24.75 tons per quarter or 550 pounds per day of CO
  - 4. 6.75 tons per quarter or 150 pounds per day of PM<sub>10</sub>
  - 5. 6.75 tons per quarter or 150 pounds per day of SO<sub>x</sub>

Table MEIR 3-3 shows the amount and type of development that could be considered potentially significant to the overall air quality of an area.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-3 PROJECTS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>	
LAND USES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY IMPACT
<b>Residential</b>	
Single-Family Housing	170 units
Apartments	259 units
Condominiums	286 units
Mobile Homes	341 units
Retirement Community	678 units
<b>Educational</b>	
Elementary School	197,000 sq. ft.
High School	162,000 sq. ft.
Community College	137,000 sq. ft.
University	744 students
<b>Commercial</b>	

MEIR 3-40

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-3 PROJECTS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>	
LAND USES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY IMPACT
Airport	15 daily commercial flights.
Business Park	161,000 sq. ft.
Day Care	32,000 sq. ft.
Discount Store	33,000 sq. ft.
Fast Food w/o drive through	3,200 sq. ft.
Fast Food with drive through	2,700 sq. ft.
Hardware Store	42,000 sq. ft.
Hotel	220 rooms
Medical office	69,000 sq. ft.
Motel	207 rooms
Movie Theater w/o Matinee	8 screens
Movie theater with Matinee	8 screens
New Car Sales	47,000 sq. ft.
Office (single tenant)	155,000 sq. ft.
Office (multi-tenant)	180,000 sq. ft.
Office Park	207,000 sq. ft.
Racquet Club	111,000 sq. ft.
Research Center	288,000 sq. ft.
Resort Hotel	193 rooms
Restaurant	20,000 sq. ft.
Restaurant (High turnover)	9,000 sq. ft.
Shopping Center	56,000 sq. ft.
Special Activity Centers Stadiums/Amusement Parks	All
Supermarket	17,000 sq. ft.
<b>Industrial/Mining</b>	
Aircraft Manufacturing & Repairs	All
Bulk Terminals	All
Cement Plant	All
Chemical Plant	All

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-3 PROJECTS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>	
LAND USES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY IMPACT
Hazardous Waste Treatment & Storage	All
Manufacturing	All
Mining	All
Pulp/Paper Mills	All
Refinery	All
<b>Institutional/Government</b>	
Clinic	97,000 sq. ft.
Government Center	75,000 sq. ft.
Hospital	170 Beds
Library	48,000 sq. ft.
Nursing Home	713 Beds
U.S. Post Office	26,000 sq. ft.
Freeway Lane Addition	All
Auxiliary Lanes	Beyond One Ramp
Waterport	All
Sewage Treatment	All
Rail	All
Cogeneration Project	All
Landfill	All
Incineration	Hazardous Medical/Municipal Waste
Power Generating Facility	All
Waste to Energy	All
Source: AEP June 1992	

**B. Environmental Impacts**

The adoption of the proposed March JPA General Plan will permit development and activities within the planning area which could generate pollutant emissions. Potential air quality impacts will be generated by public and private developments in the March JPA Planning Area. Air

quality impacts for the planning area have been divided into short-term and long-term. Short-term impacts are usually the result of construction or grading operations. Long-term impacts are associated with build-out of the planning area.

### **Short-term Impacts**

Short-term impacts refer to temporary emissions that cease after a given activity is completed. Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan would temporarily increase PM<sub>10</sub>, ROG, NO<sub>x</sub>, and CO concentrations in the March JPA Planning Area vicinity. The primary source of construction-related ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions are gasoline and diesel-powered heavy duty mobile construction equipment such as scrapers and motor graders. Primary sources of PM<sub>10</sub> emissions would be clearing activities, excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic on unpaved ground, and wind blowing over exposed earth surfaces.

Short-term emissions will occur during the construction phases of individual projects allowed under the proposed March JPA General Plan. They include:

Demolition Activities: The demolition of existing structures will generate particulate emissions.

Grading Activities: Excavation and grading activities will result in fugitive dust emissions. The SCAQMD estimates that, in general, 110 pounds of dust per acre can be generated daily by grading activities.

Construction Equipment Emissions: Construction equipment used in the demolition, grading, and construction phases will generate pollutant emissions. Equipment used in the construction phases (consisting of graders, bulldozers, cranes, trucks, etc.) is generally diesel powered resulting in high NO<sub>x</sub> and particulate emissions.

Mobile Emissions: Vehicle trips associated with deliveries and workers traveling to and from the construction site will result in mobile emissions.

Emissions generated from construction activities occurring under the proposed General Plan would cause temporary increases in pollutant concentrations which could lead to violations of the federal and state maximum concentration standards. The frequency and concentrations of such violations would depend on several factors including the soil

composition on the site, the amount of soil disturbed, wind speed, the number and type of machinery used, the construction schedule, and the proximity of other construction and demolition projects.

Heavy-duty equipment emissions are difficult to quantify because of day-to-day variability in construction activities and equipment used. However, as an example, typical emission rates for a diesel powered scraper were obtained from the South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Handbook. A diesel powered scraper is the most common piece of equipment used for grading operations. If two pieces of heavy equipment were operating at one time, and if all of the equipment operated for eight hours per day the following emissions would result: 23 pounds per day of carbon monoxide, 99 pounds per day of nitrogen oxides, 10 pounds per day of hydrocarbons, 7.4 pounds per day of sulfur oxides and approximately 6.5 pounds per day of particulate.

Based on these estimates, emissions associated with short-term construction activities could potentially exceed significance thresholds for project operations. The resulting emissions are estimates of total cumulative emissions and are not representative of individual project emissions. Daily emissions for individual projects would actually be less given the smaller size and shorter construction phase. More detailed project specific analysis demonstrating compliance with regional air quality regulations will be required on a project-by-project basis as development occurs.

### **Long-term Impacts**

Long-term emissions refer to emissions that are likely to continue over the life of the project. The main source of air quality generated by implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan will be from aircraft and motor vehicle emissions as a result of development and operation in accordance with the proposed Land Use Plan. The adoption and implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan will permit new development and continued operation of the airfield which will generate long-term air quality impacts, as associated with the following activities:

On site Stationary Emissions: Specific business activities may result in direct pollutant emissions. Such activities include restaurants, dry cleaners, automotive repair shops, gas stations, industrial processes, etc. New, modified, or relocated stationary sources that emit more than one pound per day are subject to SCAQMD Regulation XIII - New Source Review. Alternatively, new, modified, or relocated stationary sources that emit toxic air contaminants are subject to Rule 1401- New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants.

Off Site Stationary Emissions: The generation of energy (natural gas and electrical) that is needed to support development creates emissions at power plant facilities located outside the March JPA Planning Area. Off site power generation will lead to emissions due to the burning of fossil fuels. On an average day about 80 percent of the electrical power consumed in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) either is derived from non air polluting facilities (hydroelectric and nuclear) or polluting facilities (oil, gas, or coal burning) located outside the Basin.

Aviation Emissions: Aviation operations associated with airport operations for both military and civilian will result in air emissions. A Clean Air Act General Conformity Determination has been completed for the use and operation of the joint use airfield, and activity level is confined to the conformity determination, or may be updated with amendment and updating of the State Implementation Plan.

Mobile Emissions: Vehicle emissions are associated with employees, patrons, and visitors traveling to and from development. Regionally, personal commuting, office worker and retail site customer travel will add to regional trip generation and increase the vehicle miles traveled within the local air shed. Locally, project related traffic, especially at a.m. and p.m. peak hours, will be added to major roads within the local roadway system. Approximately 220,000 project related trips could be generated upon buildout of the March JPA Planning Area, which would impact the major roads within the local roadway system on a daily basis. This projected total of Average Daily Trips (ADTs) being traveled on major roadways within March JPA Planning Area. The emissions from motor vehicles for buildout of the March JPA Planning Area were estimated for carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides and reactive organic compounds. These emissions were generated from the March JPA Planning Area vehicle travel data, such as vehicle miles of travel (VMT), vehicle hours of travel (VHT), and average travel speed. The March JPA Planning Area VMT was multiplied with the appropriate emissions factors (from the SCAQMD's CEQA Handbook, April 1993), to obtain the project's emissions. The results are denoted in Table MEIR 3-4.

---

**TABLE MEIR 3-4  
VEHICULAR EMISSIONS**

---

MEIR 3-45

<b>Element</b>	<b>% over baseline</b>	<b>lbs/day</b>	<b>Exceed AQMD Threshold</b>
CO	52%	4,813	Yes
ROC	51%	258	Yes
NO <sub>x</sub>	9%	108	Yes
SO <sub>x</sub>	22%	45	No
PM <sub>10</sub>	22%	94	No

Based upon the above vehicular emission rates for the planning area and the impacts as a result of the proposed March JPA General Plan, the proposed General Plan will exceed the established Threshold of Significance for air quality with regards to carbon monoxide, and nitrogen oxide, based upon the baselines as permitted under California Public Resources Code Section 21083.8.1. Therefore, based upon the above information, the proposed General Plan could contribute significant unavoidable air quality impacts if complete build-out of the planning area is achieved. Thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, would have to be adopted if the MEIR is certified, and the proposed project approved.

Localized Intersection Impacts:

In accordance with California Public Resource Code Section 21083.3.8.1 (Senate Bill 1180), CO concentrations were modeled prior to base realignment, and therefore serve as a baseline for this MEIR relative to localized intersection impacts. Modeling at receptors for six intersections include one-hour and eight-hour average concentrations. Each intersection exceeded one-hour CO concentrations for California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), and the eight-hour CAAQS and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) concentrations were also exceeded.



**TABLE MEIR 3-5  
LOCALIZED INTERSECTION  
CO CONCENTRATION**

Intersection	Baseline (Cal. Public Res. Code Section 21083.8.1)		General Plan Buildout	
	1-HR	8-HR	1-HR	8-HR
Alessandro/Mission Grove	22.5	14.4	13.8	8.9
Elsworth/Alessandro	20.2	14.2	13.0	8.3
Elsworth/Cactus	20.8	14.6	16.0	10.7
Graham/Alessandro	25.8	18.6	15.6	10.4
Graham/Cactus	21.8	15.4	18.4	12.6
Trautwein/Van Buren	20.7	14.6	12.8	8.1

Source: FEIS, March AFB, 1996; and March JPA Transportation Study, 1998

The mobile source cumulative emissions for the proposed project, which consist of several individual development activities that may be phased over a period of time, will violate air quality thresholds. Although the results indicate air quality threshold violations from a mobile source cumulative emissions perspective, individual development activities when implemented at points, may or may not show pollutant violations.

**Stationary Sources**

Additional emissions will be generated on-site by the combustion of natural gas for space heating. Off-site emissions will be generated due to electrical usage. The generation of electrical energy by the combustion of fossil fuels results in additional emissions off-site. Industrial developments that may be located within the planning area in accordance with the proposed Land Use Plan, in some instances, will exceed the Significance Emissions Thresholds established by AEP (Table MEIR 3-3). Furthermore, cumulatively, these individual industrial developments that could occur over an extended period (20 or more years) will be in excess of those Significance Emissions Thresholds; therefore, there is a potential significant environmental impact on air quality

MEIR 3-47

due to the cumulative impact of project-related developments.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-6 PROJECTED POLLUTANT EMISSIONS (lbs/day)</b>						
<b>Source</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>TOG</b>	<b>CO</b>	<b>NO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>SO<sub>x</sub></b>	<b>PART</b>
Emissions from Natural Gas Use	73.9 million cf/mo	13.07	49.27	295.6**	neg	0.5
Emissions from Electrical Use	189.8million Kwh/yr	5.2	105.1	598.2	62.44	20.8
<b>Total</b>		18.27	154.37	893.8	62.44	21.3

*Notes: CO = carbon monoxide; TOG = total organic gases; NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides, SO<sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides; PART = particulates.*  
*\*\* assumes 120 lbs/ 1.0 million cf*

Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 1993

Since it is unknown what particular industries might locate in the planning area at this time, adequate projections of project related emissions levels is not appropriate and will have to be conducted on a project-by-project basis. All proposed project related development will only occur at levels permitted within the proposed Land Use Plan and Zoning Code and must be required to meet emission standards as regulated and controlled through the SCAQMD.

**C. Mitigation Measures**

The Air Quality/Noise Element of the proposed March JPA General Plan contains goals, policies, an air quality plan and implementation programs which will help improve air quality in the area and reduce the emissions from existing land uses and proposed developments. The policies and implementation programs of the Air Quality Section will reduce pollutant emissions from new development and vehicle trips. Transportation Element policies 2.1, 2.2, 3.6, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.5, 8.1, 8.2, 8.5, 8.6, 8.7, 8.9, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5 and 13.3, and the Transportation Demand Management Implementation Program and Riverside County

Congestion Management Program will also reduce emissions associated with vehicle use.

Because the projected March JPA General Plan emissions of pollutants would be greater than the emissions baseline as recognized under California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1 (emissions prior to base-realignment), implementation of the general plan and development within the March JPA Planning Area shall incorporate all feasible mitigation measures to reduce emissions to the maximum extent possible. Several mitigation measures may be implemented to reduce the air quality impacts associated with the construction and operation activity emissions from the proposed March JPA General Plan. As part of the environmental impact analysis process required under the CEQA, any project proponent and lead agency would be responsible for identifying and quantifying feasible mitigation measures capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, while taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors.

Project mitigation measures to lessen air quality impacts would be provided by SCAQMD, the cognizant local regulatory agency, through the consultation process. According to the SCAQMD, only mitigation measures that meet the following criteria should be used to reduce a project's emissions. The following are project level mitigation measures that shall be applied to projects, on a project-by-project basis, to reduce general plan related construction and operation emissions, as feasible.

2. The effect of the mitigation measures will coincide with the cause of the impact.
3. The agency responsible for implementing the mitigation measures must have the resources to carry out the mitigation.
4. To ensure implementation and enforcement, the mitigation will be enforceable by a legally binding contract, or other enforcement mechanism.
5. The mitigation measures will define the basis for their monitoring and enforcement.
6. The mitigation measures will be reasonably accomplished within a reasonable time frame by the project proponent.
7. Public agencies must verify the effectiveness assumed for any public improvements or permitting requirements that are used as mitigation measures.

Resolution of these above criteria will be dependent upon the size and scope of the implementation activities and individual projects. Project proponents and developers will need

to work closely with the lead agency and the SCAQMD to develop feasible mitigation measures for each particular project. Negotiation between the involved parties could be conducted as part of the CEQA process, soon after the identified action is fully described. The suggested mitigation measures discussed below may be negotiated to reduce development-related construction and operation emissions.

**1. Construction Mitigation Measures**

Emissions from various components of construction activities shall be reduced through the measures identified below. The project proponent would be responsible for implementing these measures:

1. Emissions from on-road mobile sources due to construction activities shall be reduced approximately one percent (1%) through providing temporary traffic control to improve traffic flow, scheduling construction activities during off-peak hours, and developing a trip reduction plan to achieve an average vehicle ridership (AVR) of 1.5 among construction employees.
2. Emissions from off-road mobile sources due to construction activities will be reduced approximately 99 percent by suspending construction activities during second-stage smog alerts, using electricity from power poles rather than temporary gasoline- or diesel-powered generators, prohibiting trucks from idling longer than two (2) minutes, and using alternative fuels (such as methanol or natural gas) in place of diesel fuel, as feasible. This measure is temporary, and not applicable once construction resumes.
3. Fugitive dust emissions due to grading activities will be reduced approximately 50 percent through watering exposed graded areas twice daily, replacing ground cover in disturbed areas, covering hauled loads, and suspending grading operations when wind gusts exceed 25 mph, as feasible.
4. Fugitive dust emissions due to travel of construction equipment on unpaved roads will be reduced approximately 85 percent through sweeping access roads daily, and washing dust from construction equipment leaving the construction site, as feasible.
5. Fugitive dust emissions due to travel of construction equipment on paved roads will be reduced approximately 65 percent by watering unpaved roads three times daily, limiting traffic speeds to 15 mph, and paving construction access roads at

least 100 feet from the main road, as feasible.

**2. Operations Mitigation Measures**

1. Emission from operational activities shall be reduced through the measures identified below. The industrial and commercial developers would be responsible for implementing these measures.
  - i. Emissions from on-road mobile sources due to increased commercial or industrial populations will be reduced approximately 15% by providing preferential parking spaces for car pools and vanpools, implementing compressed work week schedules, developing trip reduction plans to achieve a 1.5 AVR, utilizing satellite offices to reduce VMT, providing on-site child care facilities, implementing parking structure modifications to reduce vehicle queuing, providing video conference facilities, minimizing use of fleet vehicles during smog alerts, and using low-emission fleet vehicles. Employers and commercial/industrial developers would be responsible for implementing these measures.
  - ii. Stationary source emissions from commercial, and industrial structures will be reduced approximately 45 percent through measures designed to reduce energy demands, such as installing solar or low-emission water heaters and double-glass paned windows, using light colored roofing materials to reflect heat, orienting buildings to the north for natural cooling, and increasing wall and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements. Commercial and industrial developers would be responsible for implementing these measures.
2. Ozone precursor emissions shall be controlled by the following methods:
  - i. All internal combustion engine-driven equipment will be properly maintained and tuned according to manufacturer specifications.
  - ii. Idling of all internal combustion equipment will be limited to 10 minutes at any given time.
  - iii. Developers will use building materials that do not require the use of paint/solvents, as feasible.

Future project proponents will be responsible for complying with all applicable permitting requirements for new or modified emission sources subject to SCAQMD rules and regulations. These requirements may include provisions to mitigate and offset emission increase and/or impacts associated with the new sources.

The following mitigation measures are recommended as conditions of implementation project approval:

**Short-Term**

1. All structures and properties involved in rehabilitation/development activities shall be evaluated on a project-by-project basis to determine specific air quality impacts and appropriate mitigation. All projects must comply with SCAQMD regulations.
2. To minimize dust generation during grading operations, SCAQMD Rule 403 shall be adhered to which will require watering during earth moving operations.
3. In order to reduce pollutant emissions from construction equipment, it shall be properly maintained and tuned, and appropriate SCAQMD permits obtained.

**Long-Term**

To ensure all future March JPA General Plan related development and/or construction projects meet emission standards set by the SCAQMD, all projects within the March JPA Planning Area shall be subject to air quality analysis on a project-by-project basis if that Project meets or exceeds the potentially significant Air Quality impacts shown on Table MEIR 3-3. Such analysis shall determine specific project impacts and establish adequate, long-term measures to mitigate impacts if any are determined to exist.

In the review of development and/or construction projects within the planning area, the March JPA and project proponent shall implement the following mitigation measures to identify appropriate mitigation measures to each such project:

1. **Short-Term**

1. Minimize Construction Activity Emissions:
  - i. Water site and clean all equipment in the morning and evening.

- ii. Spread soil binders on site, unpaved roads, and parking areas; reestablish ground cover through seeding and watering.
  - iii. Employ activity management techniques: increase the distance between the emission sources; reduce or change the hours of construction; schedule activity during off-peak-hours; and require a phased-schedule for construction activities to even out emission peaks.
  - iv. Remove silt by paving construction roads, sweeping streets, and washing trucks leaving construction site.
  - v. Suspend grading operations during first and second stage smog alerts.
  - vi. Maintain construction equipment engines by keeping them tuned.
  - vii. Use low-sulfur fuel for equipment.
  - viii. Avoid using temporary power; use power from the grid instead.
2. Reduce Construction-Related Traffic Congestion:
- i. Provide rideshare incentives and transit incentives for construction personnel.
  - ii. Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interferences.
  - iii. Minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes.
  - iv. Provide a flagperson to guide the traffic properly.
  - v. Schedule operations affecting traffic during off-peak-hours.
3. Limit Emissions From Architectural Coatings and Asphalt Usage:
- i. Use low-coating systems where possible.
  - ii. Substitute active solvents with nonreactive solvents.
  - iii. Improve transfer efficiency when solvent-based paints are used.
  - iv. Use high-solid or water-based coatings.
  - v. Finish exterior walls of buildings with light-colored materials.

## **2. Long-Term**

1. Support of and compliance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the region is the most important measure to achieve this goal. The AQMP includes improvement of mass transit facilities and implementation of vehicular usage reduction programs. Additionally, energy conservation measures are included. Specific measures that will be implemented for the proposed Project include:

- i. Limit Emissions From Vehicle Trips:
  - (1) Encourage the use of alternate transportation modes by promoting public transit usage and providing secure bicycle facilities.
  - (2) Provide mass transit accommodations; such as bus turnout lanes, park and ride areas, and bus shelter.
  - (3) Provide traffic signal synchronization where feasible.
  - (4) Provide sufficient service establishments within office area.
  - (5) Encourage formation of van-pools with company vehicles or subsidy and encourage public transit passes.
  - (6) Establish telecommuting programs, alternative work schedules, and satellite work centers.
  - (7) Schedule goods movements for off-peak hours.
  - (8) Provide local shuttle and regional transit systems, transit shelters, bicycle lanes, storage areas, and amenities, and ensure efficient parking management.
  - (9) Provide dedicated turn lanes as appropriate.
  - (10) Include energy costs in capital expenditure analyses.
  - (11) Minimize power distribution losses by using dry transformers, high voltage, three phases, and step-downs, where necessary.
  - (12) Use devices that minimize the combustion of fossil fuels.
  - (13) Include and electrical generation outlet at any large development center for the purpose of refueling electric cars.
  
- ii. Minimize Energy Requirements of Buildings:
  - (1) Introduce glazed windows, wall insulation, and efficient ventilation methods; install window-systems to reduce thermal gain or loss.
  - (2) Introduce efficient heating and other appliances, such as water heaters, cooking equipment, refrigerators, furnaces and boiler units.
  - (3) Incorporate appropriate passive solar design.
  - (4) Replace incandescent indoor lighting with fluorescent lamps, and outdoor lighting with halogen lights.
  - (5) Capture waste heat and re-employ this heat, in nonresidential buildings, where feasible.
  - (6) Limit installed lighting loads to an average of about 2.3 watts per square feet of conditioned floor area.
  - (7) Recycle lighting system=s heat for space during cool weather,



- and the exhaust system through plenums during warm weather.
  - (8) Install low- and medium-static-pressure terminals in air distribution systems.
  - (9) Ensure proper sealing of all buildings, where applicable.
  - (10) Design facility entrances with vestibules, where applicable.
  - (11) Install individually-controlled light switches and thermostats to permit individual adjustments.
  - (12) Control mechanical systems, or equipment with time clocks or computer systems.
- iii. Minimize Potential Exposure to the Public to Air Toxic Emissions:
- (1) Integrate additional mitigation measures into site design such as the creation of buffering areas between a potential sensitive receptor=s boundary and potential pollution sources.
  - (2) Minimize population-exposure to asbestos emissions and take precautions including, but not limited to, those recommended in Rule 1403.

### ***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it violates any ambient air quality standards, contributes substantially to an existing or projected air quality exceedance, or exposes sensitive persons to substantial concentrations of air pollutants. Development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan will generate pollutant emissions that will exceed established thresholds of the SCAQMD. These standards of threshold are set because the project is located in a non-attainment area. Therefore, any activity will contribute to exceedance.

The Air Quality/Noise Element will reduce these impacts and offset new emissions but cannot remove existing air quality violations. With existing violations of air quality standards in the Basin, new development in the March JPA Planning Area will contribute to continued exceedance of these standards.

Air quality impacts from the proposed project cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance due to the region's existing air quality condition and the amount of emissions generated from activities permissible through the development and implementation of the March JPA General Plan; therefore, if the March Joint Powers Commission approves the project, it must adopt a Statement of Overriding

Considerations.

However, it is pertinent to note that the establishment of an employment center within the housing rich environment of Western Riverside County will make it possible for more residents of the sub-region to work within the sub-region, as opposed to commuting to Los Angeles and Orange Counties. This would reduce the peak hour traffic in the peak direction, thereby reducing peak congestion of these roadways and balancing peak traffic flows to better utilize the roadway system's capacity. Furthermore, it would also reduce the number of VMT, by reducing the length of the commute. Based upon the transportation model for the project, buildout of the March JPA Planning Area could reduce the daily traffic volume in and out of the County by 32,000 vehicles. The model also forecasted that an estimated regional VMT would be reduced by 350,000 miles per day. (Appendix F)

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

Implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan and related projects will increase air emissions in the South Coast Air Basin. New development will result in pollutant emissions which could add to poor air quality in the region. While new technology and improvements to products and equipment will represent offsets to the net increase in pollution, air quality is expected to deteriorate with new development and new vehicle trips in the area. The proposed project has the potential to decrease the amount of VMT, through the establishment of an employment area within the housing rich area of the Inland Empire Region. Air quality programs will reduce pollutant emissions in the area, but with existing violations of air quality standards, Cumulative impacts to air quality remain significant.

## 3.6 TRANSPORTATION AND

### A. Environmental Setting

The Profile Reports, pages 2-7 to 2-18 of Section II - Transportation Profile Report discusses the roadway system in and around the March JPA Planning Area. Additional discussion on the roadway system is contained within the March JPA Transportation Study Technical Report. Discussion on the aviation Transportation setting is found in the Transportation Profile Report pages 2-19 to 2-26. Other Transportation components of railway, bike lanes and transit services are discussed in pages 2-17 to 2-19 of the Transportation Profile Report.

#### *Threshold of Significance*

The following significant thresholds have been established by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) as a general guideline for transportation and circulation impacts:

- X The addition of project traffic to a signalized intersection increases the volume to capacity (V/C) ratio by the value provided below or the addition of any trips where the existing level of service is E or worse, i.e., above level of service equals .90 or greater.
  
- X Project traffic would utilize a substantial portion of an intersection(s) capacity where the intersection is currently operating at acceptable levels of service (A-C) but with cumulative traffic would degrade to or approach Level of Service (LOS) D (V/C 0.81) or lower. Substantial is defined as a minimum change of .015 for intersections which would operate from 0.08 to 0.09; any additional trips where the existing level of service exceeds 0.90.
  
- X Project access to a major road or arterial road would require a driveway that would create an unsafe situation, or a new traffic signal, or major revisions to an existing traffic signal.

- X Project has traffic infrastructure that has non-standard design features (e.g., narrow width, roadside ditches, sharp curves, poor sight distance, inadequate pavement structure), or receives use which may be incompatible with substantial increases in traffic (e.g., rural roads with use by farm equipment, livestock, horseback riding, or roads with heavy pedestrian or recreational use) that will become potential safety problems with the addition of cumulative traffic.

## **B. Environmental Impacts**

The environmental impacts of future development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan include increases in the number of vehicle trips to and from the planning area and added congestion along planning area streets, and roadways within the vicinity of the planning area.

### **Future Traffic Volumes**

Traffic forecasts were developed to estimate future background traffic conditions (assuming no further development of the March JPA Planning Area) and future conditions with full build out of the March JPA Land Use Plan. The traffic forecasts were based on the RIVSAN CTP subregional travel demand forecasting model developed and maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The CTP model is consistent with the SCAG regional model, with greater detail focused in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.

For the March JPA General Plan forecasts, the CTP model network and trip tables were obtained from SCAG. The model was refined for the March JPA to provide additional local details for the purpose of analyzing intersection volumes and capacity in the March JPA Planning Area.

Existing and Future Trip Generation: The projected volume of traffic which will be generated in the March JPA Planning Area was estimated based on expected land uses, intensities, and employment levels. Buildout of the proposed plan is estimated to generate a total of approximately 220,000 daily vehicle trips, compared with 37,000 daily trips generated by the former active duty March AFB. For further detailed information, please refer to pages 14 to 29 of Appendix F, Transportation Study, Technical Report.

The traffic forecasting model was first used to identify roadway improvements needed to serve future traffic without development of planned uses in the

March JPA Planning Area. The analysis determined that the following improvements will be needed even if no additional development occurs in the March JPA Planning Area:

- < widening Alessandro Boulevard to six lanes west of I-215.
- < widening Van Buren Boulevard to six lanes from Barton Street westerly.
- < § reconstructing the Van Buren Boulevard interchange with I-215.
- < § widening Barton Street south of Van Buren Boulevard.
- < § widening the intersection of Barton Street with Van Buren Boulevard.
- < § widening Nandina Avenue and extending it easterly to connect with the Oleander interchange of I-215.
- < § widening Oleander Avenue to four lanes east of I-215 and extending it easterly.
- < § constructing Indian Street north of Oleander Avenue.
- < § widening existing ramps in the I-215 interchanges with Alessandro Boulevard and Cactus Avenue.

In addition to these needed improvements in the vicinity of the March JPA Planning area, I-215/SR-60 is projected to be significantly over capacity between Riverside and Moreno Valley, even with the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) and truck climbing lane improvements being implemented as part of Measure A.

The traffic forecasting model was subsequently used to identify additional roadway improvements needed to accommodate the planned development of the March JPA Planning Area. The analysis determined that the following improvements would be needed in addition to those identified above:

- < – widening of Alessandro between Plummer and I-215;
- < – widening the bridge of Cactus Avenue across I-215 and widening of the off-ramps;
- < – widening Cactus Avenue to six lanes from I-215 to Graham Street (consistent with the Moreno Valley General Plan);
- < – widening Van Buren to six lanes from I-215 to Barton Street;
- < – additional widening of the Van Buren bridge over I-215;
- < – construction or widening of internal March JPA Planning Area

**Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis (continued)**

- roads;
- <     \_         widening of several key intersections to provide additional turn lanes;
- <     \_         developing the roadway connection from the air cargo terminal to Indian Street.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-7 FUTURE LEVEL OF SERVICE PM PEAK HOUR</b>						
ROADWAY/INTERSECTION	FUTURE BACKGROUND			FUTURE W/PROJECT & IMPROVEMENT		
	V/C	DELAY	LOS	V/C	DELAY	LOS
Heacock @ SR-60 EB Ramps	0.788	13.6	B	0.788	13.6	B
Heacock @ SR-60 WB Ramps	0.582	13.5	B	0.582	13.5	B
Alessandro @ Trautwein	1.362	235.9	F	1.036	32.4	D
Alessandro @ I-215 SB Ramps	1.502	168.1	F	1.227	52.5	E
Alessandro @ I-215 NB Ramps	0.864	16.8	C	0.864	16.8	C
Cactus @ I-215 SB Ramps	0.612	17.9	C	0.612	17.9	C
Cactus @ I-215 NB Ramps	1.278	139.9	F	0.995	25.7	D
Cactus @ Frederick	0.981	23.7	C	0.981	23.7	C
Cactus @ Heacock	0.942	30.4	D	0.942	30.5	D
Van Buren @ Washington	1.481	356	F	0.978	39.6	D
Van Buren @ Trautwein	1.116	133.2	F	0.819	39	D
Van Buren @ Barton	1.329	245.2	F	0.843	12	B
Van Buren @ Orange Terrace	0.799	10.4	B	0.799	10.4	B
Van Buren @ Village West (Clark)	0.698	3.3	A	0.698	3.3	A
Van Buren @ Harmon	0.716	4.3	A	0.716	4.3	A
Van Buren @ I-215 SB Ramps	1.651	736.8	F	0.762	14.2	B
Van Buren @ I-215 NB Ramps	0.729	15.3	C	0.729	15.3	C
Nandina @ Barton	0.441	19	C	0.441	11.8	B

MEIR 3-60

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-7 FUTURE LEVEL OF SERVICE PM PEAK HOUR</b>						
Oleander @ I-215 SB Ramps	0.667	11.5	B	0.667	11.5	B
Oleander @ I-215 NB Ramps	0.444	3.4	A	0.444	3.4	A
Source: March JPA Transportation Study, 1998 (Appendix F)						

With these improvements, roadways and intersections in the March JPA Planning Area are projected to operate at Level of Service AD@ or better with planned development. Table 3-7 shows the projected future peak hour levels of service, including buildout of the March JPA General Plan Land Use Plan, growth in regional traffic, and improvement of the transportation system as outlined in the Transportation Element. Full detailed analysis is found within the March JPA Transportation Study Technical Report, Appendix F of this MEIR.

Transportation Plan: The roadway functional classifications identified within the proposed March JPA General Plan Transportation Plan provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the future circulation needs. Development and improvement of roadways to meet the needs of future development will ensure that roadway service levels remain acceptable.

**Public Transportation**

The demand for public transportation is expected to increase as growth and development occurs in the planning area. The development and expansion of a transit system in the planning area and regions may be warranted when a substantial demand for the service occurs. This increase in demand would be commensurate with the creation of jobs within the planning area and the need to link these job sites with the residential areas of the region.

**Railway**

Development within the planning area, through the proposed General Plan, will take advantage of the location of the San Jacinto Branch Railine that bisect the planning area.

The proposed Land Use Plan provides for development along the branchline to be primarily industrial. Additionally the proposed Transportation Plan provides for the location of Metrolink passenger rail service and station locations, as well as a multi-modal goods movement center for rail freight service. The branchline currently is owned by Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC), with freight operation rights held by Burlington Northern-Santa Fe (BNSF). The proposed March JPA General Plan does not pose any negative impacts to the branchline. No at-grade crossing is anticipated to be necessary.

### **Bikeways**

Bikeways in the planning area will be maintained and developed consistent with the Transportation Plan and the need for these facilities. The proposed bikeway plan will accommodate future increases in development and demand for bikeways. Most bikeways, as delineated within the proposed March JPA General Plan, are Class II facilities, which are located next to curb, on the Aroadway@ section of the transportation route. Implementation of bikeways will be conducted with construction of the roadway system. Streets within the planning area will be posted for ANo Parking,@ to provide a generous eight foot wide bike lane, for a safe and usable method of transportation.

### **Aviation**

Aviation operations and facilities are governed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Department of Defense. March JPA has an approved Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and technical documents for the joint use and operation of civilian aviation at March.

The March Inland Port (MIP) is a joint use aviation facility with the Air Force Reserves (AFRES). The March Inland Port Airport Authority (MIPAA) and AFRES share essential aviation facilities such as the control towers, taxiways, nav aids and runways, as well as maintenance of facilities. At 13,300 feet, Runway 14-32 is one of the longest civilian runways on the west coast, and the longest in Southern California. Given the runway data for this facility, all freighter aircraft (including 747-400 and AN 124) can depart fully loaded under most conditions, which is ideal to serve commercial air cargo freighters that generally operate heavy loads for long stage lengths. The airfield is in compliance with FAA design standards as detailed in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13 (Change 4 Airport Design) and Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace.



Operations With realignment, the AFRES reduced the annual number of military operations at March ARB to 51,426 until the year 2010. Civilian (air cargo) operations, as to capacity under the current State Implementation Plan (SIP), is denoted in the table below. The annual service volume (unconstrained by SIP) is 200,000 annual operations.

<p align="center"><b>TABLE MEIR 3-8</b></p> <p align="center"><b>MARCH INLAND PORT - PROJECTED AVIATION OPERATIONS</b></p> <p align="center"><b>(ANNUALLY)</b></p>							
<b>YEAR</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>OPERATIONS</b>	<b>6788</b>	<b>9053</b>	<b>12774</b>	<b>17156</b>	<b>18581</b>	<b>19808</b>	<b>21001</b>
<p><small>Source: General Conformity Determination for Proposed Multiple Uses of March ARB (the "conformity analysis@)</small></p>							

Airspace at MIP is unconstrained due to location of other airports, and orientation of runway with respect to flight patterns. Furthermore, MIP is in the Hemet Sector of the Southern California TRACON, which can handle 25-30 IFR flights per hour.

Through the establishment and operation of March ARB as a joint use facility thereby creating MIP, several actions have been undertaken. The following represents many actions taken either by the MIPAA or the U.S. Air Force, to gain clearances and meet aviation regulations for the operation of March AFB/MIP as a joint use facility:

- I March AFB Master Reuse Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Base Reuse Plan designates approximately 350 acres of land for civilian aviation facilities at the southern end of the airfield at March. Property on both sides of the main runway is under the control of the March JPA. This acreage is intended to be used for commercial aviation through a military/civilian joint use arrangement. The EIS evaluated the environmental elements of the reuse plan and alternatives in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act

(NEPA).

- I Joint Use Agreement. With the conversion of March AFB to March ARB, a joint use agreement was executed between the U.S. Air Force and March JPA May 7, 1997; thereby creating civilian aviation under MIP.
  
- I Clean Air Act (CAA) Conformity Determination. In order to execute a joint use agreement at March, a CAA conformity analyses was completed. This analysis assessed the number and type of aircraft, both military and civilian that would operate at March.
  
- I Joint Use Feasibility Study. In 1995, the March Air Force Base Joint Use Feasibility Study was prepared to assess the technical feasibility of joint use operations at March AFB. The Study was prepared for the March JPA by SCAG in conjunction with P&D Aviation and Advanced Transportation Systems. Specifically analyzed within the study is the establishment of a joint use aviation facility at March AFB to establish civilian aviation. In short, the study determined that the development of civilian aviation through joint use at March is not only feasible based on the technical capabilities of the facilities, but more importantly there is a market demand. The study analyzed both air cargo and passenger services. The study determined that the highest commercial potential of March in a joint use arrangement is to serve as an all-cargo airport.
  
- I 1998 Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study - March ARB. With March Field being a military owned, and therefore military regulated airfield, the AFRES recently completed a new AICUZ for March. The AICUZ delineates the clear zones and accident potential zones for the joint use airfield, as well as the noise contours based upon the project flight operations and use of the aviation field. The noise contours include both military and civilian use, as projected in the CAA conformity determination.
  
- I Airport Layout Plan. An ALP for MIP was approved by the FAA shortly after the signing of the joint use agreement.
  
- I Airport Development Plan. The March JPA/MIPAA is completed an Airport Development Plan (ADP) for the planned development of the MIP (civilian

aviation) area.

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

Aside from the Transportation Plan, the Transportation Element of the March JPA General Plan contains policies and implementation programs (Truck Routes, Transportation Demand Management, County Congestion Management Plan, Regional Transportation Systems, Public Transportation, Intersection Design Standards, and Aviation Transportation) which outline ways to address the transportation and circulation needs for the March JPA. Transportation Plan serves as the major mechanism for ensuring that future transportation needs in the planning area and vicinity will be handled by an adequate transportation system.

The policies and programs in the Transportation Element and other elements of the proposed General Plan which address transportation concerns are listed below:

1. Land Use Element policies 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 12.2, 12.3, and the following programs:
  - i. Infrastructure Master Plans
  - ii. Capital Improvement Program
  - iii. Service Capacity Monitoring
  - iv. Development Fees
  - v. Airport Layout & Development Plans
  
2. Noise/Air Quality Element, Noise Section policies 2.1, 2.4, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.9; and Air Quality Section policies 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.9 and 6.7, and the following programs from the Noise / Air Quality Element:
  - i. Noise Ordinance
  - ii. Acoustical Analyses
  - iii. Public Transit Program
  - iv. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
  - v. Traffic Safety Programs
  - vi. Traffic Signals
  - vii. Relationship of Jobs to Housing

- viii. Civilian Aviation
- 3. Safety/Risk Management Element policies 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 8.5, and the following programs:
  - i. Evacuation Routes
  - ii. Aviation Use Compatibility

***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The proposed Transportation Plan and implementation programs will reduce the impacts caused by future increases in traffic volumes on March JPA Planning Area streets. As indicated, levels of service will improve to "D" with the proposed mitigation. The adjacent jurisdictions considers LOS AD@ to be an acceptable service level; therefore, the project as mitigated is consistent with acceptable standards. Based upon the project and associated transportation improvements and programs to be implemented as a result of the project, the impact to transportation is considered to be less than significant.

It is important to note that regional and cumulative traffic impacts without the project and its associated transportation improvements would result in significant impacts to the transportation system of the sub-region. Thus, traffic and circulation impacts are expected to be reduced to insignificant levels with the policies and programs listed above.

Again, the establishment of an employment center within the housing rich environment of Western Riverside County will make it possible for more residents of the sub-region to work within the sub-region, as opposed to commuting to Los Angeles and Orange Counties. This would not only reduce peak congestion of these roadways and balancing peak traffic flows to better utilize the roadway system=s capacity, but it would also reduce the number of VMT, by reducing the length of the commute. The transportation study completed for the project demonstrates a reduced daily traffic volume in and out of the County by 32,000 vehicles. The model also forecasted that an estimated regional VMT would be reduced by 350,000 miles per day, based upon

commutes decreasing from 50 miles to 15 miles.

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

The increase in development that will result from new development in the area due to the project and related projects will increase the vehicle trips to, through, and from ROI. The RIVSAN CTP model projects vehicle trips in the area, from buildout of the Planning Area and regional growth in the San Bernardino and Riverside counties. Estimates of traffic volumes from growth in the planning area and surrounding area may be found in the Transportation Element, and Transportation Study (Appendix F).

Proposed roadway improvements are expected to mitigate these impacts and allow planning area and regional roadway systems to operate at acceptable levels of service. Again, the benefit to the ROI in establishing an employment center in the housing rich area of the Inland Empire has benefits to reducing the overall VMT of the region. This is demonstrated through the analysis of the no project alternative with background traffic. The cumulative impact of the proposed project, with the application of the programs and policies noted herein as mitigation measures, is less than significant.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

## **3.7 BIOLOGICAL**

### **A. Environmental Setting**

The approximately 6,500 acre March JPA Planning Area is primarily by the cities of Riverside, Moreno Valley and Perris, with the unincorporated communities of Mead Valley and Woodcrest to the south and southwest respectively. To the north, wildlife habitat exists in Sycamore Canyon and the Box Springs Mountains, via somewhat tenuous connection to the planning area.

The March JPA Planning Area, although largely undeveloped within the West March Planning Subarea, is not pristine unadulterated land. Much of the undeveloped area of the West March Planning Subarea is land that has been disturbed by either prior development that is no longer present, or by other past activities. Prior development, such as the former Camp Haan, utilized a large portion of the area which is considered to be undeveloped presently, but infrastructure and foundations still remain. Past activities also disturbed the undeveloped areas of West March, including but not limited to; IRP sites and IRP site restoration activities, former gravel pits, military activity and staging areas, and use of the grounds for the former NCO training academy.

Biological resources inclusive of vegetation, habitat, wetlands and wildlife, are discussed in detail within Section 5, Resource Management of the Profile Report, in pages 5-39 to 5-59. The Stephens= kangaroo rat (SKR) is the most significant biological resource found within the planning area, due to its listing as an endangered species in accordance with the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Habitat for the listed Least Bell's vireo is located within the West March Planning Subarea. The March JPA Planning Area has no designated critical habitat for designated species. The following is a summary overview of the March JPA Planning Area's biological resources.

#### **Vegetation**

The open areas within the March JPA Planning Area consist of grasslands consisting of non-native species, urban landscape and localized riparian communities. The exact species of composition of native grassland is uncertain. A few remnant species of coastal sage scrub occur on a small portion of the non-native grasslands currently dominant throughout the undeveloped portion of the West March Planning Subarea. Non-native grasslands are characterized by exotic annual forbs. Only limited and disjunct stands of brittlebrush, valley cholla, prickly pear, and California buckwheat are representative of a former costal sage scrub community in the West March Planning

Subarea. Planted and naturalized landscape species are common throughout the developed portions of the planning area.

### **Wildlife**

Table MEIR 3-8 identifies species with federal and state status known to be near or within the March JPA Planning Area. Wildlife studies conducted within the March JPA Planning Area demonstrate a diverse composition of wildlife consisting of resident amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and permanent and seasonal birds. This is particularly true within the West March Planning Subarea. The only sensitive amphibian species known to exist in the March JPA Planning Area is the Western spadefoot toad, which is currently a Federal Category 2 candidate species. The most common reptile of the planning area is the side blotched lizard. Federal Category 2 candidate reptile species include; the Orange throated whiptail, costal western whiptail, San Diego horned lizard and northern red-diamond rattlesnake. The coyote is the most common mammalia predator of the area. In addition to the SKR, federal Candidate Category 2 mammals include San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit and Los Angeles pocket mouse.

### **Birds**

Many seasonal granivores (seed eaters) are attracted to the expansive open grasslands in the West March Planning Subarea. Table MEIR 3-8 denotes the species with federal and state status known to be near or within the March JPA Planning Area. Additionally, the grasslands are habitat for federal Candidate Category 2 species including; ferruginous hawk, tricolored blackbird, loggerhead shrike, and California horned lark. The mountain plover, proposed for listing by the USFWS on February 16, 1999, has been observed in the past within the March JPA Planning Area. In 1994, an Air Force biologist noted the presence of the mountain plover. The burrowing owl, a California Special Concern (CSC) species, is known to exist within the March JPA Planning Area. The U.S. Air Force has provided artificial burrows for owls within the Northeast Planning Subarea. Migratory and permanent birds find the riparian areas to be suitable habitat. The federally listed Least Bell's vireo is known to occur within the willow riparian habitat in the West March Planning Subarea.

### **Sensitive, Threatened and Endangered Species**

Sensitive, threatened and endangered species are known to exist or suspected to be



present on or near the March JPA Planning Area. These species are delineated within Table MEIR 3-8. Comprehensive surveys for taxonomic groups have been conducted within the March JPA Planning Area, with the noted occurrence of individual sensitive species or the probability of occurrence noted as such.

### **Sensitive Habitats**

Sensitive habitats include wetlands, plant communities that are unusual or of limited distribution, and important areas for sensitive wildlife. Sensitive habitats consist of jurisdictional wetlands at the northeastern corner of the planning area and in the West March Planning Subarea. The West March Planning Subarea also includes designated management and open space habitat for the SKR, and habitat for Least Bell's vireo (willow riparian) and fairy shrimp (vernal pools) species.

Stephens Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Habitat: Under the U.S. Air Force, March AFB, in consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), established a preserve for management of SKR. The management area contains 1,000 acres of grassland in the northern and central portion of the West March Planning Subarea. Take of individual species and loss of habitat in the preserve are strictly limited by the Biological Opinion (BO) under which the management area was established. The BO also called for the setting aside of an additional 1,200 acres of open space for SKR, where take of individuals and loss of habitat is limited to a lesser degree. The establishment of open space for SKR was in response to proposed construction projects proposed for March AFB, but which never proceeded forward.

**TABLE MEIR 3-8  
LISTED AND CANDIDATE SPECIES OCCURRING  
ON OR NEAR MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA**

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	HABITAT	STATE STATUS	FEDERAL STATUS	PROBABILITY
<b>MAMMALS</b>					
Stephens= kangaroo rat	Dipodomys stephensi	Grassy or rocky slopes with low bushes	T	E	Occurs <sup>(4,6)</sup>
Greater western mastiff bat	Eumops perotis californicus	Roosts in natural crevices, trees and buildings	CSC	2	Low
Spotted bat	Euderma maculatum	Arid areas	CSC	2	Low
San Diego desert woodrat	Neotoma lepida intermedia	Dense scrub	CSC	2	Low
San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit	Lepus californicus bennittii	Scrub and grassland habitats	CSC	2	Occurs <sup>(2)</sup>
Los Angeles little pocket mouse	Perognathus longimembra brevinasus	Costal sage scrub and grassland	CSC	2	Occurs
Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse	Chaetodipus fallax fallax	Scrub areas	ND	2	Low
<b>PLANTS</b>					
San Diego button celery	Eryngium artistulatum var. parishii	Vernal pools	E	E	Low
California orcutt grass	Orcuttia californica californica	Vernal pools	E	E	Low
Munz's onion	Allium munzi	Clay soils	T	1	Low
Thread-leaf brodiaea	Brodiaea filifolia	Heavy clay soils in costal sage scrub	E	1	Low

MEIR 3-72

**TABLE MEIR 3-8  
LISTED AND CANDIDATE SPECIES OCCURRING  
ON OR NEAR MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA**

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	HABITAT	STATE STATUS	FEDERAL STATUS	PROBABILITY
Payson's jewelflower	Caulanthus simulans	Chaparral, granitic soils	ND	2	Moderate
Many-stemmed dudleya	Dudleya multicaulis	Clay soils	ND	2	Low
Little mouse tail	Myosurus minimus spp. apus	Vernal pools and alkaline marshes	ND	2	Low

<b>BIRDS</b>
--------------

Bald eagle	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Seacoast and inland waterways	E	E	Occurs <sup>(1)</sup>
Peregrine falcon	Falco peregrinus	Open foraging areas	E	E	Low
Brown Pelican	Pelecanus occidentalis	Large open bodies of water	E	E	Low
Southwestern willow flycatcher	Empidonax traillii extimus	Oak, riparian	E	PE	
Least Bell's vireo	Vireo bellii pusillus	Riparian habitats with willow stands	E	E	Occurs <sup>(2,8)</sup>
Coastal California gnatcatcher	Polioptila californica	Coastal sage scrub with chamise chaparral	CSC	T	Low
Ferruginous hawk	Buteo regalis	Grassland	CSC	2	Occurs <sup>(1)</sup>
Burrowing owl	Speotyto cunicularia athene	Burrows; open fields and low herbaceous vegetation	CSC	ND	Occurs <sup>(5)</sup>
Mountain plover	Charadrius montanus	Wet areas of grassland	CSC	PL	Occurs <sup>(1)</sup>
California horned lark	Eromophila alpestris actia	Grassland and agricultural fields	CSC	2	Occurs <sup>(1)</sup>

MEIR 3-73

**TABLE MEIR 3-8  
LISTED AND CANDIDATE SPECIES OCCURRING  
ON OR NEAR MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA**

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	HABITAT	STATE STATUS	FEDERAL STATUS	PROBABILITY
Loggerhead shrike	Lanius ludovicianus	Variety of open habitats	CSC	2	Occurs <sup>(3)</sup>
Tricolored blackbird	Agelaius tricolor	Wetlands and grasslands	CSC	2	Occurs <sup>(1)</sup>
Ansy rufous-crowned sparrow	Aimophila ruficeps canescens	Grassy or rocky slopes with low bushes	CSC	2	Low
Bell's sage sparrow	Amphispiza belli belli	Chaparral and deserts	CSC	2	Low

**AMPHIBIANS AND REPTILES**

San Diego horned lizard	Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei	Variety, where harvester ants occur	CSC	2	Occurs <sup>(2)</sup>
San Diego banded gecko	Coleonyx variegatus abbotti	Canyon walls and rocky tracts	ND	2	Low
Orange-throated whiptail	Cnemidophorus hyperythrus	Sandy banks and brushy areas and washes	CSC	2	Occurs <sup>(2)</sup>
Costal western whiptail	Cnemidophorus tigris multiscutatus	Semi-arid habitat, annual grassland	ND	2	Occurs <sup>(2)</sup>
San Bernardino ringneck snake	Diadophis punctatus modestus	Moist areas	ND	2	Low
Coastal rosy boa	Lichanura trivirgata rosafusca	Rocky chaparral covered foothills	CSC	2	Moderate
Two-striped garter snake	Thamnophis hammondi	Near water	ND	2	Low
Coast patch-nosed snake	Salvadora hexalepis virgulata	Dense chaparral and coastal sage scrub	ND	2	Moderate

MEIR 3-74

**TABLE MEIR 3-8  
LISTED AND CANDIDATE SPECIES OCCURRING  
ON OR NEAR MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA**

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	HABITAT	STATE STATUS	FEDERAL STATUS	PROBABILITY
INVERTEBRATES					
Riverside Fairy Shrimp	Streptocephalus woottoni	Vernal Pools and vernal wet areas	ND	E	Low
Quino checkerspot butterfly	Euphydryas editha quino	Rocky outcroppings with coastal sage scrub	ND	E	Low <sup>(7)</sup>
Northern red diamond rattlesnake	Crotalis ruber ruber	Chaparral in rocky areas	CSC	2	Low

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:**

(E) Endangered (T) Threatened (PE) Potentially Endangered (PL) Proposed for Listing

**California Department of Fish and Game:** (CSC) Species of Special Concern (ND) Not Designated

1 Category 1- Taxa for which the Service has on file enough substantial information on biological vulnerability and threat(s) to support proposals to list them as endangered or threatened species.

2 Category 2- Taxa for which existing information indicates that listing may be warranted, but for which substantial biological information to support a proposed rule is lacking.

(1) James and Hanlon, 1994a

(2) Tetra Tech, 1993

(3) James and Vizgirdas, 1993; The Earth Technology Corporation 1994a; Tetra Tech, 1993

(4) Montgomery, 1992

(5) Zembal, 1992; James and Hanlon, 1994

Source: March AFB FEIS, February 1996 and the following surveys

(6) SJM Biological Consultants, 1997; Earth Tech, 1998

(7) Earth Tech, 1997

(8) Earth Tech, 1997; Tierra Madre Consultants, 1997

**Exhibit 3-5**  
**SKR & Least Bell=s Vireo Areas**

Since preparation of the BO for March AFB, Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency (RCHCA) prepared a Long-Term Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the SKR in Western Riverside County. A Section 10 incidental take permit was issued by the USFWS in 1996. The SKR HCP specifies the Sycamore Canyon-March AFB SKR habitat as a "core reserve" area for long-term SKR management purposes. The Core Reserve includes the 1,000 acres of SKR Management Area within the West March Planning Subarea. Subsequent to the decision to realign March AFB, a strategy to trade SKR habitat on the former March AFB properties in exchange for purchasing SKR habitat elsewhere in Western Riverside County is being pursued.

The Section 7 consultation process has commenced between the Air Force Base Conversion Agency (AFBCA) and USFWS to establish and set forth criteria for trading lands within the March JPA Planning Area in order to support implementation of the March AFB Master Reuse Plan and the proposed March JPA General Plan. The AFBCA and USFWS entered into formal Section 7 Consultation January 1999, after more than a year of informal Section 7 Consultation. The Section 7 consultation process is being undertaken by these parties to determine the biological value of the habitat lands for SKR and other species in the March JPA Planning Area through a new BO; and establishing an agreement and/or criteria for mitigation, upon which land within the March JPA Planning Area can be traded, mitigated or otherwise released as SKR habitat in order to take full advantage of the economic redevelopment potential afforded by surplus lands at March AFB.

Habitat for SKR within the March JPA Planning Area is surrounded by urban uses and urbanizing areas, which diminishes the biological value of those lands as viable SKR habitat over the long term. Under these conditions, and the need to replace jobs lost by the realignment of March AFB, it has been resolved that more and better quality SKR habitat could be provided elsewhere within western Riverside County. The Section 7 consultation will result in the issuance of a new BO for the planning area. A draft BO was issued by the USFWS April 1999, through the Section 7 consultation process.

Wetlands: The planning area consists of approximately 86 acres of localized jurisdictional wetlands/riparian habitat that occur along draws and drainage depressions. Wetlands are those areas defined as 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 within saturated soil conditions. These wetlands are dominated by willow riparian woodland vegetation and are considered a "sensitive" habitat type.

Potential wetlands occur mostly in the West March Planning Subarea, but are also located along portions of the Cactus storm drain and Heacock ditch channel, located at the boundary of the northeast corner of the planning area. Both channels are considered to be "Waters of the United States" along their entire lengths of the planning area. A small area south of Cactus Avenue and west of the Weapons Storage Area (WSA) supports four ephemeral (temporary) pools of water totaling less than 0.1 acre. Unique plant species and pool morphology suggests that these areas are vernal pools.

The area of jurisdictional wetlands is confined to the unimproved channels along Heacock and Cactus Avenues. Restrictions of jurisdictional wetlands require a Section 404 permit from the Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for any modification and/or alteration to the wetlands. In the case of the Heacock and Cactus Channels, crossing over the channel from the public road right-of-ways to land adjacent to the channel, may require a Section 404 permit or be permitted under a Nationwide Permit. Careful consideration of localized drainage and runoff must be made with adjacent development, as maintenance of the channels is restricted to limited activities.

***Vernal Pools:*** Vernal pools are protected by federal regulations, as they are considered jurisdictional wetlands. These pools are potential habitat for the endangered Riverside fairy shrimp and the proposed endangered conservancy fairy shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp. However, a report issued August 1995, determined that no special-status fairy or tadpole shrimp were observed within the planning area. The common, wide spread Lindahl's fairy shrimp were found at 10 of the 18 locations sampled. Additionally, no suitable habitat for the Conservancy fairy shrimp was observed (Earth Tech/Arnold, Richard 1995).

***Willow Riparian:*** The riparian communities are often considered wetlands under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, as denoted above. The willow riparian communities support several sensitive species, offering breeding habitat for Least Bell's vireo and southwestern willow fly catcher in the West March Planning Subarea. Based upon the draft BO, approximately 13 acres is



delineated as protected willow riparian as habitat for the Least Bell=s vireo.

***Threshold of Significance***

The following significance thresholds have been established by the AEP as a general guideline for biological impacts. A project=s impacts may be deemed to significantly impact biological impacts if:

- X The Project substantially affects a rare, endangered, or threatened species of plant or animal or the habitat of species.
- X The Project interferes substantially with the movement of any wildlife species.
- X The Project will disturb an important local biological resource.
- X Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use or impair the agricultural productivity of prime agricultural land.

## **B. Environmental Impacts**

Development allowed under the proposed March JPA General Plan and associated Land Use Plan could adversely affect biological resources primarily through a potential loss of vegetation and wildlife habitat. Direct losses to some species may occur from construction and other activities in newly developed areas. Urban development could increase runoff of storm water from developed areas to non-developed areas. Development of the West March Planning Subarea could affect grasslands and wetlands that support animal species. A draft BO issued by the USFWS for the disposal of portions of March AFB (the planning area) April 1999, addresses biological resources through a formal Section 7 consultation between the USFWS and the U.S. Air Force. The draft BO issued by the USFWS in April 1999 is incorporated herein by reference.

### **Vegetation**

The proposed March JPA General Plan could result in loss of grassland vegetation. Impacts to grasslands could include direct conversion to developed and/or landscaped vegetation by industrial, commercial, business park, and mixed uses within the West March Planning Subarea. Activities in the West March Planning Subarea could directly impact grasslands. These areas reflect the currently vacant, undeveloped grassland areas that could be developed upon implementation of the proposed General Plan. Although, to reiterate, undeveloped property within the West March Planning Subarea is not pristine, and has been disturbed by past activities, use and former development by the DOD and U.S. Air Force. Other areas within the March JPA Planning Area will be less impacted, if at all, since very little vacant land and native vegetation is located elsewhere.

The vegetation in surrounding and adjoining areas is similar to that on the West March Planning Subarea. Approximately 43 percent of the grassland plants are non-native species, and there are no known sensitive species. Remnant coastal sage scrub within the planning area is currently fragmented and of low diversity and, therefore, of little floristic or wildlife value. With the exception of wetlands (discussed under Sensitive Habitats), the proposed March JPA General Plan is not expected to cause adverse impacts to vegetation.

### **Wildlife**

Direct impacts from implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan could occur through individual mortality as a result of construction or operational activities. Species directly impacted may include protected species (discussed in Threatened and Endangered Species) and less mobile wildlife species (small mammals, reptiles, amphibians, and invertebrates). The increased presence of equipment, aircraft, or vehicles could also lead to accidental mortality of more mobile birds and mammals. Additional effects on wildlife could occur through habitat degradation and loss.

Development and implementation of the proposed General Plan would displace mobile species (birds, large mammals) to currently undisturbed sites. Species displaced could include the less-mobile birds, such as burrowing owl (a CSC species), as well as mammals and reptiles. Wider-ranging species, including red-tailed hawk, northern harrier (CSC), coyote, and bobcat could be impacted to a lesser degree through the loss and fragmentation of foraging habitat in the region. Development under the proposed Land Use Plan would result in a minor overall decrease in population of regionally common wildlife species.

### **Sensitive and Endangered Species**

Potential habitat for two federally listed endangered and 11 candidate for federal listing (Category 2) species may be present within the March JPA Planning Area. Direct impacts to sensitive species could result from operational or construction activities, resulting in direct mortality and habitat loss. Development in undisturbed areas can result in indirect impacts, including fragmentation or isolation of sensitive species habitat.

The U.S. Air Force and USFWS have, after more than a year of informal consultation, opened the formal Section 7 consultation for the disposal of portions of March AFB (the planning area). The Section 7 consultation process addresses all federally listed or potentially listed species and their habitat, presence or lack of presence within the March JPA Planning Area. The area potentially affected by the proposed General Plan includes all areas of the March JPA Planning Area, excluding the 2200 acres retained by the U.S. Air Force as March ARB. The March JPA General Plan accounts for the AFRES by recognizing March ARB and its continued use and operation. As a federal agency, should AFRES propose to take actions that affect endangered species within the ARB, a Section 7 between the AFRES and USFWS would need to be completed, as the ARB

will remain federal property.

Based upon the draft BO issued April 1999, SKR and Least Bell=s vireo are the only two federally listed species identified that may be impacted by the proposed project. The mountain plover, determined in February 1999 as a proposed for listing species by USFWS, in the past has been sited within the planning area.

Stephens= kangaroo rat: Discussions with the USFWS to reach agreement for the mitigation and/or trading of SKR habitat have been documented through a compact between the U.S. Air Force and the USFWS. Formal Section 7 Consultation has been initiated, with an understanding that the mitigation measures and Atake@ authority in the new BO resulting from said consultation process will be implemented for the development of these lands. The draft BO issued April 1999, sets forth the criteria for appropriate and acceptable mitigation in full compliance with the ESA. Therefore, mitigation of SKR habitat located within the planning area could be mitigated or exchanged for suitable habitat elsewhere, if approved by the USFWS. An exchange of habitat lands would mitigate impacts to SKR as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan. Consequently, a Section 10(a) take permit would be the result of said actions.

In the 1991 BO issued by the USFWS and U.S. Air Force, procedures were established to manage and protect the endangered SKR on March AFB. The managed habitat area includes 1,000 acres within the West March Planning Subarea designated as Management Area, in which disturbance is strictly limited, and an additional 1,200 acres of Open Space within the West March Planning Subarea and near the airfield where disturbance is less restricted. In surveys of the Open Space areas of March AFB disposal property, an estimated 163 acres were identified as occupied by SKR. (U.S. Air Force, 1998). No occupied habitat was found east of I-215.

Future development of the March JPA Planning Area to buildout will result in the loss of habitat for SKR. Buildout of the March JPA Planning Area will result in increased human activity and ground-disturbing activities on property that is currently vacant or under utilized. Based upon the draft BO issued in April 1999 by the USFWS, the proposed March JPA General Plan will implement the following conservation and minimization measures:

Management Area. The SKR HCP designated Sycamore Canyon and March AFB Management Area as a Core Reserve. The Section 7 consultation and resulting draft BO recognize the preferred action of the March AFB Master Reuse Plan and the Proposed Action of the Final EIS. Both documents support the release of SKR Management Area for development based upon a suitable land (habitat) trade in accordance with the replacement of biological function and value of the area to be traded. Suitable trade criteria will be considered by the USFWS based upon the following criteria:

- (11) Trade criteria for development of the Management Area should be based upon the amount and biological value of SKR-occupied habitat found on the traded area to the SKR HCP Core Reserve system. Biological value will be defined based upon the amount of SKR-occupied habitat on the subject property at the time the trade commences.
  
- (12) Replacement of biological value could be achieved through alternative means in accordance with the SKR HCP by the following:
  - (21) Expanding an existing reserve.
  - (22) Adding to a reserve, including the purchase of in-holdings (parcels remaining within the HCP reserve system, but not included as part of a reserve), thereby enhancing existing reserves within the HCP reserve system.
  - (23) Creating a new viable reserve, to achieve the same biological objectives for SKR.
  - (24) Adding property that is deemed to meet biological objectives for SKR or is deemed to assist with the connectivity of the SKR HCP Core Reserve system.
  - (25) Participating in the establishment of a multi-species HCP approved by the USFWS that achieves the same biological goals for the SKR in the SKR HCP Core Reserve system.
  
- (13) Trade of SKR Management Area that affects the function and value of the Sycamore Canyon Core Reserve should be  
MEIR 3-83

completed in a reasonable number of transactions, and an attempt will be made to limit the transactions to a maximum of three.

- (14) Any trade shall be authorized by the USFWS before releasing land for development, or by an arrangement made through an acceptable agency such as the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for commencing the trade and release of encumbrances on property currently part of the Management Area.
- (15) Trade of habitat will be consistent with the section 10a permit between RCHCA and USFWS for the HCP; or any other appropriate incidental take permit that may be forthcoming under a multi-species habitat plan for western Riverside County.

Open Space Area. Of the 178 acres of the area known as the Weapons Storage Area (WSA); approximately 58 are occupied by SKR. In the draft BO, the 178 acre WSA will be included in the SKR Management Area. Therefore, approximately 105 acres of occupied SKR Open Space will be affected by future development of the March JPA Planning Area. All occupied acreage of SKR Open Space is west of I-215. It is this 105 acres that will be mitigated, pursuant to the draft BO, at the time the property is proposed for development. Mitigation will be required for all occupied habitat on the property owner=s property. If an individual owner=s property is proposed to be developed incrementally, mitigation at each phase for SKR Open Space will be required in the following proportion:

<i>Total Acreage of Occupied SKR Habitat on Property X Acreage to be Developed in Parcel</i>
<i>Total Acreage of Property</i>

Appropriate mitigation measures will be developed by each property owner in cooperation with and approval of the Service, and may include purchase of SKR-occupied habitat elsewhere in Riverside County, purchases of mitigation Acredits,@ deposit of a fee in lieu of purchase of an amount equal to fair market value of SKR occupied habitat, or other

Service-approved measures.

The Management Area, until such time that an approved mitigation or trade is commensurate, will continue to be managed in accordance with the conditions, pursuant to the 1991 Cooperative Agreement among the U.S. Air Force, USFWS, and The Nature Conservancy (amended in 1997, replacing The Nature Conservancy with the Center for Natural Lands Management as signatory). Management of this acreage by the Center for Natural Lands Management uses funds from a non-wasting endowment.

Least Bell's vireo: Least Bell's vireo (a federally listed endangered species) is a small, grayish bird, which is normally found in drainage-associated willow thickets and has been identified in willow riparian habitat. A singing male Least Bell's vireo, and a singing male with a female were found during quantitative bird surveys in May 1993 by Tierra Madre Consultants, under contract to Tetra Tech, Inc. In 1994 the USFWS conducted 16 site visits, and a singing male was observed during two of the site visits.

In 1997, the U.S. Air Force conducted a study to delineate the habitat for the Least Bell's vireo on March AFB property. The survey delineated approximately 13 acres of habitat within the West March Planning Subarea. The draft BO specifies that approximately 12.8 acres of suitable Least Bell's vireo habitat is located within the West March Planning Subarea, with 7.1 acres south of Van Buren Boulevard.

Least Bell's vireo inhabits willow riparian habitat along drainages on West March. The topography of these areas makes them unsuitable for development, and will be preserved to the greatest extent possible. Additionally, these areas would be subject to the protection or mitigation under the Clean Water Act. The draft BO proposes that encumbrances be placed upon the 13 acres of Least Bell's vireo habitat. The March JPA through the proposed March JPA General Plan, Land Use Plan and policies incorporates the wetland/riparian drainages as open space with limited development to support recreational uses such as picnicking, hiking, and green spaces around development. Indirect impacts to Least Bell's vireo could potentially occur from increased sedimentary runoff into the streams containing vireo habitat, resulting in decreased habitat quality. As discussed in the SKR section, the Least Bell's vireo is also included within the Section 7 consultation under the ESA. The draft BO from the Section 7

consultation directly addresses the responsibilities concerning the Least Bell's vireo within the March JPA Planning Area.

Quino Checkerspot Butterfly: In 1994 the USFWS listed the Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*) as a federally endangered species under the ESA. In 1997 a comprehensive survey of March AFB (the March JPA Planning Area) was performed for the butterfly. The survey was conducted to determine locations of host plant populations and presence of the butterfly. The survey conducted by Earth Tech noted that populations of host plants for the butterfly, including dwarf plantain (*Plantago erecta*) and purple owl's clover (*Castilleja exserta*) existed, and their sites were mapped. The host plants were almost exclusively found within the West March Planning Subarea. Secondly, the survey was conducted to determine the presence of the butterfly itself. Throughout the survey period conducted in March to May 1997, during the flight season, butterflies were not found. During this same time, populations of the species at locations outside of the planning area were plentiful, and 1997 was a good survey season for the species.

Although host plants within the planning area were in the late stages of plant development, no Quino checkerspot butterflies were observed within the planning area. In fact, the Quino checkerspot butterfly has never been known to be collected within the Riverside area by University of California, Riverside, entomologist (survey text, Gordan Pratt. 1997). While an intense survey of the planning area was conducted, no adult butterflies or larvae were observed; thereby, it is considered highly unlikely that the butterfly is present within the planning area. The reasons for absence of the Quino checkerspot butterfly within the planning area may suggest possible absence or extirpation of butterflies through historic modification of their habitat. The draft BO indicates that the USFWS agrees that the project area does not contain the butterfly, therefore, development of the planning area will not impact the Quino checkerspot butterfly.

Coastal California gnatcatcher: The gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila californica californica*) typically occurs in or near sage scrub habitat, although it also uses chaparral, grassland, and riparian habitats where they occur adjacent to sage scrub habitat. Typical inland sage scrub or Riversidian sage scrub (RSS) habitat constituent are relatively low-growing, drought-deciduous, and succulent plant species. The breeding season of the gnatcatcher extends from mid-February through mid-



August, with the peak of nesting activity occurring from mid-March through mid-May.

The gnatcatcher nest is a small, cup-shaped basket usually found one to three feet above the ground in a small shrub or cactus. Clutch sizes range from three to five eggs, with the average being four. Juvenile birds associate with their parent for several weeks after fledging. Gnatcatchers are persistent nest builders and often attempt multiple broods, which is suggestive of a high reproductive potential. Home range/territory sizes of gnatcatcher pairs vary depending upon the quality of the habitat available and, likely, the time of year. Home range/breeding territory sizes for gnatcatcher pairs have been found to vary from 2 acres to greater than 40 acres.

Remnant stands of RSS sage scrub can be found interspersed among non-native grasslands on West March and are limited to sparse, mostly monotypic stands of California buckwheat, with some brittlebrush, valley cholla, and California sage scrub. As noted in the draft BO, due to the limited appropriate habitat, no gnatcatchers have been determined to be present within the planning area. Therefore, development of the planning area will not impact the gnatcatcher.

Riverside Fairy Shrimp: West March Planning Subarea contains wetlands that resemble vernal pools. Vernal pools are potential habitat for the endangered Riverside fairy shrimp and the proposed endangered conservancy fairy shrimp and vernal pool fairy shrimp. However, a report issued by the U.S. Air Force, determined that no special-status fairy or tadpole shrimp were observed within the planning area. Additionally, no suitable habitat for the Conservancy fairy shrimp was observed (Earth Tech/Arnold, Richard 1995). Therefore, development of the planning area will not impact the fairy shrimp.

Mountain Plover: The mountain plover, which the USFWS proposed for listing under the Act on February 16, 1999, occupied areas throughout the western United States during migration periods and in the winter months. This species forages in grassland areas. The breeding season for this species occurs in May, when approximately three eggs are laid in bare ground depression nest with little or no lining.

Mountain plovers have been observed twice within the planning area in 1994. The closest location where the mountain plover has been documented is at the

San Jacinto Lake Wildlife Area, approximately 8 miles east of the planning area.

The two observations of the species were in areas that will be within ARB purview or within the Management Area for the SKR conservation. If and when the Mountain Plover is listed as threatened or endangered under the Federal ESA, any future actions within the Core Reserve area that could lead to take of the species pursuant to Section 9 of the Federal ESA will be addressed either through the Section 7 or Section 10 (a) permit processes prior to development occurring. Based upon the above discussion, no impact to the mountain plover is associated with the development of the planning area.

### **Sensitive Habitats**

Impacts to sensitive habitats could include disturbance to wetlands (vernal pools, freshwater marsh, and willow riparian), which are federally regulated under the Clean Water Act (CWA), and state regulated under the California Fish and Game Code Sections 1600-1607. Impacts to endangered SKR and Least Bell's vireo habitat (regulated under the ESA) are discussed above under Threatened and Endangered Species.

Wetlands: Wetlands serve important functions that include providing habitat for fish and wildlife, purifying water through sediment and toxicant retention, maintaining groundwater supplies, and preventing floods. These functions can be degraded or lost through direct and indirect impacts of development. Direct impacts can result from potential filling, dredging, or flooding associated with initial development. Indirect impacts can occur from disturbance on adjacent lands resulting in increased sedimentary runoff that degrade water quality. Wildlife habitat, a beneficial value of wetlands, can become fragmented by disturbance adjacent to wetland areas. Direct and indirect impacts to wetlands vegetation can decrease their overall value as sediment traps.

Wetlands are defined in Title 33 CFR Section 328.3 as "those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions." The majority of jurisdictional wetlands in the United States meet three wetland delineation criteria (hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology) and are subject to protection under Section 404 of the CWA. Riparian wetlands (those occurring on streams) in the West March Planning Subarea are also

subject to the California Fish and Game (CDFG) Code Sections 1600-1607. Project proponents would have to consult with the USACE and CDFG to develop appropriate mitigation measures for wetlands impacts, on a project-by-project basis.

In accordance with the proposed General Plan, development, including redevelopment or demolition of existing facilities may occur. Consequently, there is a potential that filling, draining, flooding, alteration, or other activities that impact wetlands could occur. A total of 79 acres of wetlands are known to exist within the West March Planning Subarea. If the entire March JPA Planning Area were to be developed without regard to wetland impact avoidance, all 79 acres of wetlands on West March could be affected. However, there is ample upland (non-wetland) acreage available within the planning area to adequately support development. Therefore, given that practicable infrastructure and facility siting alternatives are available, it is anticipated that no wetlands would be directly impacted by implementation of the general plan, to the extent possible. This is further supported by the goals and policies as outlined within the Resource Management Element of the proposed March JPA General Plan.

As previously discussed, indirect impacts to wetlands can occur from disturbance on adjacent lands resulting in increased or changed chemical and sedimentary runoff that degrades water quality. This, in turn, affects the biotic elements and decreases the ability of wetlands to provide beneficial functions, such as wildlife habitat and sediment and toxicant retention. Indirect impacts to wetlands caused by disturbance of adjacent uplands are not expected as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan, because sufficient acreage would be available to create buffers between wetlands and proposed development. Further, all construction activities that may increase runoff to Waters of the United States (including wetlands) would be subject to conditions of the required NPDES permit.

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

The Resource Management Element discusses the biological resources of the March JPA Planning Area. Policies and implementation programs in the proposed General Plan that have been developed to protect biological resources are:

1. Land Use Element policies 8.2, 8.4 and 8.5, and the following implementation program:
  - i. Specific Plans
2. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 9.1, 9.2, 9.4, 9.5, 9.6 and 9.7, and the following programs:
  - i. Preservation and Managed Production of Natural Resources
  - ii. Environmental Review
  - iii. Environmental Regulations
  - iv. Biological Resources Consultation
  - v. Section 7 Consultation - SKR Land Trade
  - vi. Open Space Preservation

Based upon the draft BO issued in April 1999 by the USFWS, the proposed March JPA General Plan will implement the following conservation and minimization measures:

Management Area. The SKR HCP designated Sycamore Canyon and March AFB Management Area as a Core Reserve. The Section 7 consultation and resulting draft BO recognize the preferred action if the March AFB Master Reuse Plan and the Proposed Action of the Final EIS. Both documents support the release of SKR Management Area for development based upon a suitable land (habitat) trade in accordance with the replacement of biological function and value of the area to be traded. Suitable trade criteria will be considered by the USFWS based upon the following criteria:

- (1) Trade criteria for development of the Management Area should be based upon the amount and biological value of SKR-occupied habitat found on the traded area to the SKR HCP Core Reserve system. Biological value will be defined based upon the amount of SKR-occupied habitat on the subject

- property at the time the trade commences.
- (2) Replacement of biological value could be achieved through alternative means in accordance with the SKR HCP by the following:
    - (a) Expanding an existing reserve.
    - (b) Adding to a reserve, including the purchase of in-holdings (parcels remaining within the HCP reserve system, but not included as part of a reserve), thereby enhancing existing reserves within the HCP reserve system.
    - (c) Creating a new viable reserve, to achieve the same biological objectives for SKR.
    - (d) Adding property that is deemed to meet biological objectives for SKR or is deemed to assist with the connectivity of the SKR HCP Core Reserve system.
    - (e) Participating in the establishment of a multi-species HCP approved by the USFWS that achieves the same biological goals for the SKR in the SKR HCP Core Reserve system.
  - (3) Trade of SKR Management Area that affects the function and value of the Sycamore Canyon Core Reserve should be completed in a reasonable number of transactions, and an attempt will be made to limit the transactions to a maximum of 3.
  - (4) Any trade shall be authorized by the USFWS before releasing land for development, or by an arrangement made through an acceptable agency such as the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for commencing the trade and release of encumbrances on property currently part of the Management Area.
  - (5) Trade of habitat to be consistent with the section 10a permit between RCHCA and USFWS for the HCP; or any other appropriate incidental take permit that may be forthcoming under a multi-species habitat plan for western Riverside County.

Open Space Area. Of the 178 acres of the area known as the Weapons Storage Area (WSA); approximately 58 are occupied by SKR. In the draft BO, the 178 acre WSA will be included in the SKR Management Area. Therefore, approximately 105 acres of occupied SKR Open Space will be affected by future development of the March JPA Planning Area. All occupied acreage of SKR Open Space is west of I-215. It is this 105 acres that will be mitigated, pursuant to the draft BO, at the time the property is proposed for development. Mitigation will be required for all occupied habitat on the property owner=s property. If an individual owner=s property is proposed to be developed incrementally, mitigation at each phase for SKR Open Space will be required in the following proportion:

<i>Total Acreage of Occupied SKR Habitat on Property X Acreage to be Developed in Parcel</i>
<i>Total Acreage of Property</i>

Appropriate mitigation measures will be developed by each property owner in cooperation with and approval of the Service, and may include purchase of SKR-occupied habitat elsewhere in Riverside County, purchases of mitigation Acredits,@ deposit of a fee in lieu of purchase of an amount equal to fair market value of SKR occupied habitat, or other Service-approved measures.

The March JPA will work cooperatively with USFWS, County of Riverside, California Department of Fish and Game, and other agencies, and the public, to develop and implement a multi-species habitat plan for western Riverside County.

The following are potential project mitigation measures that shall be applied to projects, on a project-by-project basis, as they may apply:

Burrowing Owl. Thirty days prior to the onset of construction activities, a qualified biologist with appropriate resource agency permits shall survey the construction limits of the project for the presence of burrowing owls and occupied nest burrows. Any occupied burrows found during the survey efforts shall be mapped on the construction plans.

If nesting and/or activity is present at any burrow site, then the active burrow shall be protected until nesting activity has ended to ensure compliance with Section 3503.5 of

the California Fish and Game Code. Nesting activity for burrowing owls in the region of the planning area normally occurs from February 1 to August 31. To protect any burrow site, the following restrictions on construction are required between February 1 to August 31: (1) clearing limits will be established a minimum of 100 feet in any direction from any occupied borrow; and, (2) access and surveying will not be allowed within 50 feet of any occupied burrow. Construction during the non-nesting season can occur only at the sites if a qualified biologist has determined that the burrows are no longer active. If an active burrow is observed during the non-nesting period, the burrow site will be monitored by a qualified biologist, and when the owl is outside the burrow entrance, the biologist will flush any owl to open space areas. The biologist will then excavate the burrow site with tools or fill the burrow with soil so owls cannot return to the burrow site.

Least Bell=s vireo. Any development that could result in future effects to Least Bell=s vireo habitat must obtain a 404 permit, which will also require a Section 7 consultation with USACE and USFWS, prior to grading.

### ***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for CEQA compliance, a project will normally have a significant impact on the environment if it substantially affects a rare or endangered species of animals or plants or the habitat of the species. Development of the March JPA Planning Area's undeveloped areas will lead to the loss of native plant and animal communities. Rare, endangered, and threatened plant and animal species could be destroyed by urban development. The preservation and conservation programs in the Resource Management Element will help protect sensitive species. Significant impacts on sensitive plant or animal species are expected to be mitigated with implementation of the policies and programs listed above. Based upon the draft BO, the proposed General Plan is likely to adversely affect SKR even with the imposition of all feasible mitigation measures. Mitigation measures and encumbrances alleviate adverse impacts to Least Bell=s vireo to less than significant, and no other listed species are likely to be adversely affected.

Based upon the status of the SKR on former March AFB properties, impacts will be significant and unavoidable if complete buildout of the planning area is achieved. Thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, would have to be adopted.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The proposed March JPA General Plan at buildout would involve the trade of portions of the MAFB-Sycamore Canyon Core Reserve, and the mitigation of occupied SKR Open Space. This core reserve is one of seven to serve as habitat for the SKR per RCHCA's HCP. The area covered by the SKR HCP encompasses more than 5313,954 acres in western Riverside County. Within the SKR HCP Plan Area, loss of habitat and individuals has been offset by protecting 15,000 acres of SKR-occupied habitat in a reserve system consisting of seven reserves, all of which are managed to maintain the long-term survival of the species within the plan boundary. It is this area of the ROI that would be affected by cumulative impacts for biological resource by the proposed project.

The SKR Core Reserve system works as a whole to maintain SKR in perpetuity. By adding occupied habitat to the Core Reserve system elsewhere, the loss of the Open Space SKR-occupied acreage is offset at a 1:1 ratio that contributes to the SKR Core Reserve system.

As discussed in the SKR HCP, the SKR Management area could be sold or traded with parties to secure habitat in other locations of the HCP area that support similar biological function and value as the core reserves designed in the SKR HCP. Buildout of the March JPA Planning Area requires an amendment to the SKR HCP to authorize a trade. At such time as a trade is identified, an amendment to the SKR HCP would be initiated and full analysis prepared to assess the cumulative impacts to the SKR HCP. However, a trade of the Management Area affecting the biological function and value of the March AFB-Sycamore Canyon Core Reserve, would need to retain the overall biological function and value of the Core Reserve system. The Gilpin Model or other USFWS approved model will need to demonstrate the maintenance of the Core Reserve system biological function and value for SKR.

As noted in the draft BO, since impacts to SKR associated with buildout of the planning area were addressed in the SKR HCP, cumulative effects are not considered to be significant as long as the Section 10a permit by RCHCA remain in effect. However, a take permit will be required to commensurate a trade within the Core Reserve system. The proposed project together with implementation of the mitigation measures will not jeopardize any listed species determined to be within the planning area, including Least Bell's vireo.



## **3.8 ENERGY AND MINERAL**

### **A. Environmental Setting**

Energy and mineral resources are part of natural resources, and discussed in Section 5, Resource Management of the Profile Report, in pages 5-5 to 5-9. In summary, there are no known mineral resources within the March JPA Planning Area of any significance. Energy consumption and use is discussed in Section 3.12 of this MEIR.

#### *Threshold of Significance*

The following significance threshold has been established as a guideline for power utilities:

- X The proposed Project will have significant impacts if there is a need for new systems, or if there are substantial alterations to the power utilities.

### **B. Environmental Impacts**

Development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan could identify the presence of natural mineral resources, as well as require the commitment of energy resources. Impacts on energy resources are discussed in Section 3.12 of this MEIR. Specific impacts on energy and mineral resources will depend upon individual development projects as they occur under the proposed March JPA General Plan. The impacts of the commitment of aggregate resources for construction will be incremental until buildout of the March JPA Planning Area. This is not expected to be significant.

**C. Mitigation Measures**

The protection and conservation of mineral resources is addressed in the Resource Management Element. The Resource Management Element contains a conservation program for the areas' identified natural resources (water, biological, land, cultural, and energy resources). These issues are analyzed in greater detail in other section 3.12 of this MEIR. Policies and implementation programs that achieve protection and conservation of mineral resources facilities are as follows:

1. Land Use Element policies 3.1 and 8.4.
2. Noise/Air Quality Element polices 6.8, 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3, and the Energy Conservation program.
3. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 3.3, 3.8, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3, and the following programs
  - i. Preservation and Managed Production of Natural Resources
  - ii. Energy Conservation

***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have an adverse impact on mineral resources if it will conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community where it is located. With development occurring individually and over a long period of time and the void of mineral resources within the project area,, the impacts on mineral resources will not be significant or adverse. Where significant adverse impacts are expected, they can be mitigated to levels of insignificance by implementing the policies and programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan.

***Cumulative Impacts***

The above discussion addresses project specific impacts. The proposed March JPA General Plan will not create the potential for significant cumulative effects to energy and mineral resources, because the project area does not contain any known mineral resources. Based upon the mitigation measures and implementing programs for the project, impacts are not cumulatively considerable. Section 3.12 addresses energy consumption cumulative impacts.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

## 3.9 HAZARDS AND RISK OF

### A. Environmental Setting

Hazards and risk of upset concerns in the March JPA Planning Area are primarily associated with fire/explosion hazards, installation restoration sites, aviation activities, and hazardous materials use and disposal. These are discussed on pages 6-7 to 6-21 Section 6, Safety/Risk Management Profile Report.

#### *Threshold of Significance*

The following significance thresholds have been established by the AEP as a general guideline for hazardous waste impacts:

- X Uses that propose the handling, storage and treatment of hazardous materials.
  
- X Sites on or Near Known Contamination Sources:
  - 2. Appears on one or more of the following lists or documents:
    - (21 County Hazardous Materials Management Division (HMMD) - Site Assessment and Mitigation Unauthorized Release Listing (open file);
    - (22 State Office of Planning and Research - Identified Hazardous Waste and Substance Site; and
    - (23 Other possible sources - Sanborn maps, Fire Department records, topographical/existing conditions surveys.
  - 3. Falls Under One of the Following:
    - (31 Located within 1,000 feet of a known contamination site;
    - (32 Located within 2,000 feet of a known "border zone property" (also known as a "Superfund" site); and
    - (33 HMMD - site file closed but still listed.
  
- X All cases of dewatering (the removal of groundwater during excavation), there is

an issue should there be major excavation in an area with high groundwater, historically developed with industrial or commercial uses.

- X Demolition of old commercial, industrial and residential structures - asbestos and other hazardous materials.
- X Removal of underground fuel tanks - associated with service station remodels, old car rental sites and the like.
- X Residential, day care, social agencies and schools in industrial areas. The location of a school within 1,000 feet of known hazardous emissions must satisfy Assembly Bill 3205 requirements. A risk assessment should be done for any day care center, social agency or residential project where there is the potential exposure of people to such hazards.
- X Hazardous materials associated with manufacturing, mining and research/development uses. For example, radioactive materials, flammables, caustics, and biohazards.
- X Location of a project within or adjacent to a high public safety risk situation, for example, an Air Crash Hazard Zone "A"; permanent buildings in a floodway or proximity to a brush filled canyon.

**B. Environmental Impacts**

Implementation and development, as projected under the proposed March JPA General Plan, may have adverse environmental impact on hazards and risk of upset; however, due to the regulatory nature of the general plan elements, any risk will be minimal.

### **Fire/Explosion Hazards**

Future development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan may be exposed to urban fire hazards in the planning area. At the same time, they may also create fire hazards to adjacent developments. Urban fires may result from faulty electrical systems, accidents, hazardous material spills, and other activities which involve open flames and fires. Accidents and carelessness become the primary causes of urban fire in urbanized settings.

The causes of earthquake-related fires include open flames, electrical malfunctions, gas leaks, chemical spills, downed power poles, and open wires. Damages to gas line connections and electrical systems are the most likely causes for fire during earthquakes.

Automatic shut-off valves are provided to isolate gas leaks when damage to supply line occurs. Also, power lines automatically de-energize if there is a break in the system. Fire safety is promoted through building and planning standards. Future development may increase potential fire hazards in the planning area. There are fire safety measures that are incorporated into new structures which prevent the creation of fire hazards and facilitate emergency response in case of a fire.

### **Hazardous Material**

Hazardous materials will continue to pose threats to public safety in the future, and new development will be exposed to these hazards. Also, new development may involve hazardous materials use or generation which could increase safety hazards in the planning area. Because specific developments are not known at this time, it is difficult to identify where hazardous material users may be located in the future.

Table MEIR 3-9 outlines potential hazardous materials that may be associated with the proposed land use designations. These are likely to be in the business park, military operation & aviation, civilian aviation, and industrial areas of the planning area. Riverside County Fire Department, County Department of Health Hazardous Materials Division, and Riverside County Sheriff's Department are responsible for hazardous material response and regulation. Precautions and environmental laws will continue to prevent hazardous material spills and contamination which could lead to fires, explosions, contamination and health hazards.

The potential for contamination and harm in the event of a hazardous materials/waste

spill or explosion and fire incident is a serious threat to public safety. The degree of impact to the local environment will depend on the nature of the materials involved, the type of incident (spill, explosion, fire, etc.), the affected population and the capacity of emergency systems to abate the danger. The human health impacts of new development are dependent on the safety standards that are practiced by individuals. There are regulations at all levels (federal, state, city, special district) which protect public health and prevent threats to the safety of individuals. Also, the proposed General Plan promotes the health and safety of March JPA occupants over any other goal, as denoted in goals four, five and seven of the Safety/Risk Management Element.

Land uses that use or generate hazardous materials may present health risks to employees and adjacent developments. This includes the demolition of structures with hazardous materials or the use of contaminated land before remediation can be made. There are also manufacturing processes which generate toxic emissions. Unless properly regulated, they could reach unsafe levels and jeopardize the community. These risks are subject to various standards and regulations, with more stringent regulations enacted as concern for the environment and public health steps up.

Given the proposed Land Use Plan of the March JPA General Plan, the potential hazardous waste that may be generated within the planning area are; waste fuels, petroleum, oil, lubricants, paints, thinners, solvents, heavy metals and batteries. Businesses and users of hazardous materials would need to comply with local, state and regional guidelines and regulations concerning the storage, use and application, and disposal of any hazardous material. The disposal of hazardous waste will be the responsibility of the operators/businesses, and must be in accordance with applicable regulations. Compliance with all applicable federal, state, and regional regulations would preclude any impacts considered to be significant.



<b>TABLE MEIR 3-9                      POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS MATERIAL USAGE                      WITHIN MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA</b>		
<b>Land Use                      Designation</b>	<b>Operations/Activities</b>	<b>Potential Hazardous                      Materials</b>
Aviation	Operations associated with aircraft maintenance, air transportation-related industry, fueling and warehousing, and administrative offices.	Corrosives, cyanides, degreasers, fuels, glycols, heating oils, heavy metals, hydraulic fluids, ignitibles, paints, pesticides, petroleum, oil, lubricants, reactives, solvents and thinners.
Industrial	Activities associated with light industry and manufacturing, research and development, distribution centers, warehousing and corporate offices.	Aerosols, catalyst, corrosives, fuels, heavy metals, heating oils, ignitibles, pesticides, petroleum, oil, lubricants, reactives, and solvents.
Business Park	Activities associated within administrative, office, limited industrial, and service oriented businesses.	Aerosols, cleaners, corrosives, fuels, heating oils, household chemicals, paints, pesticides, petroleum, oil, lubricants, thinners, and solvents.
Office	Activities associated with office uses, including medical and administrative services.	Heavy metals, household chemicals, pesticides, pharmaceuticals, and radiological sources.
Commercial	Activities associated with retail, services industries, and restaurants.	Aerosols, cleaners, corrosives, fuels, heating oils, household chemicals, ignitibles, paints, pesticides, petroleum, oil, lubricants, thinners, and solvents.
Mixed Use	Activities associated with offices, warehousing, retail, services industries, and restaurants.	Aerosols, cleaners, corrosives, fuels, heating oils, household chemicals, ignitibles, paints, pesticides, petroleum, oil, lubricants, thinners, and solvents.
Historic District	Utilization/maintenance of existing residential units	Fertilizers, fuels, household chemicals, oils, and pesticides.
Public Facilities & Park/Rec/Open Space	Maintenance of exiting recreation facilities, and establishment of facilities that service the general public.	Aerosols, cleaners, fuels, heating oils, household chemicals, paints, pesticides, petroleum, oil, lubricants, thinners, and solvents.
Military Aviation & Operation	Airfield and airfield support, aircraft refueling and maintenance, aircraft parking, munitions storage, light industrial, administrative offices, security, medical/dental clinic.	Aviation fuels, corrosives, degreasers, glycols, heating oils, heavy metals, hydraulic fluid, ignitibles, ordnance, paints, pesticides, petroleum, oil, lubricants, thinners, solvents, pharmaceuticals, radiological sources.

**Exhibit 3-6**

MEIR 3-103

**IRP Sites**

**Contamination Sources**

Existing contamination sources within the March JPA Planning Area are as follows: Installation Restoration Program (IRP) sites including the ground water contamination plume; and hazardous building materials used during the construction of facilities such as lead based paint and asbestos containing material (ACM). The potential impact of each land use category based upon IRP sites at March AFB is discussed herein below.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-10 IRP SITES WITHIN MARCH JPA PLANNING AREA</b>	
<b>Land Use Designation</b>	<b>IRP Sites</b>
Aviation	7, 38 and groundwater contamination plume
Industrial	19, 24, 30 and 43
Business Park	3, 25, 42, a portion of 12, and groundwater contamination plume
Commercial	35 and portions of Sites 4 and 40
Mixed use	17, a portion of 12, and groundwater contamination plume
Park/Rec/Open Space & Public Facilities	26a, portions of Sites 4, 6 and 22, and groundwater contamination plume
Military Aviation & Operation	1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 27, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35c, 36, 37, 39, a portion of Site 22, and ground water contamination plume.

Installation Restoration Sites: The planning area contains 43 IRP sites. These sites and their cleanup are the responsibility of the U.S. Air Force. The Air Force is committed to the remediation of all IRP sites created by the Air Force. The IRP site clean up program includes both a risk assessment and remedial designs determined for contaminated sites. Many of these sites, upon remediation by the Air Force, will carry conditions resulting in land use restrictions. The Land Use Plan of the proposed March JPA General Plan is consistent with the clean up efforts of the Air Force, and the remedial design for

clean up is complementary to the proposed March JPA General Plan land use designations for the planning area.

Buildings & Demolition: Several buildings within the March JPA Planning Area contain hazardous materials in the form of asbestos containing material (ACM) and lead based paint. As these buildings are occupied, modified and/or razed, hazardous materials will be remediated in accordance with regulatory compliance requirements. Addressing this type of hazardous material and source of contamination will be accomplished on a project-by-project basis, in accordance with applicable regulations.

### **Aviation**

The airfield within the planning area is a joint use aviation facility; owned and operated by the Air Force and authorized for utilization by the March Inland Port Airport Authority (MIPAA), through the signing of the Joint Use Agreement May 5, 1997. The operations of the airfield are controlled by the Air Force and the airfield must comply with the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) program of the Air Force. The civilian operations, under the March Inland Port (MIP) are governed by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Therefore, FAA standards apply to the aviation field; particularly Part 77 and Part 139 of the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), in addition to the military standards.

The County of Riverside Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is currently preparing a Compatible Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) for March ARB/MIP. In 1993, the County ALUC had a CLUP for prepared for March AFB, but this document was never adopted. Upon adoption of the CLUP currently being prepared, this will provide an additional tool within the planning area and the neighboring jurisdictions to utilize to assure land use compatibility with the use and operation of the aviation field at March. Additionally, the proposed March JPA General Plan is consistent with the CLUP currently being drafted.

The aforementioned regulations address land use compatibility with respect to aviation facilities. This includes not only land use compatibility for risk and exposure of airfield related activities, but also noise exposure. Adherence to these regulations will alleviate any unreasonable impact or risk of upset.

**C. Mitigation Measures**

The Safety/Risk Management Element directly addresses the issue of risk to exposure and hazards in the March JPA Planning Area. The Safety/Risk Management Element of the proposed March JPA General Plan contains a Disaster Preparedness and Recovery Plan for the March JPA Planning Area. While this will serve as the primary instrument for addressing hazards and minimizing risk of upset within the planning area, there are policies and implementation programs in the Element which promote a safe environment and minimizes exposure, incompatibilities and conflicts with hazards.

The Safety/Risk Management Element is the sixth or last section of the March JPA General Plan. Policies and programs in the other elements of the General Plan which address the minimization of risk of upset and promotes a safe environment are listed below:

1. Land Use Element policies 1.9, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 7.6, 7.7, 8.3, 8.4 and 15.1, and the following programs:
  - i. Service Capacity Monitoring
  - ii. Utility and Service Providers
  - iii. Airport Layout and Development Plans
2. Transportation Element policies 2.5, 2.6, 4.1, 13.5, 13.6 and 13.8, and the Airport Layout Plan and Development Plan program.
3. Resource Management Element policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 6.4 and 9.8, and the following programs:
  - i. Environmental Regulations
  - ii. Open Space through Land Use Restrictions
  - iii. Public Health & Safety Regulations

***Significance Conclusion***

According to the CEQA Law and Guidelines, a project will normally have a significant impact on the environment if it creates a potential health hazard or involves the use, production, or disposal of materials which pose a hazard to people, animals, or plant

populations in the affected area. The potential impacts on human health that may occur with new development will be mitigated by programs in the March JPA General Plan, as well as by State, Federal and regional laws and regulations. Upon mitigation, the impacts associated with the project relative to hazards and risk of upset are considered to be at a level less than significant.

The potential for disaster brought by development under the proposed March JPA General Plan will be mitigated by the programs listed above. Impacts associated with aviation operations are mitigated with adherence to military and FAA aviation standards and regulations. No significant adverse impacts will occur with the project, through implementation of the identified mitigation measures.

### *Cumulative Impacts*

The above discussion addresses project specific impacts. Based upon the mitigation measures and implementing programs of the proposed March JPA General Plan, specifically the Safety/Risk Management Element, for the project, impacts are not cumulatively considerable. The proposed March JPA General Plan will not create the potential for significant cumulative effects to hazards/risk of upset.

## 3.10 NOISE

### A. Environmental Setting

Noise assessment and existing environment is delineated and discussed in Section 3, Noise/Air Quality the Profile Report, in pages 3-17 to 3-27, and in pages 6-19 to 6-22 of the Safety / Risk Management Profile Report. In accordance with California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1, the existing aviation related noise environment as delineated within the 1992 Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) Study is the baseline. A revised AICUZ was completed in 1998 by the AFRES, and reflect the permitted aviation use of March Field (both civilian and military use) forecasted for the Year 2010. The other primary noise source within the planning area is noise associated with roadway usage. The assessment of the baseline roadway noise environment is also included within the profile report.

#### *Threshold of Significance*

As previously stated in Section 3.1 of this MEIR, the following thresholds of significance have been established as a general guideline for noise impacts:

- X The proposed Project must generate a significant increase in traffic related noise within the boundaries of the sensitive land use. Specifically, Project generated noise would have to increase overall noise levels by at least 5 dBA within a private living area<sup>4</sup>; and

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that there is no scientific evidence available to support the use of 3 dBA as the significance threshold. In laboratory testing situations, humans are able to detect noise level changes of slightly less than 1 dBA. In a community noise situation, however, noise exposures are over a long time period, and changes in noise levels occur over years, rather than the immediate comparison made in a laboratory situation. Therefore, the level at which changes in community noise levels become discernible is likely to be some value greater than 1 dBA and 5 dBA appears to be appropriate for most people

- X The proposed Project must generate noise that would exceed common accepted standards or guidelines within the sensitive land use. The State of California exterior noise guideline is 65 CNEL for new residential projects.
  
- X Additional thresholds of significance are contained within Volume II, Appendices, Appendix G of the Final Environmental Impact Statement Proposed for the Disposal of Portions of March AFB, California.

**B. Environmental Impacts**

Environmental impact analysis related to noise includes the potential effects on the local population. This analysis estimates the extent and magnitude of noise levels generated upon buildout of the proposed General Plan. The change from the baseline noise conditions with respect to predicted noise levels are used as an indicator of land use impacts. Future development in March JPA Planning Area will lead to short-term noise impacts associated with demolition, excavation, earth-moving, and construction activities. These impacts will include noise from construction crews and equipment. Typical noise from construction equipment is shown in Table MEIR 3-11. Long term noise impacts will come from aviation uses, vehicles, train activity, industrial processes and equipment, large group events, and concentrated business activities. These would be found along major roadways, the railroad tracks, industrial areas, commercial areas and places which can accommodate large groups of people.

There are two primary sources of noise in the March JPA Planning Area: 1) aircraft noise and aviation operations associated with use of the airfield; and 2) traffic on Interstate 215 and major roadways. These noise sources impact development along major transportation routes and in and around the aviation field. Increased traffic on major roadways will result in increased noise levels in the planning area. However, noise generated by use and operation of the aviation field is reduced, when compared to the baseline of March AFB as an activity base prior to base realignment in April 1996, as authorized in California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1. The noise levels from roadway use at buildout of the proposed Land Use Plan is discussed on pages 3-23 to 3-24 of the Noise/Air Quality Element. Areas within the 65 CNEL noise contour will be subject to high noise levels. Noise impacts are further discussed below.



<b>TABLE MEIR 3-11 CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT NOISE GENERATION</b>	
<b>CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT</b>	<b>TYPICAL SOUND LEVELS AT 50 FEET</b>
Generator	76 dBA
Pump	76 dBA
Portable Air Compressor	81 dBA
Cement Mixer (truck)	85 dBA
Pneumatic Tools	85 dBA
Backhoe	85 dBA
Bulldozer	87 dBA

Source: Environmental Protection Agency

**Short-Term**

Short-term noise impacts will occur over the buildout of the March JPA Planning Area; time, location and duration of these impacts cannot be determined at this time. This type of noise is generally caused by short-term construction activities and is associated with public improvement projects undertaken by the JPA, or construction and/or rehabilitation of buildings by private developers. Construction noise typically represents a short-term impact on ambient noise levels. Noise generated by construction equipment can often reach high, episodic levels. Bulldozers, concrete mixers, portable generators, backhoes, air guns and a variety of other equipment can create extremely high noise levels, but usually for short periods of time.

Short-term noise impacts are generally accepted as unavoidable "side effects" of development and increased urbanization, and generally do not represent significant negative environmental impacts if: 1) construction activities are limited to daytime hours; 2) construction equipment is equipped with noise control filters, as appropriate; and 3) construction activity is monitored to ensure that noise reduction specifications

and guidelines are met.

Short-term impacts to sensitive noise receptors such as housing, schools, and churches should be evaluated on a project-by-project basis at the time of a specific project's permit processing because the significance of an individual project's effect on an individual sensitive noise receptor cannot be determined without knowing the extent and kind of project construction activities or the type of sensitive receptor possibly being impacted.

### **Long-term**

An increase in ambient noise levels within the March JPA Planning Area will occur over the long-term as a result of increased growth and development activity with buildout of the planning area. The main source of noise generation within the March JPA Planning Area at buildout will be from aircraft noise from the joint use aviation facility at March ARB and MIP and motor vehicles as a result of implementation of the Land Use Plan and Transportation Plan.

The General Plan build-out scenario could generate an increase of the average daily trips to approximately 220,000 trips, compared to the baseline of 37,000 trips when the planning area was utilized as an activity duty Air Force Base, as permissible under California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1. This represents an increase over baseline of approximately 183,000 average daily trips upon buildout of the proposed March JPA General Plan. These additional trips could potentially impact sensitive receptor areas adjacent to the March JPA Planning Area, as well as the March JPA Planning Area as a whole due to the amount of increase in vehicle trips over the existing conditions. Sensitive receptors are defined as housing, day care centers, school (K-12), and certain public use facilities. Presently, the planning area contains Green Acres Estates housing area, and Chapel #2. However, long-term impacts to sensitive noise receptors located outside the March JPA Planning Area, will have to be evaluated on a project-by project basis at the time of a specific project's permit processing. The potential significance of an individual project's long-term effect upon an individual noise receptor cannot be adequately determined without knowing long-term site specific land use activities or the type of affected sensitive receptors.

Furthermore, any long-term increase in noise levels caused through the implementation of the general plan will only occur at levels permitted within the March JPA Development Code. These noise levels are generally seen as acceptable conditions within the parameters of the March JPA Planning Area's urban setting provided that

sensitive noise receptors are not significantly impacted.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-12</b>			
<b>CALCULATED FUTURE ROADWAY NOISE LEVELS</b>			
Roadway Segment	Distance From Roadway Centerline to CNEL (in feet)		
	70 CNEL	65 CNEL	60 CNEL
<b>ALESSANDRO BOULEVARD</b>			
Trautwein - Barton	80	310	640
Barton - Frontage Rd	80	320	670
Frontage Rd - Elsworth	80	315	650
<b>CACTUS AVENUE</b>			
>Loop= Rd - Plummer	35	120	255
Plummer - Harmon	35	110	235
Harmon - Elsworth	75	265	556
Elsworth - Frederick	55	190	395
<b>VAN BUREN BOULEVARD</b>			
East of Trautwein	75	295	610
Trautwein - Orange Terrace	80	320	670
Orange Terrace - Village West	80	315	660
Village West - I 215	95	390	805
<b>TRAUTWEIN ROAD</b>			
North of Alessandro	75	260	540
South of Alessandro	50	157	375

MEIR 3-113

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-12</b>			
<b>CALCULATED FUTURE ROADWAY NOISE LEVELS</b>			
Roadway Segment	Distance From Roadway Centerline to CNEL (in feet)		
	70 CNEL	65 CNEL	60 CNEL
<b>ORANGE TERRACE PARKWAY</b>			
Trautwein - Van Buren	35	115	250
Van Buren - Barton	20	70	150
<b>BARTON ROAD</b>			
Orange Terrace - Krameria	20	70	150
<b>PLUMMER ROAD / VILLAGE WEST DRIVE</b>			
Alessandro - >Connector= Rd	35	130	270
>Connector= Rd - Van Buren	30	110	235
South of Van Buren	20	60	125
<b>HARMON</b>			
>Connector= Rd - Van Buren	20	75	155
Cactus - >Connector= Rd	25	90	190
Source: Traffic Noise Technical Report, 1998 (Appendix E)			

**Aviation Noise**

Estimates of total noise exposure resulting from aircraft operations, as expressed using DNL or CNEL, can be interpreted in terms of the compatibility with designated land uses. Land use compatibility guidelines are based upon annoyances and hearing loss considerations. Compatible or incompatible land uses are determined by comparing the predicted CNEL level at a site with the land uses shown on the proposed General Plan

Land Use Plan.

As mentioned in the previous section of this MEIR, the 1998 AICUZ modeled both existing and forecasted aviation activities at the joint use aviation field. The model produced a footprint of noise contours based upon CNEL. The proposed March JPA General Plan does not propose land uses which are in conflict with the standards of noise exposure. Additionally, the March JPA with the County of Riverside ALUC is working toward the preparation and adoption of a CLUP for the joint use aviation facility to assist adjacent jurisdictions with aviation noise compatibility issues.

The proposed March JPA General Plan includes a Noise Section within the Noise/Air Quality Element, which addresses noise impacts and compliance, including a Noise Plan. While the federal government specifically preempts local control of noise emissions from aircraft, railroads, and interstate roadways, there are established standards and recommended noise criteria to assure noise compatibility through land use and building tools. The March JPA General Plan, as proposed, does not include land uses that would be considered incompatible to the CLUP or AICUZ. Furthermore, the Noise Plan of the proposed General Plan provides means of assuring that noise compatibility is maintained.

Additionally, with the application of California Public Resources Code Section 21083.8.1, the noise contour footprints for March AFB/MIP to the year 2010, is significantly less than what was permitted and emitted by March AFB prior to base realignment in 1996. Much of the existing development subject to noise contours of 60 dBA or greater has both aviation easements and implemented noise attenuation through construction of the development as a condition required for development and noise consistency. Due to the afore-mentioned factors, any impact within the March JPA Planning Area and surrounding areas subject to aviation noise is considered to be less than significant.

**Exhibit 3-7  
1992 AICUZ Noise Contours**

MEIR 3-116

**Exhibit 3-8  
1998 AICUZ Noise Contours**

MEIR 3-117

**C. Mitigation Measures**

The major goal of the Noise Section of the Noise/Air Quality Element is to prevent the creation of noise problems in the planning area and mitigate existing noise sources. Policies and implementation programs in the Noise Element will serve to reduce future noise impacts in the planning area. This Element is Section 3 of the March JPA General Plan. Policies and programs in other elements of the General Plan which would reduce noise impacts are:

1. Land Use Element policies 1.9 and 6.4, and the following programs:
  - i. Development Code
  - ii. Airport Layout and Development Plans
2. Transportation Element policies 2.8 and 13.6.
3. Resource Management Element Environmental Review program and Public Health & Safety Regulations program.
4. Safety/Risk Management Element policy 7.1 and the Aviation Use Compatibility program.

The following mitigation measures will be applied as conditions of approval for implementing development projects, as appropriate:

**Short-Term**

1. All construction projects shall be reviewed on a project-by-project basis by the March JPA staff to determine possible impacts upon identified sensitive noise receptors and to determine the need for project specific acoustical analysis. If a specific construction activity is determined to have significant noise impacts, an acoustical analysis shall be prepared containing appropriate mitigation.
2. All construction activities shall be limited to between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., if occupied residence are located within 300 feet. If no residences are located within 300 feet, no restrictions or construction hours are required.
3. All construction equipment used for construction activities shall be fitted with

MEIR 3-118



exhaust muffling and noise control filter devices to reduce noise impacts.

4. All future developments occurring as a result of implementation of the proposed General Plan shall conform to the goals and policies of the proposed plan.

### **Long-Term**

1. Information and location of noise sensitive receptors shall be reviewed and updated by March JPA staff to ensure that all sensitive receptors that may be affected by the long-term implementation of the proposed General Plan are identified. These sensitive receptors shall include, at a minimum, the following: schools, churches, hospitals, housing, libraries and housing.
2. All development projects shall be reviewed on a project-by-project basis by the March JPA to determine possible impacts upon identified sensitive noise receptors and the need to have a project specific acoustical analysis conducted. If a specific construction activity is determined to have significant noise impacts, an acoustical analysis shall be prepared containing appropriate mitigation.
3. Building setbacks and methods of sound attenuation shall be considered and used where appropriate in with specific development proposals in the planning area to limit stationary and vehicular long-term noise impacts upon sensitive noise receptors.

While not recommended as conditions of Project approval, the following policies will be imposed on a case by case basis, if feasible, to further reduce long-term noise impacts:

4. Separate industrial and noise sensitive receptors (residential, schools, churches, hospitals, libraries and housing) sufficiently to reduce the noise impact to residential uses to an insignificant level.
5. Separate residential uses and truck routes so that noise impacts will be contained without unnecessarily lengthening truck trips.
6. Restrict trucking hours in residential neighborhoods.

7. Minimize stop signs and signals along truck routes; set speed limit based on safety and noise limitation standards.
8. New construction and development of sensitive receptors (residential, schools, churches, hospitals, libraries and senior housing) within the planning area should include double pane windows, solid core doors, and increasing the amount of insulation in ceilings and walls. This will reduce the noise impacts as a result of aircraft activities at March ARB and MIP.

### ***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will result in a substantial increase in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas. New development will increase traffic volumes and the intensity of urban activities in the March JPA Planning Area. This will lead to increases in existing noise levels. While extreme noise impacts will be prevented, through identified programs, ambient noise levels are expected to be greater at buildout than existing levels. The increase will be incremental over a long period of time and is not likely to be perceptible. Thus, noise impacts from future development can be mitigated to a level less than significance through implementation of the identified noise reduction and mitigation programs.

Aviation noise impacts are considered to be less than significant. This is primarily demonstrated through the base line condition as permitted in accordance with California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1, which permits the 1992 AICUZ noise contours to represent the base line condition for the March JPA Planning Area, and the aviation operations at March ARB/MIP. The noise contours under the pre-base realignment are greater than the permissible aviation operations under the Joint Use Agreement and modeled within the 1998 AICUZ. Based upon California Public Resources Section 21083.8.1, the project will not have a significant adverse impact on aviation noise, as the project aviation noise forecasted is less than the baseline noise contours.

### ***Cumulative Impacts***

Construction of the related projects in the area and future projects in the planning area of the March JPA will result in short-term noise impacts that will accompany the construction phases of each project. Since these projects will not occur simultaneously, construction noise impacts will be short term, incremental and can be mitigated with controls on construction time periods and equipment use. Impacts associated with vehicles coming to and leaving these developments include increases in noise levels along roadways throughout the area. This will affect land uses along specific streets and could be adverse for sensitive land uses such as residences, hospitals, libraries, schools, nursing homes, rehabilitation centers and other similar uses. Stationary noise impacts will also occur as they relate to industrial equipment and appliance use, large crowds, and other activities. Project impacts are not cumulatively considerable, based upon the project mitigation measures and implementation programs.

Aviation noise is not projected to have a cumulative impact, as the noise contours as denoted in the 1998 AICUZ is reduced from the baseline condition as denoted in the 1992 AICUZ. As urbanization of the region occurs, noise levels are expected increase as the proposed project and the cumulative projects of the region develop. Cumulative impacts with respect to noise are considered to be less than significant.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

## 3.11 PUBLIC

### A. Environmental Setting

Public services in the March JPA Planning Area are provided by the Riverside County Sheriff's Department and military police (*police protection and law enforcement*), Riverside County Fire Department and March ARB Fire Services (*fire protection and emergency services*), and Val Verde Unified School District and Moreno Valley Unified School District (*educational services*). Pages 1-28 to 1-33 of Section 1 - Land Use Profile Report, discuss these services in detail. Fire hazards and available services are discussed on pages 6-7 to 6-13, Section 6 - Safety/Risk Management Profile Report.

#### Police Protection

Police protection within the cantonment area of March ARB will be provided by the military police. Police protection within the non-cantonment areas of the planning area is provided by the County of Riverside Sheriff's Department. Riverside County Sheriff's Department provides law enforcement services for the City of Moreno Valley, City of Perris and adjacent unincorporated areas of Riverside County. The Department has substation locations within the area at: 14114 Business Center Drive in Moreno Valley, East 4th Street in Perris, and the Ben Clark Public Safety Training Center located within the West Planning Subarea of the March JPA Planning Area. Overall, response time is approximately eight (8) minutes for non-emergencies, and five (5) minutes for emergencies.

#### Fire Protection

Fire protection services are provided by the on-base fire department within the cantonment areas. Riverside County Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency services for the remainder of the March JPA Planning Area. Again, Riverside County provides these services for the City of Moreno Valley, City of Perris and adjacent unincorporated areas of Riverside County. Fire stations serving the March JPA Planning Area are as follows:

- X Station 65 located at Kennedy Park in the City of Moreno Valley. Response time is three (3) minutes. Station has a Class "A" pumper and is staffed by three

*Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis (continued)*

---

firefighters, augmented by paid-call personnel. This station also has a 100 foot truck company with four firefighters, a breathing support unit, a rescue squad and 25 volunteer firefighters.

- X Station 59, located in the unincorporated area of Mead Valley, has a response time of eight (8) minutes. Station has a Class "A" pumper and is staffed by two firefighters, augmented by paid-call personnel. This station also has a reserve engine staffed by volunteer firefighters.
  
- X Station 1, in the City of Perris on San Jacinto Avenue, has a response time of eight (8) minutes. Station has a Class "A" pumper and is staffed by two firefighters, augmented by paid-call personnel. This station also has a reserve engine and 25 volunteer firefighters.
  
- X Station 6 located in Edgemont, has a response time of nine (9) minutes. Station has a Class "A" pumper and one Quick Attack. This station is staffed by three firefighters, augmented by paid-call personnel. This station also has a reserve engine, rescue squad, and 25 volunteer firefighters.
  
- X Station 2, located on Sunnymead Boulevard in the City of Moreno Valley, has a response time of four (4) minutes. This station has three firefighters, a second engine, a rescue squad and 25 volunteer firefighters.

The current Insurance Service Office (ISO) rating is Class 4. This ISO rating is based upon service equipment and distance to the March JPA Planning Area.

For March ARB/MIP, the Fire Station of the Air Force Reserves located on the air reserve base, at the flightline. This fire station is classified as having an Index AE@ Fire Fighting Capacity. This is the highest fire fighting classification for airfields.

**Schools**

The March JPA Planning Area is bisected by the Val Verde and Moreno Valley unified school districts. Moreno Valley Unified School District has the only educational facilities in the planning area; the Arnold Heights Elementary School located on Harmon Street just north of Van Buren Boulevard. When March AFB was an active duty military installation, the school had an enrollment of 600 students, with a facility capacity of 750. As an active duty base, the school primarily served the base's residential Arnold Heights area. Arnold Heights is now vacant, due to base realignment, and this housing area will not be re-occupied. The 111 historic units in Green Acres Estates are being re-occupied as housing, leased to the general public at market rate.

***Threshold of Significance***

**Police Protection:** The following significant threshold has been established by the AEP as a general guideline for police protection:

- X A potentially significant impact may be identified when a development will cause the response time for services to increase.

**Fire Protection:** The following significant threshold has been established by the AEP as a general guideline for fire protection services:

- X A potentially significant impact may be identified when a development will cause the response times for these services to increase. Each department is responsible for determining if a specific project will increase response times for their services.

**Schools:** The following significance thresholds have been established by the AEP as general guidelines for school services:

- X A potentially significant impact is identified when the capacity of the affected school district is exceeded, and any additional students would exacerbate the problem.

- X If a school district has an existing overcrowding condition and mitigation cannot remedy the condition, then the project has a significant unmitigatable impact.
  
- X Impacts to schools are considered significant if the available educational facilities are inadequate to serve the school-age population generated by the project.

**B. Environmental Impacts**

Future development in the planning area will require the provision of public services and infrastructure such as; fire protection, police protection, and other governmental services. While these services are currently being provided within the March JPA Planning Area, future development will require the expansion of service areas and increases in staffing and equipment in order to meet an expanded demand that directly correlates to the increase in development.

**Police Protection**

The demand for police protection services will increase with an increase in development in the March JPA Planning Area. Crimes, traffic and traffic accidents will increase proportionally with the increase in development and activity. Police protection services will involve security activities, response to crimes and accidents, and the continued maintenance of peace and order. Adjustments in fire and police department staffing and equipment will be necessary as new development occurs in the March JPA Planning Area, as well as surrounding lands.

Actual service planning will have to consider other factors in projecting the need for police protection services. They include the presence of criminal elements, density of development, traffic problems, individual safety precautions, business cooperation, response time, number of calls for service, and the attraction of structures, property, and criminal elements. As more intense development occurs in the March JPA Planning Area, police services will need to be expanded according to demand and the level of safety and security that the area is willing to provide.

**Fire Protection**



The demand for fire protection is directly related to the presence of fire hazards and emergency situations in the March JPA Planning Area. These hazards are influenced by several factors such as dry brush areas, industrial uses, hazardous material users, fire safety of structures, fire hydrant capacity, weather (high temperatures, high winds, etc.), the presence of combustible materials, high voltage power lines, high pressure gas lines, and substandard electrical systems and equipment. The impacts of new development on fire protection will increase demand for emergency and fire protection services due to the increase in the number of structures that need to be served.

Fire protection services will be greater on slopes with dry brush and limited access; within industrial areas; and other identified fire hazard areas. The needed manpower and equipment for adequate fire protection may be generally estimated at one engine company per every 3.5 million square feet of commercial or industrial space. Buildout of the March JPA Planning Area is projected at 21.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial uses. This translates to the need for approximately 6 engine companies at buildout. As individual development occurs, fire protection needs will have to be evaluated and service provision augmented whenever necessary. To ensure that emergency fire flow requirements are available, the following fireflow standards shall be followed for planning purposes:

Commercial or Industrial	3,500 gallons per minute
Other	2,500 gallons per minute

The Transportation Plan will have no impact on fire or police protection services, except for temporary road detours during construction which may alter emergency response times. However, response times may reduce, as traffic service levels improve through implementation of the proposed Transportation Plan of the March JPA General Plan.

### **Schools**

School services will not be impacted, as there is no increase in population connected with the implementation of the Land Use Plan. On the contrary, pursuant to California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1, the baseline for the March JPA Planning Area will be markedly decreased for both number of residential units and population of the planning area.

As an active duty base, the March JPA Planning Area contained 2,869 residential units; of these, the number of non-transient residential units was 703. The proposed March JPA General Plan will only permit the existing 111 units of the Historic District to remain for any type of continual residential use. This represents only 15 percent of the baseline condition for the March JPA Planning Area. Implementation of the Land Use Plan of the proposed General Plan will result in a decrease of 85% of occupied housing and population of the planning area thereby reducing the existing demand for school facilities proportionately.

The two school districts, although new development does not include a residential component, will collect school fees as set forth within AB 2926 & AB 1929. Furthermore, SB 50 stipulates that school districts can collect a fixed rate fee for new development. The fee for commercial and industrial development pursuant to SB 50 is based upon the square footage of new construction. Legislation permits school districts to collect \$0.30 per square foot of non-residential development to account to non-residential growth inducing impacts to schools. This fee, as collected by Moreno Valley Unified School District and Val Verde Unified School district, goes toward the cost associated with providing school facilities.

**C. Mitigation Measures**

The impacts of new development on public services will be reduced through application of the policies and implementation programs that call for the provision of adequate services to serve new development in the planning area. These are as follows:

1. Land Use Element policies 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 10.1, 10.4, 11.1 and 11.2, and the following programs:
  - i. Service Capacity Monitoring
  - ii. Development Fees
  - iii. Utility and Public Service Providers
2. The Environmental Review Program of the Resource Management Element.
3. Safety/Risk Management Element policies 4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 5.5 and 7.3, and the following programs:
  - i. Fire Hazard Mitigation
  - ii. Emergency Fireflow

***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will have a significant adverse impact on public services if it results in a significant increase in the resident population or creates a condition where essential public service levels cannot be maintained. Under the proposed March JPA General Plan, any potential impact of new development on public services can be mitigated to a level considered to be less than significant.

The application of the mitigation measures and employment of the implementation programs of the proposed General Plan will assure that the necessary levels of service for public services be maintained and that any impact to services will be less than significant. Timely provision of services, as development takes place, will prevent deterioration in existing service levels or inadequate services.

***Cumulative Impacts***

New development under the proposed March JPA General Plan and related projects will increase the demand for fire protection, police, and other governmental services in the area. Cumulative impacts to schools are less than considerable, based upon the imposition of SB50. Based on the fire protection standard of 1 engine company per 3.5 million square feet of commercial or industrial use, there could be a need for 6 engine companies to serve the Planning Area at buildout. The County Fire Department regularly reviews its services and increases staffing, fire stations and equipment as necessary to keep response time reasonable and to adequately serve the area. Cumulative impacts are expected to be satisfactorily mitigated by the project mitigation measures and implementing program.

Buildout of the planning area of the Mach JPA and implementation of related projects will increase the demand for police protection services in the area. This will require increase in police personnel and equipment to adequately provide for the public safety needs of the area. The Planning Area is under the jurisdiction of the County of Riverside, Sheriff=s Department. The Sheriff's Department plans its service provision with consideration for response times, number of calls, number and type of crime incidence, and other factors. Cumulative impacts on police protection services can be mitigated to levels less than significant. Based upon project mitigation measures and implementing programs, impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

## 3.12 UTILITY AND SERVICE

### A. Environmental Setting

The Profile Reports, pages 1-21 to 1-27 of Section I - Land Use Profile Report, discusses the utility and energy services in the March JPA Planning Area. Currently, utility service is provided by the Caretaker Program with the March JPA, through the Air Force. These utility systems are supplied by Southern California Edison - SCE (*electricity*), Southern California Gas - SCG (*natural gas*), Western Municipal Water District - WMWD (*water/waste water*), GTE (*telephone/communications*), and Waste Management of Inland Valley (*solid waste disposal*). The former active duty base has its own sewer treatment plant, electrical substation and distribution system, and storm drain system that discharges into the master planned drainage facilities of Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (RCFC&WCD).

#### Water Resources

Water service in the March JPA Planning Area is dependent upon primarily imported water resources. The Colorado River Aqueduct carries water from the Colorado River from the eastern deserts of California to Lake Mathews for storage. Lake Mathews is located approximately 10 miles southeast of the planning area. Lake Mathews, a Metropolitan Water District (MWD) facility is a primary source of potable water for the planning area and surrounding communities. Water resources in the area are discussed in pages 5-2 to 5-5 of the Resource Management Profile Report.

#### Wastewater

The March JPA Planning Area contains a sewer treatment plant (STP) within the West March Planning Subarea. The trickling filter process plant provides secondary treated wastewater and has historically served the former active duty AFB along with the outside community of Air Force Village West (AFVW). Treated effluent from the STP is pumped and used for irrigation of the golf course (0.40 million gallons per day [MGD]) and Riverside National Cemetery (0.30 MGD). The treatment plant has a capacity of treating 1.2 MGD. During active duty of the base, average flow was 0.7 MGD, which included 0.06 MGD from AFVW.

**Power**

The March JPA Planning Area contains its own electrical distribution system. A 115 kilovolt (kV) substation is located within the Northeast Planning Subarea. Power is supplied to the substation by Southern California Edison Company; and then distributed through an independent system.

**Natural Gas**

Natural gas service to the March JPA Planning Area is supplied by Southern California Gas Company. A ten-inch transmission main west of I-215 is connected to the March JPA Planning Area and then distributed through the planning area's distribution system.

**Storm Drain**

The Profile Reports, page 1-35 to 1-36 of Section I - Land Use Profile Report and Section VI - Safety/Risk Management Profile Report pages 6-6 to 6-7, and 6-10 discusses the drainage and hydrology of the March JPA Planning Area.

**Telephone & TV Cable**

The Profile Reports, pages 1-27 of Section I - Land Use Profile Report, discusses telecommunication systems. Telephone service is currently operated under the Caretaker Program for the March JPA Planning Area. Telephone service is operated through the Northeast Planning Subarea switch via the U.S. Air Force's communications infrastructure.

**Exhibit 3-9**  
**Water/Wastewater Districts**

**Solid Waste**

As an active duty base, solid waste generated within the March JPA Planning Area was collected in large dumpsters in the operational areas and small trash bins in the housing areas. As an active duty base in 1993, solid waste generation was 13.1 tons per day and disposed of at the Badlands landfill. The Badlands landfill accepts 210 tons per day. California's Integrated Solid Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) required a 25 percent reduction in the amount of solid waste disposed of in the landfills by 1995 and a 50 percent reduction by 2000. March AFB had a recycling program which accounted for 17 percent of solid waste generated within the March JPA Planning Area.

***Threshold of Significance***

**Water Resources:** The following significant thresholds have been established by the AEP as a guideline for impacts to water resources:

- X If the project-related water demand met or exceeded the safe yield of existing water supplies at the current level of service, thereby requiring development of new facilities and sources beyond those already planned.
  
- X If the proposed Project encourages activities that use water in a wasteful manner.

**Wastewater:** The following significant threshold has been established by the AEP as a guideline for impacts to wastewater facilities:

- X Significant impacts would occur if the project-related demand caused an increase in wastewater treatment that reached or exceeded the current capacity or caused a reduction in the level of service, thereby requiring expansion or development of new facilities.

**Utilities:** The following significant threshold has been established as a guideline for public utilities:

- X The proposed Project will have significant impacts if there is a need for new



systems, or if there are substantial alterations to the power utilities.

**Storm Drain:** The following significant thresholds have been established by the AEP as a guideline for flood control/drainage impacts:

- X If the proposed Project causes substantial flooding, erosion or siltation;
- X If the proposed Project exposes people or structures to major hydrological hazards such as flooding;

**Solid Waste:** The following significant threshold has been established by the AEP as a general guideline for solid waste impacts. A project's impacts are considered to significantly impact solid waste facilities if:

- X An increase in solid waste disposal would cause a significant accelerated need for additional waste disposal sites or expansion of existing landfill.

**B. Environmental Impacts**

**Water Resources**

Pursuant to California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1, the baseline of water consumption for assessment is set at the level of activity and water usage when March AFB was an active duty military base prior to base realignment in 1996. As an activity duty base, the water consumption and usage of the March JPA Planning Area were 2.14 MGD for both domestic and irrigation purposes. All water is supplied by WMWD. Potable water is delivered to the planning area via a 54-inch distribution main operated by Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). A 20-inch pipeline transports water from Lake Mathews to the golf course and Riverside National Cemetery. Water usage for irrigation from Lake Mathews was approximately 9.3 million gallons, for an average daily water consumption rate of 0.43 MGD (0.40 for Riverside National Cemetery and 0.03 for golf course irrigation). The effluent from the STP also provided irrigation for the golf course and Riverside National Cemetery; it was supplied at an average daily rate of 0.70 MGD.

The March JPA Planning Area contains nine potable water storage facilities ranging from 15,000 gallons to 2.5 million gallons. At time of base realignment, the water consumption overall within the planning area decreased to less than 57 percent to 1.2 MGD by the AFRES. Accordingly, the effluent from the STP reduced to 0.2 MGD.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-13 WATER RESOURCES/CONSUMPTION BASELINE</b>		
<b>WATER SOURCE</b>	<b>CONSUMPTION BASELINE</b> <small>California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1</small>	<b>REALIGNMENT (CURRENT)</b>
WMWD	2.14 MGD	1.20 MGD
LAKE MATHEWS	0.43 MGD	0.90 MGD
STP	0.70 MGD	0.20 MGD

The realignment of March AFB and the implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan will support additional development. An increase in development will result in an increase in water consumption. Estimates of future water consumption are provided in Table MEIR 3-14. Based upon the pre-alignment baseline and the estimated future water consumption, the increase in water consumption is 3.97 MGD for both potable and non-potable water. Western Municipal Water District, the water supplier to the planning area, has indicated in a letter dated July 28, 1998 that water needs can be supplied, in accordance with AB 901.

Approximately 6.11 million gallons of water per day will be needed at buildout for the March JPA Planning Area. Short term water consumption will also occur during construction. Additional water resources such as new pumps, booster stations, and reservoirs will be needed to provide for this demand. Water conservation programs will also be implemented to limit the depletion of local water resources.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-14 PROJECTED WATER CONSUMPTION</b>
--

*Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis (continued)*

LAND USE	CAPACITY	DAILY CONSUMPTION FACTOR	WATER CONSUMPTION
COMMERCIAL	5.136 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.51 MGD
INDUSTRIAL	11.219 million sf.	200 gpd/ksf	2.24 MGD
RESIDENTIAL	111 units	750 gpd/unit	0.08 MGD
PUBLIC FACILITY	2.055 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.21 MGD
RECREATION/ OPEN SPACE	937 acres	2000 gpd/acre	1.87 MGD
MILITARY	2102 acres	military base estimate	1.20 MGD*
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>6.11 MGD</b>
du = dwelling unit    sf = square feet                      gpd = gallons per day                      ksf = 1,000 sf * Estimate from AF IS, 1995			

**Wastewater**

The STP that exists and serves the former military base March JPA Planning Area, along with AFVW, has a capacity of treating 1.2 MGD. During active duty of the base, average flow was 0.7 MGD, which includes 0.06 MGD from AFVW. Waste water is collected and delivered to the STP through a system of gravity and force mains. Through a trickling filter process, the plant provides secondary treated effluent. Treated effluent from the STP is pumped and used for irrigation of the golf course (0.40 MGD) and Riverside National Cemetery (0.30). Treated effluent is also pumped to evaporation and storage ponds. As noted previously, the amount of effluent from the STP has decreased from 0.7 MGD to 0.2 MGD due to the reduced activity level at the realigned military installation. Therefore, the 1.2 MGD capacity system is operating just over 15 percent of its current capacity, and with the baseline as an active duty base, as permissible in accordance with California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1, was operating at almost 60 percent of its capacity.

New development will result in additional sewage generation and the need for sewer service, as well as upgrading the system to tertiary treated effluent. Estimates of sewage generation at buildout are provided in Table MEIR 3-15. Water conservation measures can reduce the amount of sewage generation.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-15</b>			
<b>PROJECTED WASTEWATER GENERATION</b>			
<b>LAND USE</b>	<b>CAPACITY</b>	<b>DAILY GENERATION FACTOR</b>	<b>WASTEWATER GENERATION</b>
COMMERCIAL	5.136 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.51 MGD
INDUSTRIAL	11.219 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	1.12 MGD
RESIDENTIAL	111 units	200 gpd/unit	0.02 MGD
PUBLIC FACILITY	2.055 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.21 MGD
RECREATION/ OPEN SPACE	937 acres	10 gpd/acre	0.009 MGD
MILITARY	2102 acres	military base estimate	0.20 MGD*
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2.27 MGD</b>
du = dwelling unit      sf = square feet      gpd = gallons per day      ksf = 1,000 sf      * Estimate from AF IS, 1995			

Land uses within the planning area will generate approximately 2.27 MGD of waste water at full buildout. This represents an overall increase from the active duty baseline of 0.70 MGD by an additional of 1.27 MGD. This is a 30 percent increase in capacity over the existing capacity of the sewer plant. The increase in sewage generation will require the upgrade and expansion of the existing sewage treatment plant, and the expansion, extension and upgrading of sewer lines. New development and end users will be required to obtain discharge permits from the operation of the treatment plant or some kind of approved connection fee assessed to facilitate the necessary expansion of the system.

**Power**

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) supplies electric power to the US Air Force's electrical substation. Power supply is then distributed within the March JPA Planning Area with the base's distribution facilities. New development allowed under

the proposed Land Use Plan will require additional power resources. Estimates of power consumption at buildout of the March JPA Planning Area are provided in Table MEIR 3-16. Short term demand for power will also occur for individual construction projects in the planning area.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-16</b>			
<b>PROJECTED POWER CONSUMPTION (annual)</b>			
<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Annual Consumption Factor*</b>	<b>Power Consumption</b>
Residential	111 du	6,081 kWh/unit	0.6 million kWh
Non-Residential	21.5 million sf	8.8 kWh/sf	189.2 million kWh
<b>Total</b>			189.8 million kWh
du = dwelling units    sf = square feet                      kWh = kilo-watt-hour * SCE "Common Forecasting Methodology VI, Demand Forecast,@ 1985.			

SCE provides power on demand. Although the availability of resources to generate power will influence the company's ability to provide service, no adverse impacts on services are expected to occur with new development under the proposed March JPA General Plan. Furthermore, the deregulation environment of investor-owned electric utilities in California, and the creation of the power exchange (PX) furthers the competition of making energy available to the March JPA Planning Area. The regional increase in power consumption will lead to depletion of energy resources throughout the nation. Energy conservation practices are promoted by SCE to reduce demand. Also, alternative sources of energy are constantly under experimentation to ensure that electric power will continue to be available.

Power consumption and service impacts will be evaluated by the power distributor on a project by project basis. The upgrade of equipment and facilities is made in accordance with this evaluation prior to project development. Energy conservation practices and energy-efficient equipment will require less energy and extend the availability of energy sources in the region. New developments are required to consult with the power provider to coordinate the provision of services. During the course of reviewing proposed development projects, alternative ways of promoting energy conservation will

be considered as part of the project review process. The UBC also includes standards to promote energy conservation in new development.

**Natural Gas**

Natural gas consumption will increase with new development and the increase in employment opportunities. Buildout of the March JPA Planning Area under the proposed Land Use Plan will increase natural gas consumption to approximately 73.9 million cubic feet per month. Table MEIR 3-17 provides estimates of natural gas consumption.

Pursuant to California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1, the baseline for the consumption rate of natural gas within the March JPA Planning Area is set at the level of activity and usage when March AFB was an active duty military base. As an activity duty base, the consumption rate of natural gas was 16.26 million cubic feet (mmcf) per month. The project natural gas consumption rate upon full buildout of the March JPA Planning Area is denoted in Table MEIR 3-17, with a monthly rate of 73.9 mmcf. This represents an increase of 57.6 mmcf monthly.

Natural gas is provided to the March JPA Planning Area by SCG, and is dispensed through on-demand service. Individual development projects are served upon application for new service. No adverse impact on gas service is expected with new development. Sources of natural gas may be depleted on a regional basis with future growth and development. SCG continues to tap gas resources to ensure adequate provisions are met. Source development is an ongoing program that will ensure that SCG can provide natural gas service to all customers. Conservation efforts will reduce the need for natural gas and extend the availability of natural gas.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-17</b>			
<b>PROJECTED NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION</b>			
<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Monthly Consumption Factor*</b>	<b>Natural Gas Consumption</b>

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-17</b>			
<b>PROJECTED NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION</b>			
<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Monthly Consumption Factor*</b>	<b>Natural Gas Consumption</b>
Residential	111 du	9,125 cf/unit	1.0 million cf
Commercial	5.1 million sf	3.5 cf/sf	17.8 million cf
Industrial	9.7 million sf	3.3 cf/sf	32.0 million cf
Public Facilities	6.6 million sf	3.5 cf/sf	23.1 million cf
Total			73.9 million cf
du = dwelling unit      sf = square feet                      cf = cubic feet * SCG factors from SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook.			

**Storm Drains**

The storm drain system in the planning area is primarily carried along natural streams and riparian areas, unlined channels, roadway shoulders, improved culverts, channels and underground storm drains. There are areas where storm drain facilities need to be provided/improved to eliminate flood hazards. Undeveloped areas will require new storm drain facilities when development occurs. These facilities shall be designed and provided with future development. New structures and the paving of vacant land will increase storm runoff and may require the upgrade of drainage pipes downstream. The March JPA shall ensure that studies and provisions are incorporated into new development to provide adequate storm drain facilities and avoid flood hazards in the planning area, and that downstream properties will not be adversely impacted. The March JPA Planning Area, and the proposed Land Use Plan of the March JPA General Plan specifies densities and land use intensities that are consistent with the factors included in the ADPs by RCFC&WCD.

**Telephone and Cable**

New development in the planning area will require telephone and communication services. This will mean the extension of existing lines in the area and upgrade to existing facilities. Final disposition of the former active duty base's system has not been

determined, however, GTE and TCI Cablevision will provide service on demand and no adverse impacts are anticipated.

**Solid Waste**

New development and the increase in employment in the March JPA Planning Area will lead to increases in solid waste generation. Estimates for solid waste generation at buildout of the area under the proposed Land Use Plan are provided in Table MEIR 3-18.

<b>TABLE MEIR 3-18 PROJECTED SOLID WASTE GENERATION</b>			
<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Capacity</b>	<b>Daily Generation Factor</b>	<b>Solid Waste Generation</b>
Residential	111 du	4 lbs/unit	444 lbs
Commercial	5.136 million sf	5 lbs/ksf	25,680 lbs
Industrial	9.774 million sf	5 lbs/ksf	48,870 lbs
Other	4.655 million sf	5 lbs/ksf	<u>23,275 lbs</u>
Total			98,269 lbs
du = dwelling units    sf = square feet                      lbs = pounds              ksf = 1000 sf			

Pursuant to California Public Resource Code Section 21083.8.1, the baseline of solid waste generation and disposal to the landfills for assessment is set at the level of generation and disposal when March AFB was an active duty military base. As an activity duty base, the rate was 13.1 tons per day, with 17 percent diverted from the landfill. This equates to 26,203 pounds per day, with 2.2 tons (or 4,454 pounds) per day being recycled.

Full implementation of the general plan will ultimately result in the generation of additional solid waste. Approximately 98,269 pounds of solid waste will be generated daily within the March JPA Planning Area upon full buildout. This is equivalent to 49.1 tons. The increased generation of solid waste is 36 tons per day; or 2.7 times the baseline condition.



Solid waste generated in Western Riverside County is disposed of at the Mead Valley, El Sobrante, Lambs Canyon and Badlands landfills. A total of 910,900 tons of solid waste was accepted by these landfills. The projected solid waste generation is approximately an additional 1.5 percent of this rate. The daily solid waste generation from the present to buildout will depend on the rate of growth of new development. New or expanded landfills may have to accommodate a portion of the solid waste needs of the planning area and the subregion as a whole.

The County has developed a Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) which will reduce the amount of solid waste disposed at local landfills. In accordance with AB 939, the goal of the element is a 25 percent reduction by 1995 and a 50 percent reduction by 2000. This will significantly reduce estimated solid waste generation at buildout of the Land Use Plan. If successful, this will extend the life of area landfills to provide disposal services to the planning area for a longer time.

Implementation of the SRRE, which contain measures to reduce the amount of waste disposed at the landfills, will ensure that the March JPA reduces solid waste generation in accordance with the State requirements under AB 939. However, regional constraints on the availability of long-term landfill capacity are such that the projected increase in solid waste generation is considered to be a regionally significant impact; although the rate of generation is standard, in and of itself, and is not considered to be a significant impact.

Solid waste disposal represents an issue of regional concern. Without additional facilities or capacity expanded for solid waste disposal, the existing capacity of the landfills may not be adequate for the project and the solid waste of the region. Many programs are in place through the County of Riverside Waste Management District to reduce solid waste generation. Other measures to provide additional facilities or expanded capacity are being pursued, including the Eagle Mountain Landfill project. However, without the additional capacity being secured to date, the additional solid waste generation associated with the proposed March JPA General Plan will incrementally reduce the life expectancy of the landfills serving the area. Given the project, and the increased amount of solid waste projected to be generated, and given the fact that landfill space is in increasingly shorter supply, solid waste generation is considered to be a significant impact.

**C. Mitigation Measures**

MEIR 3-143

Adverse impacts on energy and utilities can be mitigated by policies and programs that address the provision of adequate infrastructure and utility services. The proposed March JPA General Plan includes policies to reduce solid waste impacts. The policies and programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan that addresses utilities and service systems are:

1. Land Use Element policies 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11.1, 11.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 13.1, 13.3, 14.2, 14, 15.2, 16.4, 16.5, 17.1, 17.2, 17.3, 17.4, 17.5 and 17.6, and the following programs:
  - i. Infrastructure Master Plans
  - ii. Capital Improvement Program
  - iii. Service Capacity Monitoring
  - iv. Development Fees
  - v. Utility and Service Providers
2. Transportation Element policy 3.7.
3. Resource Management Element policies 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3, and the following programs:
  - i. Water Conservation Ordinance
  - ii. Environmental Review
  - iii. Energy Conservation
4. The following program of the Safety/Risk Management Element:
  - i. Master Flood Control and Drainage Plan

The following project mitigation measures that shall be applied to projects, on a project-by-project basis, as feasible:

1. Projects shall be evacuated by the March JPA to determine their impact on flood control/drainage and water quality. No project shall be approved unless there is adequate on-site drainage and no significant impacts to water quality.
2. All structures shall be protected against 100-year flood by building design or other flood proofing measures.

**Significance Conclusion**

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will have a significant adverse impact on energy, utilities and infrastructure if it results in a substantial demand for energy resources or the development of a new energy source; in the deterioration of service levels or creates a demand which existing utility services cannot meet; or breaches published national, state or local standards relating to solid waste or litter control. The impact of new development on energy and utility services can be mitigated with programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan. The expansion of infrastructure and facilities to meet the demand of individual developments will ensure that essential utility services are available at all times. Water and energy conservation and waste reduction programs will help reduce adverse impacts to insignificant levels after mitigation.

The impact to solid waste generation will be reduced to the extent feasible with the application of mitigation measures. Nonetheless, based upon the above information, impacts will be significant and unavoidable due to the uncertain availability of sufficient regional land fill and other solid waste management facilities if complete build-out of the Planning area is achieved. Thus, a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines would be required to be adopted for this impact.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Implementation of the proposed General Plan will increase the consumption of water and generation of wastewater and solid waste. Increase in consumption or generation is noted in the following table. Overall, the cumulative impact of the project to utilities and service systems is negligible, given the small proportional increase to the ROI.

<b>CUMULATIVE UTILITY CONSUMPTION/GENERATION</b>			
<i>Utility</i>	<i>Project Consumption/Generation</i>	<i>ROI Consumption/Generation</i>	<i>% of ROI Consumption/Generation</i>

*Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis (continued)*

Water (gallons per day)	3,970,000	70,100,000	<6%
Wastewater (gallons per day)	1,570,000	33,500,000	<5%
Solid Waste (tons per year)	16,012	910,900	<2%

Cumulative increase in demand for power is not significant. The availability of power to serve future development will depend on the Southern California Edison Company and the resources and facilities through the PX and ISO. Because there are a wide variety of energy sources used for power generation, it is anticipated that future development under the proposed March JPA General Plan and related projects will present no impacts on SCE's service and adequate resources will be available to these developments with no impact on SCE or existing energy sources.

Increases in natural gas consumption will accompany new development under the proposed General Plan and related projects. Again, cumulative increase in the consumption of natural gas to the ROI is negligible. Southern California Gas Company provides natural gas service on demand and no adverse impact on their service is anticipated with buildout.

New development under the proposed General Plan and related projects will increase solid waste generation and create additional demand for solid waste disposal in the area.

Estimates of cumulative solid waste generation are provided in the cumulative table. These estimates do not account for recycling programs that are required by State laws. Recycling and waste reduction can reduce waste generation and demand for landfill capacity. If existing landfills are filled to capacity, new sites will need to be developed to serve future developments which may be a significant cumulative impact.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

**3.13**

**AESTHETICS**

**A. Environmental Setting**

The March JPA Planning Area encompasses approximately 6,500 acres or ten square miles. March ARB consists of approximately 2,100 acres; thereby accounting for the disposal of an estimated 4,400 acres by the U.S. Air Force. Exclusive of March ARB, approximately 70 percent of the 4,400 acres is vacant and undeveloped. The majority of the vacant, undeveloped property is located on the West March Planning Subarea. It is also within this area of the March JPA Planning Area that scenic corridors, views and vistas can be identified. Furthermore, the West March Planning Subarea is adjacent to the Riverside National Cemetery and is bisected by Van Buren Boulevard, which is identified as a scenic corridor. Further information relative to the aesthetic setting of the March JPA Planning Area is discussed in the Resource Management Profile Report, Section 5, pages 5-34 to 5-39.

***Threshold of Significance***

The threshold of significance is reached if a project will result in a substantial demonstrable negative aesthetic effect. The aesthetic and visual impacts of new development will change the visual character of the area, but the threshold of significance is generally defined as development intensity or standards that are a significant departure to that generally associated with or acceptable to an area. Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines uses the following:

- § Project will have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista;
- § Project will substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to , trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway;
- § Project will substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; and
- § Project will create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

MEIR 3-148

**B. Environmental Impacts**

Future development under the proposed March JPA General Plan will lead to greater urbanization of the March JPA Planning Area from its current underdeveloped status. Changes in the visual quality of streetscapes and skylines will occur as vacant areas are developed and existing structures are replaced with new ones. Views of the surrounding hills could also change as development occurs within the hillsides and structures constructed can obscure views of the hills. Future development at buildout of the planning area, as allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan, includes approximately 21.5 million square feet of non-residential (commercial and industrial) uses. This is a marked increase in urban development which would provide the March JPA Planning Area with an industrialized character. However, the density of development would be consistent with the region and neighboring communities.

Roadways built under the proposed Transportation Plan would also increase the urban quality of the area. Development could reduce the sense of openness and the existing undeveloped quality of the area. Design review, landscaping, height restrictions, site orientation, and setbacks will assist with reducing visual incompatibilities that could otherwise occur with new development. By evaluating the visual impacts of new development, any potential adverse aesthetic impacts can be prevented.

The proposed General Plan further recognizes the visual qualities of the March JPA Planning Area, and through the general plan implementation programs, provides for open space, scenic vistas and corridors, and gateways. Special design guidelines and standards will lessen any impact development may have to areas considered to have a scenic quality.

New development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan will result in greater intensity and density of development in the planning area than which currently exists, but no more intense than surrounding land uses with similar designations. Development allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan will create new sources of light and glare. This means that there is more potential for light and glare impacts. Artificial lighting will accompany new development. This includes exterior lighting for parking lots, signs, fields, walkways, and interior lighting which could be visible outside. Thus, the March JPA Planning Area will experience increased lighting levels with future development.

High intensity structures will also cause spillover light to adjacent properties. Glare from

reflective surfaces will occur with developments that use mirrors, bright lights, and other reflective surfaces for building facades. Development of vacant land will increase the nighttime lighting levels in the planning area. The light and glare impacts of new development can be prevented through design review. Street lighting on roadway projects could increase lighting levels in the planning area. Infrastructure projects are not expected to create any light and glare impacts.

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

The March JPA General Plan sets forth both a blueprint for future development, as well as definition of the tone for development within the planning area. Many policies and programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan address the visual and aesthetic qualities of the environment. These will serve as mitigation measures for the aesthetic impacts of future development under the Plan. The Resource Management Element of the March JPA General Plan, Open Space and Recreation Plan recognizes and designates Scenic Corridors/Vistas. Policies and implementation programs of the March JPA General Plan that address the aesthetic quality of the planning area are as follows:

1. Land Use Element policies 1.4, 2.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6, 4.8, 8.1, 8.2 and 9.4, and the following programs:
  - i. Development Code
  - ii. Specific Plans
  - iii. Area Design Plans
  - iv. Design Review
  
1. Transportation Element policies 1.2 and 2.8.
2. Noise/Air Quality Element, noise policies 1.4 and 3.1.
  
3. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 3.2, 5.1, 7.3, 7.4, 9.1, 9.7, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4 and 10.5, and the following programs:
  - i. Landscaping Guidelines
  - ii. Environmental Review
  - iii. Scenic Corridors



***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will result in a substantial, demonstrable negative aesthetic effect. The proposed General Plan provides for standards of development that are consistent with the sub-region and neighboring jurisdictions, particularly floor area ratios. Regional elements and standards, such as the designation of scenic boulevards/corridors in the proposed General Plan, are consistent with local plans of the jurisdictions and sub-regional plans for trails and corridors. Development intensity and standards are consistent with the sub-region, and therefore are considered to be a less than significant impact. New development does not equate to an aesthetic impact of a plan. Implementation of the General Plan with the afore-mentioned measures will not result in any significant impacts.

***Cumulative Impacts***

The above discussion addresses project specific impacts. The proposed March JPA General Plan will not create the potential for significant cumulative effects to aesthetics, as the proposed General Plan provides for development and intensity that is consistent with the ROI; and provides policies and implementation programs that address the aesthetic quality. Based upon the mitigation measures and implementing programs of the General Plan, the impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

## **3.14 CULTURAL**

### **A. Environmental Setting**

The 6,500 acre planning area is partially developed, with most development concentrated east of Interstate 215 and large tracts of vacant undeveloped land located within the West March Planning Subarea. The March JPA Planning Area is boarded on most of its edges by the cities of Riverside, Moreno Valley and Perris. The unincorporated communities of Mead Valley and Woodcrest are south and southwest of the planning area. Cultural resources include historic (prehistoric), paleontological and archeological resources. These types of resources include sites, structures, districts, artifacts, or any other physical evidence of human activity considered to be important to culture, subculture, or community for scientific, traditional, religious or other reasons. Cultural resources are defined as those resources that contribute to the knowledge of the past and the inhabitants thereof.

Cultural resources inclusive of historic (prehistoric), paleontological and archeological are discussed in detail within Section 5, Resource Management of the Profile Report, pages 5-9 to 5-34. Under the purview of the U.S. Air Force, Section 106 consultation review process with State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) was initiated. Record and literary searches were performed for the planning area and all land within a one-mile radius. Information gleaned from the records search was supplemented by the results of complete site investigations and surveys. All undeveloped property within the March JPA Planning Area has been subjected to intensive survey for the purpose of identifying cultural resources. The findings of these surveys are included within the Resource Management Profile Report.

The primary law governing cultural resources in terms of their treatment in an environmental analysis is the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) which addresses the protection of archeological, historic and cultural resources. In compliance with the NHPA, the U.S. Air Force has submitted and is in the process of consultation with the SHPO, as required under Section 106 of the NHPA for the United States Air Force historic district at March Air Field, including the officers' housing area of Green Acres Estates.

The March Field Historic District is the most significant cultural resource identified within the planning area. The March Field Historic District has been nominated for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) upon concurrence by SHPO. Furthermore under the governance of the U.S. Air Force, a Cultural Resource Management Plan (CRMP) for March

AFB was prepared, which includes a maintenance manual for the Historic District. The following is a summary overview of the March JPA Planning Area's cultural resources.

### **Historic Resources**

Historic setting of the planning area includes prehistoric, protohistoric and historic, historic prior to military use and during military use. The pre-historic and historic setting of the planning area is discussed in detail within Section 5, Resource Management of the Profile Report, pages 5-9 to 5-17. The March JPA Planning Area has a long military history, which commenced with the nationwide military buildup that took place prior to the United States entering World War I. The War Department constructed Alessandro Aviation Field, which was later known as March Air Field.

*Historic District:* The military installation, reactivated in 1927 and operated to 1943. The base was the principal tactical training base for all of the western United States. During this time, permanent facilities were constructed, including; 129 military family housing units (Green Acres), commanding officers' residence, hospital, administration building, barracks, hangars and other support facilities. These facilities built between 1927 and 1943 were constructed within a distinctive triangular area northeast of the flightline. Architecturally, the period of base construction within the historic district represents the integration of the principles of the City Beautiful Movement and innovative technological design.

The establishment of a historic district was recommended for nomination. The proposed historic district included the original one square mile and adjacent buildings constructed between 1928-1943. The March Field Historic District is located within a triangular area of about 158 acres and consists of essentially all buildings and structures constructed between 1928 and 1943 as "part of the second generation of March Field" and one extent building from the original 1918 March Field. The March Field Historic District was submitted for listing on the NRHP with the concurrence of the California SHPO.

The base was expanded by 930 acres in 1940, for the national buildup for World War II. At this time, a power station, hanger additions, runways and taxiways were constructed in the Works Progress Administration. A year later the War Department funded the construction of housing, maintenance, storage and other strategy support facilities, including an 800 foot railroad spur extension. This phase of construction was not

integrated either architecturally or technologically with the earlier construction. The majority of the frame-type buildings have since been removed.

*Camp Haan:* Camp Haan (CA-Riv-3285H), a World War II Antiaircraft Replacement Training Center and prisoner-of-war camp, was first recorded in 1987. Three additional areas within the West March Planning Subarea have subsequently been recorded as part of Camp Haan, none of which were determined to be significant, primarily because they had been substantially impacted by demolition activities. This 8,058 acre installation opened on November 11, 1940 and eventually hosted, the Army Services Depot, Southwest Branch; U.S. Disciplinary Services Barracks, and an Italian prisoner-of-war camp. The camp was closed in August 1946 and many of the wooden buildings and 2,459 tent floors were removed. Remains within the West March Planning Subarea consist of foundations, building piers and roads.

A survey conducted in 1994 included previously unsurveyed portions of Camp Haan. Five historic sites were recorded of which four are associated with Camp Haan. These sites included: three concrete building foundations, a boulder exhibiting World War II-era graffiti, and a glass shard deposit that is tentatively dated between 1880 and 1920. Eligibility of Camp Haan for listing on the NRHP is not supported, as integrity of the site has been severely compromised.

A draft Historic Preservation Plan prepared by JRP Historical Consulting Services and Brian F. Mooney in 1994 addresses the treatment and long-term management of all formerly reevaluated historical properties within the planning area. This report was finalized as part of the Cultural Resource Management Plan and Maintenance manual in 1996.

### **Archeological Resources**

Records indicate that ten archeological surveys have been conducted, with no sites or artifacts determined to be eligible for inclusion within the National Register. Detailed information on these surveys and recorded sites are discussed within Section 5-- Resource Management of the Profile Reports. The last survey conducted included an intensive examination that covered 2,500 acres of undeveloped land, and concluded the surveying of all undeveloped, and not previously surveyed property within the March JPA Planning Area.

This survey, as with the prior surveys, found that sites: (1) cannot be temporally placed within a regional chronology because they lack associated artifacts, and (2) lack midden (an indication of the presence of subsurface deposits) that would indicate long-term use or occupation. Therefore, they are not eligible for inclusion within the National Register. In December 1997, a final draft report of the survey was released by the U.S. Air Force that further investigated two sites and random sampled four other sites.

The primary goal of the investigation was to determine whether the sites contained the qualities necessary to meet the criteria for eligibility on the National Register. The contractor conducting the investigation for the U.S. Air Force tested the sites with specific hypotheses. These hypotheses included: cultural affiliation, cultural behavior, site formation process, chronology, and site function and settlement organization. The conclusions of the report state that no further archaeological work is necessary and that the six hypotheses were not proven positive. In May 1998, SHPO concurred with the findings of the report.

In summary, the sites consist of bedrock milling stations and are the physical remains of the processing of food stuffs. They are a part of a broad pattern of resource exploitation that is exhibited over much of Southern California. Seldom are there cultural deposits and artifacts that are diagnostic of cultural affiliation or temporal association with these types of sites. The archaeological fieldwork at the sites investigated produced a low frequency of recovered artifacts, even though a large number of shovel test pits were placed at the sites.

Consultation with the San Manuel Band of Serrano Mission Indians and other native American tribes were conducted by the U.S. Air Force as part of the December 1997 archaeological investigation as claims to traditional resources were made. Any substantiation of traditional resources will be pursued, but to date none specifically have been identified or recognized through SHPO.

*Traditional Resources:* Traditional resources can include archaeological sites, burial sites, ceremonial areas, caves, mountains, water sources, plant habitat or gathering areas, or any other natural area important to a culture for religious or heritage reasons. Significant traditional sites are subject to the same regulations, and are afforded the same protection as other types of historic properties. Any modern traditional resources within the planning area are likely to be associated with the Cahuilla or the Luiseno Indian groups; to date, no such resources have been identified. Based upon

ethnohistorical records, the Serrano and Gabrieleno groups may also be associated with the area. The March JPA conducted extensive cultural resource consultations pursuant to a claim through the Notice of Preparation process that the planning area contained Traditional Cultural Properties. Appendix AC@ contains the ethnographic research, consultations, and findings resulting from this process. The following is a summary of the process:

As part of the Environmental Documentation for properties within the March JPA Planning Area, LSA Associates, Inc. (LSA) conducted Native American consultation in an effort to determine the group that had occupied the region prehistorically. This work is summarized in Schroth (1988 and 1999). A preliminary assessment of the March JPA property concluded that the area could have been held by the Gabrielino, Luiseño, Serrano, or Cahuilla tribes, based upon which ethnographic description was used. A list of all groups within these tribes was requested and received from the Native American Heritage Commission. The list contained 36 bands and persons.

All 36 identified groups or individuals were contacted by certified mail. Three letters were returned as undeliverable, and one letter has not been located by the postal service. The remaining letters (n=32) were received and receipt of delivery signed (Schroth 1999).

Seven groups expressed an interest in attending meetings to discuss the property: the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Serrano), the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, the Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council of San Gabriel, the Soboba Band of Mission Indians (Luiseño), the Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians, Katherine Saubel of the Native American Heritage Commission (Cahuilla), and the Pauma/Yulma Band of Mission Indians (Luiseño). All meetings were held, and copies of the *Draft General Plan and Review of Traditional Cultural Properties and Ethnography of the March Joint Powers Authority Planning area* (Schroth 1998) were presented and discussed.

Each group expressed somewhat different concerns and desires for the Planning area. These are summarized below:

*San Manuel Band of Mission Indians (Serrano)* - On November 24, 1998, the San Manuel Band indicated that not all archaeological sites had been tested and agreed to provide a map outlining those areas believed to have highest

---

---

*Section 3: Environmental Impact Analysis (continued)*

---

---

significance. This map has not been received. They also suggested that a Native American cultural center for use by all groups be planned within the Planning area.

*Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (Luiseño)* - The Pechanga Band presented evidence of Luiseño occupation of the general area during prehistory. They did not present any claims to property or suggestions for property treatment.

*Gabrielino/Tongva Tribal Council of San Gabriel* - This group expressed their interest in achieving federal recognition for the Tribe. They also indicated use, at least during transit, of the project vicinity.

*Soboba Band of Mission Indians (Luiseño)* - The Soboba Band verbally indicated that their elders had indicated the group occupied the Planning area. They also indicated that they relied heavily on the Pechanga Band of Mission Indians to protect their interests.

*Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians* - This meeting indicated that the band's greatest concern is possible impacts to archaeological sites, which were not identified. They also emphasized that the area had been Cahuilla prior to Euroamerican settlement.

*Katherine Saubel of the Native American Heritage Commission (Cahuilla)* - Ms. Saubel, a member of the Native American Heritage Commission and an elder of the Cahuilla tribe, indicated that the Planning area was part of traditional Cahuilla territory. She also recommended protecting grinding areas and any area containing cremations, and curating any artifacts recovered at the Malki Museum.

*Pauma/Yulma Band of Mission Indians (Luiseño)* - The band expressed concern over potential impacts to cultural resources, and expressed interest in the identification of finds, repatriation of human remains and associated burial materials, and protection of archaeological sites. They suggested that a cultural center/museum be planned for the area and that joint meetings with all Native American groups be held.

Based on a thorough review of existing ethnographic and artifactual evidence, as

MEIR 3-157

discussed in Schroth (1998 and 1999), the only quantifiable evidence for occupation/use of the area was presented by the Pechanga Band of Mission Indians. Unique rock art styles and mapping of their locations supported their contention that the area was Luiseño. None of the groups offered evidence that the Planning area contained Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Areas, or other sites of special concern to a particular group. Concerns expressed revolved around the protection of cultural resource sites and, if protection was not feasible, proper mitigation of these impacts in accordance with 36 CFR 800.



### **Paleontological Resources**

The treatment of paleontological resources is governed by Public Law 74-292 (the National Natural Landmark Program, implemented by Title 36 CFR 62). Only significant paleontological remains are subject to consideration and protection by a federal agency. Among the criteria used for National Natural Landmark designation are illustrative character, present condition, diversity, rarity, and value for science and education.

A fossil is the hardened remains or traces of plant and animal life of some previous geologic period which has been preserved in rock formations in the earth's crust. Quaternary-age fossils have been found in alluvial deposits near the planning area. However, very few finds are of significant scientific quality. North of the planning area, in San Timoteo Canyon, vertebrate fossils have been found and have been used to date local rock formations. Other fossils, both marine and nonmarine, are found throughout the Peninsular Ranges Province in sedimentary rock units. These units are not present within the planning area. Therefore, there is no significant paleontological resources determined to be within the planning area.

### ***Threshold of Significance***

In accordance with Section 15064.5 of the California Public Resources Code, Determining the Significance of Archeological and Historical Resources, a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.

- X Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired;

**Exhibit 3-10  
Historic District**

MEIR 3-160

- X The significance of a historical resource is materially impaired when a project:
1. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historic Places; or
  2. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in a historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1 (g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidences that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
  3. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that conveys its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for the purposes of CEQA.

Additionally, Appendix G of State CEQA Guidelines utilizes the following:

- § Project causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- § Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature; and
- § Project disturbs any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

**B. Environmental Impacts**

Future developments allowed under the proposed Land Use Plan have the potential to affect existing historic, archaeological and paleontological resources. The West March Planning Subarea, as a primarily undeveloped area, may be sensitive for archaeological and paleontological resources. The area may contain other archaeological/paleontological resources, aside from those recovered in the past. In the Northeast Planning Subarea, historic structures are found within the Historic District. Thus, new development in the March JPA Planning Area may lead to the disturbance, destruction or discovery of cultural resources. Future development often means on-site excavation and grading, which may uncover paleontological resources. Because of the site-specific nature of these resources, it is difficult to determine if actual adverse impacts will occur until project sites have been chosen and development projects proposed.

The Conservation Plan in the Resource Management Element calls for site investigations and the development of sensitivity maps, in order to preserve the area's cultural resources to the maximum extent possible. Additionally, the Cultural Resource Management Plan for the Historic District will preserve the integrity of the district through implementation of the Plan. Outside of the Historic District, there is currently no other cultural resources determined by SHPO to be of significance.

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of mitigation measures consistent with 36 CFR 800 as they relate to protection, mitigation, and documentation of cultural resource sites will ensure that all potential impacts to unknown cultural resource values will be reduced to below a level of significance. Policies and programs that will preserve the paleontological, archaeological and historical resources in the planning area are as follows:

1. Land Use Element policies 4.2, 4.3, 8.2, 8.4, 9.1, 9.3 and 9.4, and the following programs:
  - i. Specific Plans
  - ii. Area Design Plans
  
2. Resource Management Element policies 3.1, 7.1, 7.1, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, and 10.3, and the following programs:
  - i. Environmental Review
  - ii. Environmental Regulations
  - iii. Cultural Awareness Program

MEIR 3-162

iv. Cultural Resource Management Plan

***Significance Conclusion***

According to the CEQA Law and Guidelines, a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will disrupt or adversely affect a prehistoric or historic archaeological site, or a property of historic or cultural significance to a community or ethnic or social groups, or a paleontological site except as a part of a scientific study. Significant adverse impacts on cultural resources mean the destruction and demolition of archaeological, paleontological and historical resources in March JPA Planning Area. The proposed General Plan does not have any impacts to Traditional Cultural Properties, Sacred Areas, or Areas of Special Concern to any Native American group. The Resource Management Element will serve as the primary tool to prevent these impacts. Impacts on unknown resources may be greater than for known resources and sites, but will be addressed on a project level, when development is proposed or resources are discovered. Impact levels will be less than significant with implementation of the proposed conservation/preservation programs.

***Cumulative Impacts***

The above discussion addresses project specific impacts. Outside of the Historic District, the project area contains no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources. The proposed March JPA General Plan will not create the potential for significant cumulative effects to cultural resources, as cultural resources are rather site specific, and the proposed project will not adversely impact regionally significant cultural resources. Based upon the mitigation measures and implementing programs for the proposed March JPA General Plan, impact are not cumulatively considerable.

***THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK***

## 3.15

### A. Environmental Setting

The March JPA Planning Area, as an active duty base, contained recreational facilities. The existing recreational facilities include the golf course now open to the public and the recreational facilities and youth center located in the Northeast Planning Subarea which is being reused by the City of Moreno Valley, Department of Parks and Recreation. The March Field Museum is an additional recreational facility located within the March JPA Planning Area. Pages 5-34 to 5-39 of Section 5--Resource Management Profile Report discusses the open space and recreation issues in the planning area.

#### *Threshold of Significance*

The following significance threshold has been established by the AEP as a guideline for parks and recreation:

- X A standard of 2.5 acres of local parkland per 1,000 population should be maintained.

### B. Environmental Impacts

Increase in development typically increases the demand for recreational and open space opportunities in an area. However, no impacts on recreational facilities are identified as a result of the proposed March JPA General Plan; as the Land Use Plan proposes employment generating, rather than residential land uses. The proposed Land Use Plan will not cause an increase in population, as a direct result of the proposed land uses for the March JPA Planning Area. Furthermore, approximately 777 acres of Parks/Recreation/Open Space have been designated within the proposed Land Use Plan. This acreage provides for a variety of recreational needs within the March JPA Planning Area and will contribute to the recreational opportunities for the sub-region. The acreage designated as Parks/Recreation/Open Space on the proposed Land Use Plan will contribute to the recreational opportunities of the sub-region, particularly regional-type recreational facilities.

The Land Use Plan focuses on employment generating land uses, with no new housing provided; therefore the standard recreational principles of need do not directly translate. However, the Land Use Plan and the elements of the proposed General Plan pose a campus-like setting of open space and common areas to complement the development pattern of the area. The acreage provided within the Land Use Plan substantially exceeds requirements for recreational uses and facilities. Furthermore, the proposed Parks/Recreation/Open Space designated land will provide and improve the aesthetic appeal of the Planning area and contribute to improving the quality of life for individuals living, visiting, and working within the March JPA Planning Area and sub-region as a whole.

Regional recreation of a commercial nature to meet projected market demands is also reflected in the Land Use Element, specifically with the land use designation of Destination Recreation. Trails, bikeways and open space linkages are also encompassed within the elements of the proposed General Plan, including linkages with regional and adjoining facilities. The Open Space and Recreation Plan for the March JPA Planning Area is embodied within the Resource Management Element of the proposed General Plan.

### **C. Mitigation Measures**

The Resource Management Element addresses open space and recreation issues in the March JPA Planning Area. Policies and implementation programs that achieve the recreational and open space facilities are as follows:

1. Land Use Element policies 1.7, 1.8 and 9.3.
2. Transportation Element policies 12.3, 12.4, and 12.5.
3. Noise/Air Quality Element Implementation Program for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities.
4. Resource Management Element policies 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 9.3, 9.4, 9.5 and 10.3, and the following programs:
  - i. Parks Plan
  - ii. Open Space Preservation
  - iii. Private Recreation and Open Space Facilities
  - iv. Joint Use of Facilities



v. Bikeways and Trail Development Plan

***Significance Conclusion***

In accordance with generally accepted practices and principles for administering CEQA, a project will have a significant impact on the environment if it will be in conflict with established recreational uses of the area. No impacts are related to recreational opportunities or services; therefore, the project will not result in a significant impact to parks and recreation.

Recreational impacts will remain unchanged and will not be significant as the Land Use Plan does not include new housing opportunities and parklands and areas of various recreational activities are denoted within the Land Use Plan to complement the development of employment-based land uses. The recreational facilities will provide for regional recreational activities, as well as recreational outlets within an employment center. This is provided for in the policies and programs outlined within the Resource Management Element of the March JPA General Plan.

***Cumulative Impacts***

The above discussion addresses project specific impacts. The proposed March JPA General Plan will not create the potential for significant cumulative effects to recreation, as the proposed project will not create the need for additional demand for recreational facilities, and conversely, provides for additional recreational facilities. Based upon the mitigation measures and implementing programs for the project, impacts are not cumulatively considerable.

## SECTION 4: EARLIER ANALYSIS

---

There are three environmental documents containing analysis of the March JPA Planning Area, relative to base realignment and its implementation. As the March JPA General Plan is a tool of implementation of the March AFB Master Reuse Plan, these earlier environmental documents and their accompanying technical analyses, has been consulted and referenced. The following documents were relied upon by the document preparers and incorporated by reference into this document pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150 and are considered part of the information upon which this MEIR is based. Each of these documents is available for review at the offices of the March Joint Powers Authority, and is incorporated by reference.

### 4.1 MARCH AFB DISPOSAL

With the realignment of March AFB to March ARB, the Air Force prepared an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS, as part of the reuse planning phase, in compliance with NEPA, considered all reasonable disposal alternatives and their respective environmental impacts. The EIS was prepared to provide information and analysis on the potential impacts resulting from disposal and proposed reuse of base property. The Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on October 28, 1993. With potential joint use of the airfield, the FAA was a cooperating agency to the Air Force, which was the lead agency responsible for preparing the EIS.

A preferred land use pattern and alternatives were studied within the EIS to identify the range of direct and indirect environmental consequences. A public scoping meeting was held April 20, 1994 at which information was gathered and used to determine the scope and direction of studies and analysis required to complete the EIS. A draft EIS was completed in mid 1995, and the Final EIS for the realignment of March was issued in February 1996.

## **4.2 MARCH AFB REDEVELOPMENT EIR**

The March Joint Powers Redevelopment Agency (MJPRA), formulated a project area and adopted a Redevelopment Plan encompassing the March JPA Planning Area and approximately 450 acres within the City of Moreno Valley in accordance with Assembly Bill 3769. In establishing the project area and adopting the Redevelopment Plan, the MJPRA adopted and certified a Program EIR (SCH# 96031022). The redevelopment agency adopted the plan in July 1996. The environmental analysis prepared for the establishment and adoption of the redevelopment project area, was the first CEQA related document prepared addressing the planning area. Prior to this document, all other environmental related documentation, analysis or processes, were a result of NEPA or military regulatory compliance.

## **4.3 CAA GENERAL CONFORMITY DETERMINATION / PROPOSED MULTIPLE USES OF MARCH ARB**

One of the requirements for completing and signing a Joint Use Agreement for shared use of the airfield was an "air quality conformity analysis." This analysis was required of any federal action that could have an impact on air quality in non-attainment areas in the country. The joint use agreement executed May 1997, permits civilian air operations to occur at March Field. Aviation activities have air quality related impacts, and it is that impact that was evaluated in the analysis.

After several months of evaluation of different scenarios of joint use activity, the Air Force was able to make a finding that the joint use of the airfield facilities would not negatively impact the California State Implementation Plan to attain federal air quality standards. This finding does make assumptions regarding the assumed number of operations that would occur by civilian aircraft, and these assumptions form the basis for environmental conditions that are contained in the final joint use agreement.

**Exhibit 4-1**  
**March AFB Redevelopment Project Area**

MEIR 4-3

**Exhibit 4-2  
March Field-Joint Use Area**

MEIR 4-4

## SECTION 5: MANDATORY ELEMENTS

---

### ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

#### 5.1 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE

The proposed Land Use Plan of the March JPA General Plan will effectively commit land to the different designated urban land uses and reduce the amount of land available for other uses. As a result of alterations to the physical environment, the implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan will result in a significant irreversible commitment of resources, including construction materials, biological habitat, water, land, and energy resources.

Construction activities carried out in accordance with the proposed Land Use Plan will consume non-renewable resources such as sand, gravel, and steel, and renewable resources such as lumber. Energy resources will also be irretrievably committed during construction. As the planning area continues to grow, development and users within the Planning Area will require a further commitment of energy resources in the form of natural gas and electricity generated by hydroelectric power, coal, solar, or nuclear power for utilities. Irreversible commitments of fossil fuels will also be required to support the transportation of people and goods. These commitments will be long-term obligations.

Land is another resource that will be irreversibly committed during the implementation of the proposed project. Development projects under the proposed March JPA General Plan represent a commitment to the continued urbanization of the March JPA Planning Area located in the urban area of western Riverside County. Land committed to urban uses is unlikely to revert to open space uses, even after the 50- to 75-year life span of the physical structures is reached. Infrastructure and facilities that will be provided along with new development will encourage continued urban uses in the planning area.

Development under the proposed General Plan will result in significant environmental changes within the planning area. Urbanization will result in irreversible adverse impacts in areas of the community that are presently undeveloped. The proposed March JPA General Plan and this MEIR contain policies, programs and mitigation measures that are designed to limit environmental damage from development, and calls for site-specific mitigation measures, where needed. These measures will reduce and minimize environmental damage, although the unavoidable adverse impacts of development will result in a certain amount of irreversible environmental damage.

Implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan may alter the intensity of development in the planning area by possibly encouraging development in areas that are

MEIR 5-1

currently underutilized or vacant, however, said level of development is consistent with the sub-region. Increased urbanization will bring more people and activities to the March JPA Planning Area, cause more automobile trips to be made, and will result in increases in ambient noise levels and air pollution. While air quality programs can reduce the amount of pollutants generated, population increases will lead to air quality deterioration in the long term. Similarly, increases in vehicle trips could cause traffic congestion and eventually reduce the level of service of some roads. Proposed roadway improvements and traffic management programs are made part of the proposed General Plan to control air quality deterioration and reduce traffic impacts.

Urbanization will result in a greater demand for public services and utilities. Fire and police stations will be needed to serve future growth of the planning area. Improvement and expansion of utility services will cause some adverse impacts on the natural environment. Other changes to the environment associated with urbanization include increased levels of noise and light. Traffic noise and noise associated with increased activity and land use intensity will increase with the projected growth in population. These activities will require artificial lighting, raising the level of ambient light during nighttime hours. Light and noise are expected by-products of development and will be reduced, but not eliminated, with the programs in the Noise/Air Quality Element and the design review of individual projects.

Natural resources in the March JPA Planning Area will also experience adverse impacts with development. Projects under the proposed General Plan and projected increases in development and end-users will generate increases in water consumption, which could strain water sources. Once development occurs, a commitment exists for the provision of services. Future development will cause physical changes to the area including loss of biological habitats and the alteration of the natural topography. Once again, conservation programs will limit harmful effects, but it will not be possible to completely prevent irreversible changes to the environment.

The process of development itself will alter land use in the area. The conversion of undeveloped land to commercial, or industrial use will prevent open space or habitat uses on the land. Areas currently considered hazardous because of their potential for flood, hazardous materials, or earthquake hazards, may be developed as urbanization progresses. Development may also disturb cultural resources, some of which the planning area will not be able to preserve. Land use restrictions can contain this development in less sensitive areas, but cannot eliminate or prevent adverse impacts. Programs to protect sensitive areas and resources will only be effective if they are implemented early and fully.

## **5.2 LONG-TERM DISADVANTAGES TO THE ENVIRONMENT**

CEQA and State CEQA Guidelines require EIRs to identify the "relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity." Special attention must be given to impacts which narrow the range of beneficial uses of the environment or present long-term risks to the public's health and safety. The EIR must also identify the reasons or justifications that project implementation should occur now rather than in the future. Finally, the EIR must describe the cumulative and long-term effects of the proposed project which may adversely affect the environment.

Implementation of the proposed March JPA General Plan will not result in immediate development projects, but the proposed Land Use Plan will accommodate approximately 21.5 million square feet of commercial and industrial development at buildout. New development built under the proposed General Plan will represent a continued long-term commitment to urbanization and population support systems. Areas of the planning area that are urbanized during the life of the General Plan are not likely to revert to vacant land or open space. Long-term effects associated with plan implementation include increases in traffic, air pollutants, noise, visual changes, and additional demands on public services and infrastructures. Because the proposed General Plan and related projects allowed under the Plan will be implemented over a long period, many of the environmental impacts associated with its implementation will be incremental and cumulative over the long-term rather than immediate.

Urban development allowed under the proposed General Plan would limit the range of beneficial uses of the environment. For example, once an area is developed, its potential use as a natural habitat for native plant and animal species would end. The land would not be expected to revert to a natural habitat use at any foreseeable time after development. Policies and programs in the proposed March JPA General Plan are designed to limit disruption of the natural environment and minimize the adverse effects of urban development. Project-specific mitigation measures will also be included in the development of individual projects, as feasible.

The proposed March JPA General Plan is intended to guide future development and plan the provision of public services and infrastructure to meet the demands of the growth, and to protect the environmental resources of the planning area. While it cannot prevent development and growth in the area, it serves as a tool for balancing future growth and the protection of the environment. The March JPA General Plan is needed at this time to provide the March JPA with planning direction and to respond to the concerns and interests of the community. Also, the adoption of the proposed March JPA General Plan will comply with the requirements of State law.



### **5.3 DIRECT OR INDIRECT ADVERSE**

The proposed March JPA General Plan is designed to allow the development of an employment center, while providing balance to new growth and development, and the need to provide and account for demand of services. The implementation of the proposed Land Use and Transportation Elements could affect the amount and pace of growth in the March JPA Planning Area. The other elements: Resource Management, Noise/Air Quality, Safety/Risk Management, and Housing will manage growth in the March JPA Planning Area without encouraging development.

### **5.4 GROWTH INDUCING**

Growth-inducing impacts can be either direct or indirect. Direct growth-inducing impacts are generally associated with the provision of urban services, such as utilities, improved roadways, police protection, etc. to an undeveloped area. The provision of these services allows new development of commerce and industry more easily, and can encourage property owners of the region to convert their property to urban or more intense urban uses. Indirect, or secondary, growth-inducing impacts consist of new development induced by the additional demand for housing, goods, and support services associated with the population and employment increases caused by, or attracted to, urban growth. Providing the infrastructure and services needed for growth in planning area will induce additional growth, producing a cyclical pattern of growth in the greater region.

New development under the proposed March JPA General Plan will represent an intensification of land uses in several areas of the planning area which are currently vacant, or underdeveloped. Focusing on the development of commerce and industry, and the setting of the Interstate 215 corridor, development of March Inland Port, support of the continued Military mission at March, and providing for unmet needs of the region, this will provide short-term construction employment, as well as long-term employment in commerce and industry land uses. Additional employment opportunities in the March JPA Planning Area may create a demand for housing within the region, although the region is housing rich, and job poor. Roadway improvements and the provision of public services throughout the planning area will encourage construction and development, which will increase the local employment base. The intensification of land uses will increase water consumption, as well as the generation of sewage and solid waste.

MEIR 5-4

*Section 5: Mandatory EIR Elements (continued)*

---

The proposed March JPA General Plan would serve as a growth-inducing factor for development in the region, while at the same time, providing for growth and development in an orderly and responsible manner, by providing for unmet needs of the region and capitalizing on the assets and infrastructure of the planning area and the greater Inland Empire region. The project with application of the mitigation measures have impacts that are less significant to relative growth inducing impacts.

*THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK*

## SECTION 6: PLAN ALTERNATIVES

---

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines, this section addresses alternatives to the proposed March JPA General Plan. State CEQA Guidelines require a **No Project** to be included in the alternatives to be evaluated. Alternatives must be capable of eliminating any significant adverse impacts or reducing them to a level of insignificance.

The following significant adverse impacts were identified for the proposed March JPA General Plan which could not be adequately mitigated to less than significant:

- < Air Quality - Due to the region's existing air quality condition and the amount of emissions generated from activities permissible through the development and implementation of the March JPA General Plan, the proposed project is not consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan. Cumulative impacts to air quality remain significant as the proposed project will contribute emissions within a non-attainment area.
- < Biological Resources - Buildout of the planning area requires the trade and/or replacement of habitat for SKR. Based upon the status of the SKR within the planning area, impacts will be significant and unavoidable if complete buildout of the planning area is achieved.
- < Utility & Service System: Solid Waste - The impact to solid waste generation will be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures; however, impacts will be significant and unavoidable due to the uncertain availability of sufficient regional land fill and other solid waste management facilities if complete build-out of the planning area is achieved.

Three alternatives to the proposed March JPA General Plan were considered. The first alternative is a **No Project Alternative** which considers the existence of current conditions of the planning area, with realignment of March from an active duty base to an air reserve base, however without further reuse or development of the surplus properties. This alternative analysis what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the General Plan is not adopted, and assumes that no new development will occur and conditions will remain as present at time of realignment.

Should the general plan not be adopted, development activities could not take place, as the planning area is presently undesignated, as it is federal property. However, the property that was determined to be surplus to the U.S. Air Force will be transferred from federal ownership, in accordance with the March AFB Master Reuse Plan. The proposed project is consistent with

the reuse plan. Under the No Project Alternative, it assumes that no development activity will be forthcoming, as the property would remain without a zoning classification or general plan designation.

A second alternative is a **Development Constrained Alternative** which considers a lesser amount of surplus property being available for development, due to land use constraints imposed by the endangered Stephens' kangaroo rat (SKR). This alternative results in a lower development build out, as it includes a less amount of property for development, but no reduction in the development intensity of property.

The third alternative considered, is an **Alternative Site**. However, the Alternative Site alternative was rejected as infeasible since the circumstances related to the March JPA General Plan are site specific. Since the proposed general plan is an implementation tool of the Base Reuse Master Plan, a potential alternative site location fails to meet project objectives and therefore is not feasible. Several elements of the proposed project and project objectives are particular to existing infrastructure, such as the airfield, and the joint use operation by the AFRES and civilian aviation. Consequently, an alternative site assessment is not practical, and does not meet project objectives.

Alternatives considered but rejected, include: reduced density, housing alternative, and military aviation alternative. None of these alternatives were consistent with the March AFB Master Reuse Plan, nor met project goals and objectives.

## **6.1 NO PROJECT**

The No Project Alternative directly correlates with the No-Action Alternative assessed by the U.S. Air Force in the EIS for the realignment of March AFB. Under this alternative, the Air Force Reserves would continue to operate within the military cantonment area. The airfield would continue to be used by the 452<sup>nd</sup> Air Mobility Wing, tenant organizations and transient aircraft. The remainder of the planning area would not be reused, and remain undeveloped and vacant.

By placing the former base property into a caretaker status, this action would be inconsistent with policies for affecting growth in western Riverside County, as set forth within the western Riverside Sub-regional Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, it would be contrary to the actions of the U.S. Air Force. This alternative would result in limited jobs being created and/or retained within the planning area, thereby not assisting with the jobs/housing balance of the region.

Limited or no ground disturbances would be associated with this alternative. Additionally, no newly created impervious surfaces would result from this alternative. While this alternative results in no impact to water hydrology resources and geological/soil resources, it also prevents necessary hydrological infrastructure from being developed within the planning area, and the sub-region. Portions of the West March Planning Subarea have evidence of hydrological deficiencies that resulted from development west of the planning area, but not being conveyed properly through the planning area to regional flood control facilities.

This alternative would not require the use or expansion of public services or utilities. Consumption would be less for water, energy and natural gas, and the generation of waste water and solid waste would be less than baseline conditions. As outlined within Sections 3.11 and 3.12 of this MEIR, the current condition and use of public services and utilities would be set, and remain unchanged. However, it is important to note, that the existing infrastructure system would not be improved or expanded, even to the benefit of the sub-region. This alternative would operate utility systems at a capacity level less than 20% of the existing capacity of the systems, in the case of the water and waste water systems. Consumption or generation factors would be less than 70% from baseline conditions as well.

A major portion of the planning area would remain vacant and undeveloped. This alternative would not disturb property, thereby not impacting biological resources identified within the planning area. Archeological resources, although none listed with SHPO as significant, would also remain unchanged as well. The vast amount of grassland of the West March Planning Subarea and the decaying of vacant structures under this alternative could possess a threat to risk of upset, in the form of grassland fires, and deterioration of structures to collapse, fire or other means of decay. Many of the vacant buildings contain forms of hazardous materials such as lead-based paint and asbestos containing material. The deterioration of these materials could pose a risk of upset or hazard.

Traffic noise levels for most roadway segments would be similar, or in some instances greater than the proposed project. This is a result of specific roadways proposed within the March JPA General Plan not being developed, and causing traffic to utilize existing roadways at a higher volume. Affected pollutants generated by motor vehicle emissions would be reduced from the baseline condition for CO, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> by the No Project Alternative. However, many roadway segments within the planning area and vicinity would deteriorate to an unacceptable LOS as a result of traffic related to regional growth.

Traffic growth of the region, defined in the Transportation Impact Analysis (Appendix F) as Future Background Traffic would reduce the LOS at 50% of the study intersections to below that of the proposed project, because the improvements proposed in the March JPA General Plan would not be provided under this alternative. The LOS would also be degraded at most of the study intersections under this alternative from the baseline condition. Under the No Project Alternative the regional benefit of reducing vehicle miles traveled would not be achieved.

In the No Project Alternative, the impacts to traffic and circulation would be greater than the baseline condition, as permitted under California Public Resource Code Section 21083. Biological resource impacts would be lessened to a less than significant impact, as would the impact to utility and service systems-solid waste. The impact to air quality would also be lessened from the proposed project.

## **6.2 DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINED**

The Development Constrained Alternative directly correlates with the SKR/Aviation Alternative analyzed within the base realignment EIS. Under this scenario, the aviation activities would include the joint use arrangement of the airfield, and base reuse of existing facilities and undeveloped property. Under this alternative, a portion of the planning area would be protected as habitat for the federally listed SKR. For this alternative, 1,000 acres would be retained as SKR habitat, thereby constraining the amount of property available for development, as well as constraining infrastructure improvements.

The Development Constrained Alternative, in providing for 1,000 acres of SKR habitat, also includes reallocation of acres for the general plan land use designations, but no change in development intensity for each land use designation. This alternative would provide for approximately 17 million square feet of commercial, industrial and business enterprise to be within the planning area upon full buildout, with an estimated 25,900 jobs.

Although, this alternative would reduce the amount of acreage to be developed, similar impacts to natural resources from ground disturbing activities within the planning area, outside of the 1,000 acre SKR habitat. The Development Constrained Alternative would reduce the impact on biological resources, specifically for the federally

endangered SKR. The disturbance of less acreage by this alternative would result in the impacts to biological resources to be considered less than significant. Similarly, wetlands identified within the planning area are largely contained within the SKR habitat area, as are recorded archeological sites, although none are listed as significant.

An estimated 25,900 jobs would be created by the buildout of the Development Constrained Alternative. Affected pollutants generated by motor vehicle emissions would be increased from the base line condition for CO, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, SO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> by the Development Constrained Alternative. If this alternative was selected, a statement of overriding considerations would be necessary for Air Quality.

With buildout of this alternative, 166,000 daily trips or 25% fewer than the proposed project would be generated. Traffic noise levels for most roadway segments would be similar, or in some instances greater than the proposed March JPA General Plan. Specific roadways proposed within the March JPA General Plan, within the 1,000 acres set aside for SKR, would not be developed under this alternative. This would cause vehicular traffic to utilize other roadways at a higher volume.



**Exhibit 6-1**  
**Development Constrained Alternative**

Section 6: Plan Alternatives (continued)

<b>TABLE MEIR 6-1 DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINED ALTERNATIVE</b>				
Land Use Designation	Acres <i>GROSS</i>	Density		Full Buildout Capacity*
		<i>MAX.</i>	<i>AVG.</i>	
<b><i>INDUSTRY</i></b>				
Business Park	515	.75	.20	3,140,676 sf
Industrial	374	.60	.15	1,710,601 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>4,851,277 sf</b>
<b><i>COMMERCE</i></b>				
Office	47	.75	.30	429,937 sf
Mixed Use	509	.60	.25	3,880,107 sf
Commercial	45	.60	.30	411,642 sf
Destination Recreation	135	.50	.25	1,029,105 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>5,750,791 sf</b>
<b><i>PUBLIC</i></b>				
Park/Recreation/ Open Space	509	.25	.025	388,011 sf
Public Facility	446	.50	.10	1,359,943 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>1,747,954 sf</b>
<b><i>SPECIAL</i></b>				
Military Operations	2102	n/a	n/a	2,500,000 sf
Aviation	316	.40	.15	1,445,321 sf
Historic District	58	2 <sup>du/ac</sup>	2 <sup>du/ac</sup>	111 units
AFVW Expansion	75	.60	.30	686,070 sf
Cemetery Expansion	160	.10	.005	24,394 sf
SKR Reserve	1000	0	0	0 sf
SUBTOTAL				<b>4,655,784 sf 111 units</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>17,005,806 sf 111 units</b>
ac - acre                                      sf - square feet                                      du/ac - dwelling unit per acre FAR - floor area ratio                      * based on average FAR, of net acre				

Peak hour intersection forecasts and LOS were evaluated for this alternative. Most intersections are projected at LOS F with the Development Constrained Alternative, though conditions improve at two intersections; Cactus Avenue and Plummer Road, and Plummer Road and Alessandro Boulevard. If this alternative was adopted, a statement of overriding considerations would be required for impacts to Transportation and Circulation due to unacceptable LOS at study intersections.

The reduced level of development under this alternative would reduce the amount of police protection, fire protection, and public services. The March JPA, as with the proposed March JPA General Plan project, would require similar mitigation for maintaining an acceptable level of service and response.

Under the Development Constrained Alternative, the impacts to utility systems differ from that of the baseline condition and proposed March JPA General Plan. Consumption and generation rate would be reduced from the proposed Project due to the reduced level of development, but remain greater than the baseline condition.

**Water.** This alternative would have a 3.98 mgd water consumption rate. This rate of water consumption under this alternative is above the baseline condition of 3.27 mgd. As with the proposed project, the increase in water rate consumption will require the expansion of the existing water system.

**Wastewater.** Wastewater generation is also reduced, from the proposed March JPA General Plan project. Under this alternative the approximately 1.43 MGD of waste water would be generated at full buildout of the planning area. This represents an overall increase from the SB1180 baseline of 0.70 MGD by an additional 0.73 MGD. This increase in wastewater generation is beyond the capacity of the existing 1.20 MGD sewer treatment plant. As with the proposed project, the increase in sewage generation will require the upgrade and expansion of the existing sewage treatment plant, and the expansion, extension and upgrading of sewer lines. New development and end users will be required to obtain discharge permits from the operation of the treatment plant or some kind of approved connection fee assessed to facilitate the necessary expansion of the system.

---

<p><b>TABLE MEIR 6-2</b> <b>WATER CONSUMPTION</b> <b>DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINED ALTERNATIVE</b></p>
--

**Section 6: Plan Alternatives (continued)**

LAND USE	CAPACITY	DAILY CONSUMPTION FACTOR	WATER CONSUMPTION
COMMERCIAL	5.751 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.57 MGD
INDUSTRIAL	4.851 million sf.	200 gpd/ksf	0.97 MGD
RESIDENTIAL	111 units	750 gpd/unit	0.08 MGD
PUBLIC FACILITY	1.359 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.14 MGD
SKR HABITAT	1,000 acres	0	0
RECREATION/ OPEN SPACE	509 acres	2000 gpd/acre	1.02 MGD
MILITARY	2102 acres	military base estimate	1.20 MGD
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3.98 MGD</b>
du = dwelling unit    sf = square feet                      gpd = gallons per day    ksf = 1,000 sf * Estimate from AF IS			

**Power & Natural Gas:** Development allowed under this alternative will require additional power and natural gas resources from the baseline condition, as does the proposed March JPA General Plan, albeit at a reduced level commensurate with the reduction in development at buildout. Estimates of power consumption at buildout of the March JPA Planning Area are provided in Table MEIR 6-4. Buildout of this alternative will increase natural gas consumption to approximately 57.9 million cubic feet per month (mmcf). Table MEIR 6-5 provides estimates of natural gas consumption. As an activity duty base, the consumption rate of natural gas was 16.26 mmcf per month represents an increase over the baseline condition.

<b>TABLE MEIR 6-3 PROJECTED WASTEWATER GENERATION</b>			
LAND USE	CAPACITY	DAILY GENERATION FACTOR	WASTEWATER GENERATION
COMMERCIAL	5.751 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.58 MGD
INDUSTRIAL	4.851 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	.48 MGD
RESIDENTIAL	111 units	200 gpd/unit	0.02 MGD

**Section 6: Plan Alternatives (continued)**

PUBLIC FACILITY	1.359 million sf.	100 gpd/ksf	0.14 MGD
SKR HABITAT	1,000 acres	0	0
RECREATION/ OPEN SPACE	509 acres	10 gpd/acre	0.005 MGD
MILITARY	2102 acres	military base estimate	0.20 MGD*
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1.43 MGD</b>
du = dwelling unit      sf = square feet      gpd = gallons per day      ksf = 1,000 sf * Estimate from AF IS			

<b>TABLE MEIR 6-4 PROJECTED POWER CONSUMPTION (annual)</b>			
Land Use	Capacity	Annual Consumption Factor*	Power Consumption
Residential	111 du	6,081 kWh/unit	0.6 million kWh
Non-Residential	17.0 million sf	8.8 kWh/sf	149.6 million kWh
<b>Total</b>			150.2 million kWh
du = dwelling unit      sf = square feet      kWh = kilo-watt-hour * SCE "Common Forecasting Methodology VI, Demand Forecast,@ 1985.			

Public services and utilities would need to be expanded under this alternative. Although, the consumption rate or generation rate is less than the proposed March JPA General Plan for these services, based upon a reduced level of development, the facilities and systems would need to be expanded beyond current capacity.

<b>TABLE MEIR 6-5 PROJECTED NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION</b>			
Land Use	Capacity	Monthly Consumption Factor*	Natural Gas Consumption
Residential	111 du	9,125 cf/unit	1.0 million cf
Commercial	5.8 million sf	3.5 cf/sf	18.6 million cf
Industrial	4.6 million sf	3.3 cf/sf	15.2 million cf
Public Facilities	6.6 million sf	3.5 cf/sf	23.1 million cf
<b>Total</b>			57.9 million cf

TABLE MEIR 6-5 PROJECTED NATURAL GAS CONSUMPTION			
Land Use	Capacity	Monthly Consumption Factor*	Natural Gas Consumption
du = dwelling unit    sf = square feet    cf = cubic feet * SCG factors from SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook.			

Under the Development Constrained Alternative impacts would be similar to the proposed March JPA General Plan; however, the impacts to air quality would be greater due to decreased LOS for study intersections, and traffic and circulation impacts would be increased to unacceptable levels. The impact to air quality would remain a significant impact, as would impacts to solid waste. Impacts to biological resources would be lessened to a less than significant impact.

### 6.3

The alternative analyses indicate that the **No Project Alternative** is, within specific elements, environmentally superior because it will have no new environmental impacts in the March JPA Planning Area. However, this also assumes that the growth around the planning area will continue and will impact the infrastructure within the planning area without means of accommodating improvements that serve a sub-regional function. Furthermore, this alternative is unlikely to reflect the future of the March JPA Planning Area, nor does it achieve project goals and objectives.

The **Development Constrained Alternative**, when compared to the proposed General Plan, will have a lower degree of environmental impacts relative to biological resources. On the other hand, this alternative limits development potential in the March JPA Planning Area including infrastructure expansion and linkages. Again, the constraints to expanding and developing an appropriate infrastructure system that contributes to the benefit of the sub-region is impacted negatively; specifically related to air quality, and circulation and transportation aspects. The Development Constrained Alternative does not reduce impacts for air quality to a less than significant adverse impact, and causes significant impacts to circulation and transportation. In conclusion, neither alternative would meet the goals and objectives of the proposed General Plan, and the March AFB Master Reuse Plan, nor would either alternative completely mitigate all impacts to a less than significant level.

## SECTION 7: PREPARERS OF EIR

---

### 7.1 PREPARERS OF EIR

#### Document:

March Joint Powers Authority  
Chris Carlson Buydos, AICP, Assistant Director  
P. O. Box 7480  
Moreno Valley CA 92552

#### Transportation Analysis:

Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.  
James G. "J.D." Douglas, Senior Project Manager  
505 South Main Street, Suite 900  
Orange CA 92868

#### Cultural Resources/Traditional Cultural Properties Analysis:

LSA Associates, Inc.  
Dee Schroth, Ph.D.  
3403 10th Street, Suite 520  
Riverside, CA 92501

#### Legal Counsel & Review:

Best, Best & Krieger  
Michelle Ouellette, ESQ  
P. O. Box 1028  
Riverside, CA 92502

***March JPA would like to recognize two advisory committees; the Planning and Transportation Teams, and each of its members that contributed to the preparation of the March JPA General Plan and its associated environmental document:***

Steve Whyld, City of Riverside  
Bill Wilkman, City of Riverside  
Fran Dunajski, City of Riverside  
Steve Brown, City of Perris  
John Terell, City of Moreno Valley  
Craig Neustaedter, City of Moreno Valley

Jerry Jollife, County Planning Department  
Ed Studor, County Transportation and Land  
Management Department  
Sian Roman, County Transportation and Land  
Management Department  
Steve Ruddick, Western Riverside Council of  
Governments

### 7.2 SOURCES

*Section 7: Preparers of EIR (continued)*

The following documents were relied upon by the document preparers and incorporated by reference into this document pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines 15150 and are considered part of the information upon which this MEIR is based. Each of these documents are available for public review at the offices of the March Joint Powers Authority. The custodian of records is the March Joint Powers Authority for the March AFB Redevelopment Project & EIR, and the United States Air Force Base Conversion Agency for the General Conformity Determination for Proposed Multiple Uses of March ARB, the Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Portion of March Air Force Base, California, and the Draft Biological Opinion for the Disposal of Portion of March Air Force Base, respectively.

1. March Joint Powers Authority, 1996. March AFB Redevelopment Project & EIR, (SCH #96031022) Urban Futures.
2. U. S. Air Force, May 1997. General Conformity Determination for Proposed Multiple Uses of March ARB (the "conformity analysis"), prepared with Earth Technology Corporation.
3. U. S. Air Force, February 1996. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Portion of March Air Force Base, California, prepared with Earth Technology Corporation.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, April 1999. Draft Biological Opinion for the Disposal of Portion of March Air Force Base.

## **& ENTITIES CONSULTED**

-----, 1997.

Least Bell=s Vireo Surveys, March Air Force Base, California.

-----, 1997. Quino Checkerspot Survey at March Air Force Base, Riverside County California.

Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, 1998a. Distribution and density of Stephens= Kangaroo Rats at selected localities on March Air Force Base, December 1997, Riverside CA.



Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, 1998b. Distribution and density of Stephens= Kangaroo Rats at the sewage treatment plan and antennae farm on March Air Force Base, November 1998, Riverside CA.

Air photos.

Alston, Wes, Fire Marshal, 1997. City of Moreno Valley, written communication dated March 5, 1997.

Army Corps of Engineers, September 1996. Cultural Resources Management Plan for March AFB, California, prepared by JRP Historical Consulting Services and ASM Affiliates, Inc.

Army Corps of Engineers, November 1995. Maintenance Manual for Buildings within the March Field Historic District, March AFB, California, prepared by JRP Historical Consulting Services and Brian F Mooney Associates.

ASM, 1996. An Intensive Survey of Approximately 2500 acres of March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California, prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District.

Barreto, Daisy, Associate Engineer, 1997. Riverside County Flood Control District, Riverside, personal communication on February 14, 1997.

Blackwelder, Paul, Assistant Director, 1997. Riverside County Transportation Commission, Riverside, personal communication on February 7, 1997.

Brown, Steve, Senior Planner, 1997. City of Perris, Perris, personal communication on March 5, 1997.

California Department of Health Services, Office of Noise Control, Guidelines for the Preparation and Content of the noise Element of the General Plan, 1988.

California Integrated Waste Management Board, 1991, Active Landfills, dated April 1, 1991.

California Office of Planning and Research, 1987. General Plan Guidelines.

California South Coast Air Basin, Hourly Wind Flow Patterns, 1977.

City of Moreno Valley, 1984. General Plan Program, prepared by Planning Network, Moreno Valley, California.

City of Moreno Valley. Development Code and Official Zoning Atlas, Moreno Valley California.

City of Moreno Valley. Oleander Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report, Moreno Valley, California.

City of Perris, 1997. Development Code, Perris California.

City of Perris, 1992. General Plan, Perris, California.

City of Perris. Zoning Map, Perris, California.

City of Riverside, 1993. General Plan 2010, Riverside California.

City of Riverside. Municipal Zoning Code, Riverside California.

City of Riverside. Zoning Map, Riverside California.

Clary, Kim, 1997. State of California Department of Housing and Community Development, telephone, personal communication on April 2, 1997.

County of Riverside, 1983. Comprehensive General Plan, Riverside County, California.

County of Riverside, 1997. Mead Valley Community Plan, Riverside County, California.

Creswell, Cathy, Assistant Deputy Director - Housing Policy, 1997. State of California Department of Housing and Community Development, telephone, personal communication on February 10, 1997.

Cullen, Robert, Senior Civil Engineer, 1997. Riverside County Flood Control District, Riverside, personal communication on February 14, 1997.

Downs, Keith, Aviation Director, 1997. County of Riverside, written communication dated March 17, 1997.

Drover, C.E., 1989. An Archaeological Assessment of 1720' P.Z. Tank Site and Associated Pipeline Easement, unpublished report on file at Eastern Information Center, University of California.

Drover, C.E., 1987. An Archaeological Assessment of the Air Force Village West, Riverside, California, unpublished report on file at Eastern Information Center, University of California.

Drover, C.E., 1991. An Archaeological Assessment of Orangecrest-Springs 69 KV Transmission Line, City of Riverside, California, unpublished report on file at Eastern Information Center, University of California.

EarthTech, 1997. Archeological Testing at Six Sites on March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California, prepared for U.S. Department of the Air Force, Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence.

EarthTech, 1997. Research Design for a Phase II Archaeological Evaluation for March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California, prepared for U.S. Department of the Air Force, Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence.

EarthTech, 1997. Vegetation of March Air Force Base, Colton California.

Federal Aviation Administration, 1989c. Federal Aviation Regulations Part 150 - Aircraft Noise Compatibility Planning.

Gunderman, Dave, Assistant Director, 1997. Western Riverside Council of Governments, Riverside, personal communication on February 11, 1997.

Gutierrez, Olivia, Director of Planning and Community Development, 1997. City of Perris, Perris, personal communication on March 5, 1997.

Fields and Silverman Architects, 1985. Preliminary Historic Inventory, March Air Force Base, California.

Hart, E. W., 1990, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California: California Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication No. 42.

HESI, 1996. Recommendations for Disposal of Utility Systems on March Air Force Base, prepared for March Joint Powers Authority.

Insurance Services Office (ISO), 1990, Public Protection Classification Manual.

International Conference of Building Officials, 1994. Uniform Building Code.

JRP Historical Consulting Services and ASM Affiliates, 1996. Cultural Resources Management Plan for March AFB, California, prepared for Army Corps of Engineers and March Air Force Base.

JRP Historical Consulting Services and Brian F. Mooney & Associates, 1995. Maintenance Manual for Buildings within the March Field Historic District, March AFB, California, prepared for the Army Corps of Engineers and March Air Force Base.

March Joint Powers Authority, 1996. March AFB Redevelopment Project & EIR, Urban Futures.

March Joint Powers Authority, 1995. March Air Force Base Realignment, Report of the Infrastructure Subcommittee, prepared by the Infrastructure Subcommittee.

March Joint Powers Authority, 1995. March Air Force Base Master Reuse Plan, prepared in association with Western Riverside Council of Governments, March Planning Team.

March Joint Powers Authority, 1997. Airport Development Plans (Airport Layout Plan) for March Inland Port, March ARB, prepared by P&D Aviation in association with Southern California Association of Governments.

McCarthy, D.F., 1986. An Archaeological Assessment of the West March Housing Development, March AFB, Riverside County, California, Civil Engineering Division March AFB, California.

Mikelsell, S.D. and Wee, S.R., 1992. Summary Report on Historical Significance and Historic Preservation Management for the March Field Historic District, March Air Force Base, California, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Mooney, B.F. and Associates, 1993. Work Plan for an Archaeological survey of March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California, prepared for March AFB and Air Mobility Command and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

National Flood Insurance Program, 1984. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Riverside County, California and Incorporated Areas, Panel 740, 745, 765, 1425 and 1450 of 3600, April 15 1980. Preliminary revisions to the 1984 Flood Insurance Rate Map.

*Section 7: Preparers of EIR (continued)*

---

Niehaus & Associates, 1987. Final Environmental Assessment of the Land Conveyance for the Proposed Air Force Village West Project at March AFB, California, prepared for United States Air Force Strategic Air Command.

Reagan, Jack, Executive Director, 1997. Riverside County Transportation Commission, Riverside, personal communication on February 7, 1997.

Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. Riverside County Area Drainage Plans.

Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency, 1995. Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat in Western Riverside County, California.

Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency, 1995. Joint Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report regarding Authorization for Incidental Take and Implementation of a Long-term Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens= Kangaroo Rat in Western Riverside County, California.

Riverside County Waste Management, 1992. Riverside County Source Waste Reduction and Recycling Element and Household Hazardous Waste Element.

Safford, Tom, Principal Engineer, 1997. Western Municipal Water District, Riverside, personal communication on February 4, 1997.

Selway, R.R., 1984. Cultural/Historic Resources Study, March Air Force Base Master Plan Update, prepared for EDAW, Inc.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1993. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April.

Southern California Air Quality Management District, 1981. A Climatological-Air Quality Profile: California South Coast Air Basin.

South Coast Air Quality Management District, 1997. 1997 Air Quality Management Plan.

South Coast Air Quality Management District and Southern California Association of Governments, 1994. 1994 Air Quality Management Plan.

Southern California Association of Governments, Guidelines for the Development of Local Air Quality Elements, 1990.

Southern California Association of Governments, Regional Growth Management Plan.

Southern California Association of Governments, 1997. Draft Regional Transportation Plan.

Southern California Association of Governments, 1997. Final Report March AFB Joint Use Feasibility Study, prepared by P&D Aviation and Advanced Transportation Systems for March Joint Powers Authority.

Spanne, L.J., 1986. Report on a Cultural Resources Survey for Three Proposed Construction Locations on March Air Force Base, prepared for 22 CSG/DEEV March Air Force Base, California.

State Department of Motor Vehicles, California Motor Vehicle Code, 1992.

Stine, P.A., 1993a. Biological Opinion Regarding a Proposed Land Use Strategy and Management of Stephens= Kangaroo Rat on March Air Force Base. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Southern California Field Station, Carlsbad Office.

Stine, P.A., 1993b. A Proposed Change to the Existing Land Use Strategy and Management of Stephens= Kangaroo Rat on March Air Force Base. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Southern California Field Station, Carlsbad Office.

Swope, K., and B. Neiditch, 1987. An Archaeological Assessment of 970 Acres of Land Located on March Air Force Base, Riverside, California, Archaeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside.

Terell, John, Planning Official, 1997. City of Moreno Valley, Moreno Valley, personal communication on February 12, 1997.

Tetra Tech, 1990. Draft Report Cultural Resources Investigations for Proposed Realignment of Facilities from Los Angeles Air Force Base to March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California, prepared for the U.S. Air Force, AFRCE-BMS, Norton Air Force Base.

The Nature Conservancy of California, 1992. Site Management Plan Stephens= Kangaroo Rat Preserve, March Air Force Base.

Tierra Madre Consultants, 1997. March Air Force Base survey of suitable habitat for least Bell=s vireo, unpublished report prepared for Earth Tech Inc., Colton California.

Turner, Roger, Senior Planner, 1997. Eastern Municipal Water District, San Jacinto, personal communication on February 11, 1997.

Western Riverside Council of Governments, 1996. Non-motorized Transportation Plan, Riverside California.

Western Riverside Council of Governments, 1994. Subregional Comprehensive Plan, Riverside California.

Western Riverside Council of Governments, 1996. Non-motorized Transportation Plan, Riverside California.

Western Riverside Council Habitat Consortium, 1995. Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan - Phase I Information Collection and Evaluation, Riverside California.

Whyld, Steve, Director of Planning, 1997. City of Riverside, Riverside, personal communication on February 21, 1997.

Williams, Dusty, Senior Civil Engineer, 1997. Riverside County Flood Control District, Riverside, personal communication on February 14, 1997.

U.S. Air Force, 1992a. Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study, March Air Force Base, California.

U.S. Air Force, 1998. Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study, March Air Force Base, California.

U.S. Air Force, 1994c. BRAC Clean-up Plan, March Air Force Base, California.

U. S. Air Force, May 1997. General Conformity Determination for Proposed Multiple Uses of March ARB (the "conformity analysis"), prepared with Earth Technology Corporation.

U. S. Air Force, November 1994. Basewide Environmental Base Line Survey, March AFB California.

U. S. Air Force, February 1996. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Disposal of Portion of March Air Force Base, California, prepared with Earth Technology Corporation.

U.S. Bureau of Census, 1991. 1990 U.S. Census

U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1971. Soil Surveys for Western Riverside Area, California.

U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, PB-206-717, 1971. Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Community Planning and Development, 1995. The Noise Guidebook.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1979. Environmental Criteria and Standards.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1979. Noise Assessment Guidelines.

U. S. Department of Interior. Sensitive Species List for March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California, Fish and Wildlife Service, Southern California Field Station, Carlsbad Office.

U.S. Department of Transportation, 1980. Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land Use Planning and Control, Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise.

U.S. Geological Survey, 1959. Santa Ana, California Quadrangle, Revised 1979, Scale 1:250,000.

U.S. Geological Survey, 1967a. Perris, California Quadrangle, Revised 1979, 1:24,000.

U.S. Geological Survey, 1967b. Riverside East, California Quadrangle, Photo revised 1990, Scale 1:24,000.

U.S. Geological Survey, 1967c. Steele Peak, California Quadrangle, Photo revised 1990, Scale 1:24,000.

U.S. Geological Survey, 1967d. Sunnymead, California Quadrangle, Photo revised 1990, Scale 1:24,000.

Western Riverside County of Governments, 1994. Final Western Riverside Subregional Comprehensive Plan, Riverside, California.



*Section 7: Preparers of EIR (continued)*

---

Yankee, Randal, Chief Deputy, 1997. Riverside County Sheriff's Department, Riverside, personal communication on February 20, 1997.

## SECTION 8: RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

### 8.1 RESPONDING AGENCIES

The March Joint Powers Authority received comments from the following agencies, organization and/or individuals during the 45-day public review period of the Draft Master Environmental Impact Report. The March Joint Powers Commission held a public hearing on July 21, 1999 during the 45-day public review period, and received no public comment or testimony.

Comments to the Draft Master Environmental Impact Report		
#	Commenting Entity	Comments
1	Moreno Valley Unified School District	1-A
2	Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)	2-A
3	Riverside County Fire Department	3-A to 3-E
4	County of Riverside Health Services Agency	4-A to 4-I
5	Western Riverside Council of Governments	5-A to 5-G
6	South Coast Air Quality Management District	6-A to 6-I
7	Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District	7-A
8	California Indian Legal Services	8-A to 8-F
9	California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Santa Ana Region	9-A to 9-G

The comments to the Draft Master Environmental Impact Report are located herein.

## **8.2 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS**

The March Joint Powers Authority, upon receiving comments to the Draft Master Environmental Impact Report during the 45-day public review period, prepared responses to the comments in accordance with state CEQA Guidelines. Responses to the comments were transmitted to the commenting entities September 3, 1999, greater than 10-days prior to the September 15, 1999 March Joint Powers Commission hearing date proposed for certification of the Final Master Environmental Impact Report.

Comments have been responded, in accordance with a reference system, as noted on the letters of comment. The responses to these comments are as follows:

1. Moreno Valley Unified School District
  1. Comment so noted.
2. Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)
  1. Comment so noted.
3. Riverside County Fire Department
  1. Comments so noted, and included within the MEIR (MEIR 3-134). Based on the fire protection standard of 1 engine company per 3.5 million square feet of commercial or industrial use, there could be a need for 6 engine companies to serve the Planning Area at buildout. The County Fire Departments regularly reviews its services and increases staffing, fire stations and equipment as necessary to keep response time reasonable and to adequately serve the area. Cumulative impacts are expected to be satisfactorily mitigated by the project mitigation measures and implementing program.
  2. Comment so noted, and included within the MEIR. Property is unincorporated territory of the County of Riverside. Once property is transferred to private ownership, the property will be assessed for taxation purposes. Operation expenses for the department will be derived from property tax generated from the March JPA Planning Area, and the development thereof. In addition, the Project incorporates within the mitigation measures, development of mitigation fees for new development for the development of protection service facilities (MEIR 3-133) . Therefore, no new development will occur until appropriate fees are paid to

MEIR 8-2

fund increased public services. Thus the project will not have cumulative significant adverse impacts.

3. The Project addresses the need to secure adequate fire flows for new and planned development (MEIR 3-131 to 3-132). The MEIR contains mitigation measures addressing Emergency Fireflow and Fire Hazard Mitigation Implementation Program. The March JPA, with the transfer of local land use authority by the County of Riverside to the March JPA, has local purview of fire protection standards; therefore, Ordinance No. 787 will not take precedence over the adopted codes and ordinances of the March JPA. Plans are required to be prepared by a Fire Protection Engineer, for fire sprinkler systems.
4. The MEIR contains as mitigation measure the Fire Hazard Mitigation Implementation Program, which addresses open space areas. Currently the bulk of the existing open space area is defined as Stephens= Kangaroo Rat Management Area, which is currently managed (through periodical, controlled burns) by the Center for Natural Lands Management.
5. The project includes the following mitigation measures to address these issues, to a less than significant impact: Fire Hazard Mitigation Implementation Program, Service Capacity Monitoring, Utility and Public Service Providers, and Emergency Fire Flow (MEIR 3-133). Application of these mitigation measures, inclusive of Safety/Risk Management Element Policies 4.1 and 4.2, mitigates any potential impact to fire and emergency responses to a less than significant level.

4. **County of Riverside Health Services Agency**

1. The March JPA General Plan and MEIR are not project specific documents, but rather form the blue print or master plan of development potential within the March JPA Planning Area, and analyze associated impacts. In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines, health services are not defined as an area of impact for assessment. However, the Plan does permit health related services to be accommodated within the Planning Area. Additionally, health care is not solely provided through public agencies, but also by private entities. Based upon these premises, the document is not required to include analysis to health services, and not based upon the lack of new residential development.
2. Table 3-7 denotes LOS F at these intersections to occur, without development of the project, and that with development of the project, the LOS improves to LOS D or better in each case; except for Alessandro @ I-215 SB ramps, which improves to LOS E. Implementation of the mitigation measures includes a capital improvement plan and recommended improvements, including the coordination of improvements with adjoining jurisdictions (see policies 3.3, 4.3 and 4.4 of the Transportation Element).
3. The March JPA General Plan states the March JPA=s goals, policies and plans, as well as implementation programs to allow the future growth and development of the March JPA Planning Area. The assessment of potential environmental impacts is included in the MEIR, not the General Plan document itself. Therefore, the comments on the General Plan are not environmental issues that require a response pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines.

Additionally, many of the General Plan goals and policies cited in the comment are merely potential land uses for the development area. Because the MEIR and General Plan are not development-specific but merely provide an initial first tier review of potential development of the Planning Area, it is impossible to anticipate precise land uses. It is therefore impossible for the March JPA to analyze in any detail potential land uses under the Land Use Element such as possible industrial centers, whether heavy or light industry, intermodal transportation center, and a Metro Link Station. Similarly, under the Transportation Element, the development of a heavy duty truck access route, high speed rail corridor, and civilian aviation operation would be speculative at this level, and not project specific. For all of these potential land uses, additional environmental review will be required prior to project approval. At that time, site specific

knowledge will be available regarding potential project impacts, which will be analyzed at that time. Please refer to the traffic study regarding potential traffic impacts.

With regard to potential noise and air quality impacts, whether policy 8.2 in the General Plan encouraging the separation of sensitive receptors is impractical will be studied when actual projects are submitted for approval.

With regard to Section C under Noise/Air Quality Element, (2) and (3) -- comment noted. The Air Quality Conformity Analysis was completed in 1997, and is valid and consistent with the State Implementation Plan until the year 2010. With regard to Comment A (4) regarding Air Force Village West expansion, such facilities are the responsibility of the project applicant, and will be analyzed at a project specific level, when such time the development application is submitted for approval. With regard to paragraph A (5) under Land Use Element, the MEIR contains a thorough analysis of potential cumulative impacts based upon regional planning studies.

Under Section D, Safety/Risk Management Element -- comment noted. With regard to the General Plan creating 38,000 jobs, the March JPA reiterates that development, if and when it occurs, will be over many years (20 years -30+ years). As projects are approved, additional environmental review will be necessary and must consider impacts on public services. Comment noted that Riverside General Hospital has been replaced by Riverside County Regional Medical Center in Moreno Valley.

With regard to Section E, Resource Management Element, as previously noted, additional environmental review will occur prior to projects being developed that could have adverse impact on the flood plain, water quality, storm drainage system and flood hazards. All feasible mitigation measures will be imposed at that time pursuant to CEQA. Additionally, the ground water contamination is the responsibility of the Air Force, and is included within the IRP program. Clean up is currently in place and being monitored by the Air Force.

4. While adoption of the March JPA General Plan, as a document, itself does not impact the environment, the MEIR does assess potential environmental impacts to the environment if buildout of the planning area results, thereby implementing the March JPA General Plan. These potential impacts would be the result of project specific actions, under the implementation of the March JPA General Plan, and mitigation measures.
5. The March JPA recognizes impacts to air quality to be at a level considered  
MEIR 8-5

to be significant; therefore, a statement of overriding considerations must be adopted. The Noise/Air Quality Element imposes programs and other measures that will assist with the reduction of air emissions. This includes measures such as Public Transit Programs, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Teleconferencing, Traffic Signal Coordination, and Energy Conservation. The implementation of these mitigation measures will assist in reducing air emissions from the March JPA Planning Area.

6. Table MEIR 3-3 lists project thresholds, based upon type of development, that is used as a guideline issued by AEP, to assist in determining projects that may have a potentially significant impact to air quality.
7. The March JPA recognizes impacts to air quality to be at a level considered to be significant; therefore, a statement of overriding considerations must be adopted prior to project approval.
8. Response times may or may not reduce, as traffic service levels improve through implementation of the proposed Transportation Plan of the March JPA General Plan. (MEIR 3-63)
9. Attachment A, is the Notice of Preparation, which denotes areas that were initially identified to be addressed within the MEIR. Geological Problems, Air Quality and Transportation/Circulation all have been analyzed and addressed within the MEIR.

Implementation of the March JPA includes mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts from buildout of the planning area. See responses to comments 4-G & 4-F for Air Quality and Transportation/Circulation. The commentor fails to explain concerns relative to geology; therefore, the March JPA is unable to respond.

5. Western Riverside Council of Governments

**NOTE:** *Comments so noted on the majority of the responses on finding of project consistency with regional plans. March JPA concurs with these findings and will not respond to each individual comment of finding of consistency.*

1. Comment so noted.
2. Metering and other transportation control measures are not precluded from the Project, and Policy 4.7 of the March JPA General Plan Transportation Element denotes the need to AWork closely with CALTRANS to implement

freeway ramp/arterial roadway interchange improvements that promote the efficient flow of vehicular traffic to and from the March JPA Planning Area . . . @ This includes metering of freeway ramps.

3. The March JPA General Plan includes both air cargo and passenger use, as included in Transportation Element policies 13.1, 13.7 and 13.8. In pages 2-35 to 2-36 of the March JPA General Plan. As stated, it denotes the aviation facilities will include the option of an all air cargo or air cargo and passenger terminal facility at March Inland Port. This is consistent with the Airport Layout Plan currently approved by the Federal Aviation Administration. Page 3-64 to 3-66 of the MEIR addresses the use of the airfield as previously approved and entitled through the federal process. While the March JPA is marketing to air cargo, use of the airfield is not limited to solely air cargo use. As noted in the March JPA Transportation Element and the mitigation measures for the Project, March Inland Port includes the passenger air service, in addition to air cargo. Further compounding this issue, is the current review by SCAG of the allocation of MAP, and air cargo tonnage to Southern California area airports.
4. See response to Comment 5-C.
5. Comment so noted. See responses to comments 5-B and 5-C. Based upon these responses, the Project is consistent with the freeway policies and Regional Transportation Plan.
6. The March JPA Planning Area is within the district boundaries of Western Municipal Water District (WMWD). WMWD has reviewed the Project, and issued a letter dated July 28, 1998 pursuant to AB 901. This letter states, AThe District is prepared, with its existing governmental powers and its present and projected distribution facilities, to provide its service area with adequate supplies of water to meet expanding and increasing needs in the years ahead. When and as additional water resources are adequate to meet increasing needs for domestic, industrial and municipal water, the District will be prepared to deliver such supplies.@ This letter is referenced on Page 3-140 of the MEIR. Additionally, the MEIR includes mitigation measures to comply with water management plans and practices.
7. Comment so noted. A mitigation monitoring program and report plan will be considered and adopted if the MEIR is certified.



6. South Coast Air Quality Management District
  1. Comment so noted, and MEIR changed to reflect correct data/information.
  2. Comment so noted, and MEIR changed to reflect correct data/information.
  3. Comments so noted. Table was included as a guideline for reference use only. Table accounts for operational emissions, and not construction (temporary) emissions.
  4. Comment so noted, and MEIR changed to reflect correct data/information.
  5. The emission factors for the air quality analysis were drawn from the SCAQMD=s CEQA Handbook, April 1993. The emission factors were taken from Table A9-5-J-10 on page A9-42. At the time of this study, the 1997 update of the handbook was not available for official use.

Vehicle miles of travel (VMT) and average speed within the March JPA Planning Area were used to generated emissions. The VMT estimates were directly generated by the SCAG based Riverside County Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) travel demand model and average speed estimates were developed by taking a ratio between VMT and VHT. The VMT used in the analysis are as follows:

<i>Alternative</i>	<i>VMT</i>	<i>Avg. Speed</i>
<i>No Build</i>	<i>1,883,682</i>	<i>25 mph</i>
<i>GPLU</i>	<i>2,288,859</i>	<i>20 mph</i>
<i>SKR</i>	<i>2,178,654</i>	<i>22.5 mph</i>

See attached table for further detail.

6. Baseline year is from the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared by the U.S. Air Force for the Disposal of Portions of March Air Force Base. Data collection for the baseline occurred while March was an active duty base, in 1994. The EIS is incorporated by reference within the MEIR, and includes the methodology and assumption referenced.
7. Table MEIR 3-6, is referenced from the EIS prepared by the U.S. Air Force for the Disposal of Portions of March Air Force Base. The EIS is incorporated by reference within the MEIR, and includes the methodology

MEIR 8-8

*Section 8: Responses to Comments (continued)*

---

and assumption referenced.

8. Comment so noted, and language within MEIR modified accordingly.
9. Comment so noted, and language within MEIR modified accordingly.
7. Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District
  1. Comment so noted. The March JPA in conjunction with the District, is currently preparing a Master Drainage Plan for the March JPA Planning Area to assist with addressing storm drain improvement needs. This plan, in conjunction with the mitigation proposed in the General Plan and MEIR will mitigate all potential adverse impacts to downstream properties to below a level of significance.
8. California Indian Legal Services
  1. This comment is informational. Comment is hereby noted and included in the official environmental record of the proposed project, and will be forwarded to the appropriate March Joint Powers Authority decision-makers for their review and consideration.
  2. The entire project area has been surveyed for cultural resources as required for the development of Determination of Eligibility and Findings of Effect for the project. While it is possible that ground disturbing activities may encounter previously unrecorded cultural resources, it is unlikely that additional surveys should be required, or would discover these potential buried resources. The mitigation proposed in the MEIR will address cultural resources. The comment is hereby noted, included in the official environmental record of the proposed project, and will be forwarded to the appropriate March Joint Powers Authority decision-makers for their review and consideration.
  3. The Resource Management Element, Cultural Resource Management Plan (MEIR 3-168) will be developed to govern cultural resource compliance for the various projects within the March JPA sphere of influence. The Pechanga Band of (Luiseno) Mission Indians will be invited to participate in the development and implementation of this document as interested parties as defined in 36 CFR 800.6(a)(4). Additionally, the March JPA will include the Pechanga Band of (Luiseno) Mission Indians on its project notification list.
  4. Requested Mitigation Measures #1 - As stated above in the response to 8-C, MEIR 8-9

5. Requested Mitigation Measure #2 - This requested mitigation measure requests four things: that the Pechanga Band and March JPA develop the mitigation measures for the treatment of sites; specifies the mitigation for those sites; specifies mitigation measures for treatment of human remains; and, requires the presence of Native American monitors. Each suggestion will be addressed individually.

March JPA has direct responsibility to oversee the development of the Resource Management Element, Cultural Resource Management Plan (MEIR 3-168). This document will be developed to comply with applicable mitigation measures as discussed in 36 CFR 800, the Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 and applicable local planning regulations. The Pechanga Band of (Luiseno) Mission Indians will be invited to participate in the development and implementation of this document as interested parties as defined in 36 CFR 800.6(a)(4).

Public Resources Code Section 21083.2 (b, c and d) specifically address how mitigation of impacts will be accomplished through avoidance (b), and excavation (c and d). These regulations will provide the basis for mitigation measures that will be specified for cultural resources.

Treatment of human remains is addressed in State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 which states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition of the remains pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the descendent may inspect the site of the discovery. The descendent shall complete the inspection within 24 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. March JPA has no jurisdiction to circumvent these requirements.

Native American monitoring during ground disturbing activities is not required by either 36 CFR 800, CEQA or local planning statutes. Since the Pechanga will be involved in the development of the Resource Management

MEIR 8-10

Element, Cultural Resource Management Plan (MEIR 3-168) for the project, their comments will be incorporated into that document. Tribal involvement will thereby be assured in developing reasonable mitigation measures.

6. Requested Mitigation Measure #3 - Since the project area is not on tribal lands, nor is there evidence of Pechanga religious or other cultural significance for the property, the Pechanga will be invited to participate in the development and implementation of cultural resource management of the project area as interested parties as defined in 36 CFR 800.6(a)(4). The comment is hereby noted, included in the official environmental record of the proposed project, and will be forwarded to the appropriate March Joint Powers Authority decision-makers for their review and consideration.

The March JPA General Plan, is not a project specific development, but rather a master plan. Future specific development projects in implementing the March JPA General Plan may warrant cultural resource management, and project specific mitigation measures. The development and implementation of project specific cultural resource management and/or mitigation measures will be conducted as defined in 36 CFR 800.6 (a)(4).

9. California Regional Water Quality Control Board - Santa Ana Region
  1. Comment so noted. Please refer to responses to Comments 9-B, for further explanation.
  2. Comment so noted. The Project does not include new residential land uses, and is consistent with the March Air Force Base [AFB] Master Reuse Plan, upon which the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Disposal or Portions of March AFB was based upon. Disposal of property, its use, and restrictions upon transfer from the U.S. Air Force shall proceed based upon those prior actions and documents completed through the base reuse process.
  3. Comment so noted. (See response to Comment 9-B, for further explanation.) The IRP sites, which includes the ground water contamination are addressed and included in the Final EIS for the reuse of March AFB. The MEIR incorporates by reference the Final EIS, and the restrictions of use. It is important to note that both the March AFB Master Reuse Plan and March JPA General Plan proposed land uses that are consistent with the program clean up levels for the IRP sites; therefore, deed restrictions and other institutional controls that may be required for these sites, will not conflict with the proposed land uses.

4. Comment so noted. (See response to Comment 9-B and 9-C, for further explanation.)
5. The Sewer Treatment Plant (STP) with its existing facilities needs to be upgraded, and these problems are currently existing. The March JPA General Plan proposes, and includes within the mitigation monitoring program, several implementing programs, including but not limited to the following: Infrastructure Master Plans, Capital Improvement Program, Service Capacity Monitoring, and Utility and Service Providers. Such actions will be required prior to development. Implementation of these programs will mitigate the aforementioned circumstances to a level considered to be less than significant.
6. See response to Comment 9-E. The implementation of the programs included in the mitigation monitoring program will incorporate disposal options for the treated effluent. Options include additional storage capacity, among others. Options will be included within the master plan to be developed for the water and waste water systems (Infrastructure Master Plan). Such options must be implemented prior to the development. Therefore, any impacts will be mitigated below a level of significance.
7. The ground water clean up permit is under the purview of the federal government (U.S. Air Force), as it is part of the Installation Restoration Program (IRP). The March JPA, as a local government, cannot preempt a federal agency=s permits or purview. This IRP program was addressed within the March AFB Master Reuse Plan, and Environmental Impact Statement for the Disposal or Portions of March AFB, which is incorporated within the MEIR. The actions and programs of the U.S. Air Force are proceeding from those prior actions and documents completed through the base reuse process. Therefore, it is not an issue to be addressed within the MEIR.

Comments to the Draft Master Environmental Impact Report, which affected the document text, has been incorporated into the Final Master EIR. Where appropriate, the text of the draft document was amended to incorporate the appropriate response to comments, thereby resulting in the final document language as presented herein.