Temecula Valley Hospital Master Plan Update and Planned Development Overlay Amendment

Findings and Facts in Support of Findings
and
Statement of Overriding Considerations

State Clearinghouse No. 2005031017

City of Temecula

May 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
g/bhp-hr	grams per brake horsepower-hour
Gpm	gallons per minute
GVWR	Gross Vehicle Weight Rating
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
NZE	near-zero emission
PDO	Planned Development Overlay
PM	particulate matter
SEIR	Subsequent EIR
UHS	Universal Health Services, Inc.
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
ZE	zero-emissions

1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code § 21000, et seq. ("CEQA") and the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15000, et seq. (the "Guidelines") provide that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been certified that identifies one or more significant effects on the environment caused by the project unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- Specific economic, social, or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the EIR..[1]

Pursuant to the requirements of CEQA, the City Council of the City of Temecula hereby makes the following environmental findings in connection with the proposed Temecula Valley Hospital Master Plan Update and Planned Development Overlay Amendment Project (Project), as more fully described in the Final Subsequent EIR (SEIR) dated May2025 – SCH 2005031017. These findings are based upon written and oral evidence included in the record of these proceedings, comments on the Draft SEIR and the written responses thereto, and reports presented to the Planning Commission and City Council by City staff and the City's environmental consultant.

1 Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21081; 14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15091.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project applicant, Universal Health Services, Inc. (UHS), is proposing the Temecula Valley Hospital Master Plan Update and Planned Development Overlay Amendment (proposed project), which is the subject of a Subsequent EIR (SEIR). The proposed project would consist of revisions to the currently approved project, which would require a Major Modification and Planned Development Overlay (PDO) Amendment. The Amendment revises the purpose and intent of the PDO; establishes an administrative approval process for buildings and structures that conform to the architectural standards of the PDO; clarifies the allowable mix of structures and uses in the PDO; and sets forth design guidelines for buildings and structures. Specifically, the proposed project would revise the approved master plan to allow for development of the following structures: an approximately 20,000-square-foot expansion to the existing hospital building emergency department; a 125,000-square-foot, five-story second hospital tower; two four-story, 80,000-square-foot medical office buildings, a 14,000-square-foot utility plant; an approximately 125,000-square-foot, five-story third hospital tower, a four-story parking structure; and six surface parking lots. In addition, the proposed project includes relocating the existing helipad from its interim location to the roof of the proposed parking structure. The proposed project would be implemented through three phases of development. The existing hospital building and associated infrastructure that were constructed during Phase I of the currently approved project would be maintained in place.

The proposed project would result in full buildout of the Temecula Valley Hospital master plan on the project site. The existing 237,305-square-foot hospital building and 5,180-square-foot storage building, which were constructed as part of Phase I, would be maintained onsite. In addition, the existing onsite backbone circulation system and access driveways to Temecula Parkway and De Portola Road would remain unchanged. The remaining undeveloped areas, which were previously graded as part of Phase I, would be developed in two phases (II-III) under the proposed project. Specific timing for the development of Phases II to III would be dependent upon regional demand for the proposed uses and is not precisely known at this time. The existing onsite parking lots would be reconfigured and relocated as the individual phases are developed. The proposed project would not involve major changes to the site's topography. The proposed facilities and phasing are described in the Final SEIR.

Several structures that were originally proposed in the currently approved project would no longer be constructed, which include the cancer center and fitness rehabilitation center.

All proposed buildings would be designed to meet UHS Temecula Exterior Design Standards. The design and architectural style of new buildings would be consistent with the Spanish-Mediterranean or Mission styles of existing development on the project site and nearby development.

The proposed pervious features onsite include various existing and proposed water quality basins and detention basins, trees included in parking islands and open spaces with drought tolerant vegetation. All impervious areas, except for the northern horse trail, the eastern independent channel and existing pervious areas will be replaced with new landscaping such as trees. All surface water flows from buildings and parking lots will be routed to the project's biofiltration basins; non-structural improvements such as rain barrels and tree wells would also be installed as needed to comply with applicable pollutant control and hydromodification requirements. Water quality improvements installed on the east side, where the existing hospital building and storage building are located, during Phase I will remain; new water quality improvements would be focused on the existing, undeveloped west side of the project site, and where new development and reconfigurations are proposed on the east side.

Project Objectives

As set forth in the SEIR, objectives that the City of Temecula and applicant seek to achieve with this Project (the "Project Objectives") are as follows:

The City's objectives for the currently approved project, as listed in the 2006 EIR, are to:

- Provide for superior, easily accessible emergency medical services within the City of Temecula;
- Provide for a regional hospital campus including a hospital facility, medical offices, cancer center and fitness rehabilitation center designed to be an operationally efficient state-of-the-art facility;
- Encourage future development of a regional hospital and related services;
- Support development of biomedical, research, and office facilities to diversify Temecula's employment base;
- Ensure the compatibility of development on the subject site with surrounding uses in terms of the size and configuration of buildings, use of materials and landscaping, the location of access routes, noise impacts, traffic impacts, and other environmental conditions; and
- Incorporate buffers that minimize the impacts of noise, light, visibility of activity, and vehicular traffic on surrounding residential uses.

The applicant's objectives for the currently approved project, as listed in the 2006 EIR, are to:

- Provide high-quality health services to the residents of Temecula and surrounding communities;
- Provide a regional hospital facility that includes standard hospital services, with outpatient care, rehabilitation, and medical offices;
- Provide a regional hospital facility designed to be an operationally efficient, state-of-the-art facility that meets the needs of the region and hospital doctors; and
- Provide medical offices, a cancer center and fitness rehabilitation center adjacent to the hospital facility to meet the needs of doctors and patients who need ready access to the hospital for medical procedures.

The proposed project is consistent with and furthers the objectives of the currently approved project, as listed above. Specifically, the proposed project would:

- Increase the size of the originally proposed hospital and emergency department to accommodate a growing regional population and number of patients;
- Provide a mix of medical facilities to meet the demand for a variety of inpatient and outpatient medical services;
- Support development of biomedical, research, and office facilities to diversify Temecula's employment base;
- Provide medical office space adjacent to the hospital facility to meet the needs of doctors and patients who need ready access to the hospital for medical procedures; and
- Relocate the existing helipad to a central location and change the helicopter flight approach/departure path to minimize helicopter noise impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses.

3 PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An EIR was prepared for the Temecula Valley Hospital project and was certified by the City of Temecula (City) in January 2006. In February 2006, a legal challenge to the hospital project was filed on the grounds that the EIR was inadequate, which resulted in a ruling that found that the EIR did not adequately address several areas, and that the City failed to make valid findings that the City had adopted all feasible mitigation measures before adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations. In response, the City prepared an SEIR pursuant to the court's direction that was certified in 2008. In 2011, the project applicant, United Health Services, Inc. (UHS) filed a planning application to change the phasing of the project to reduce the number of beds from 170 to 140 in Phase I, modify the building facades, relocate the truck loading bays and service yards, and relocate mechanical equipment. An Addendum to the 2008 Final SEIR was prepared and adopted by the City in February 2011. Additionally, in July 2012, a conservation easement was approved to satisfy the off-site mitigation requirements for impacts caused by development of the hospital. Phase I of the hospital began operations on Monday, October 14, 2013.

In February 2016, the City certified a Supplemental EIR for a Major Modification to relocate the previously City-approved helistop to two new locations, an interim location for use during preliminary project phases and a permanent location on the roof of a future hospital tower constructed during a later phase, and to develop the location of the previously City-approved helistop location with a single-story, 5,000-square-foot storage building.

The following provides a history and timeline of the environmental documentation that has been prepared for the Temecula Valley Hospital.

January 2006 Environmental Impact Report

UHS (applicant) filed planning applications in 2004 and 2005 for a General Plan Amendment (PA04-0462); Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Development Plan (PA04-0463); a Tentative Parcel Map (PA04-0571); and a Zone Change to PDO-9 (Planned Development Overlay-9) (PA05-0302) to develop and operate the regional hospital facility. This included the following:

- A General Plan Amendment to remove the Z2 overlay from the General Plan Land Use Map, which limited the height of buildings along Temecula Parkway to 2 stories, and the Professional Office General Plan land use designation from the site.
- A Zone Change from Professional Office and De Portola Road Planned Development Overlay (PDO-8) to Temecula Hospital Planned Development Overlay (PDO-9). PDO-9 allows a maximum building height of 115 feet for 30 percent of the roof area of the hospital.
- A CUP to construct a 320-bed hospital facility and helistop (City zoning regulations require CUPs for such uses).
- A Development Plan application for the construction of a 408,160-square-foot hospital, a helistop, two medical offices totaling approximately 140,000 square feet, a 10,000-square-foot cancer center, and an 8,000-square-foot fitness rehabilitation center. Total building area would involve approximately 566,160 square feet on the 35.31-acre site.
- A Tentative Parcel Map (Map 32468) to consolidate eight lots into a single parcel.

The City circulated an Initial Study from March 8, 2005 to April 6, 2005 (State Clearinghouse #2005031017) with the intent of preparing a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). At the Planning Commission hearing held on April 20, 2005, the City received public input and testimony and determined that a Focused EIR should be prepared for the project to analyze potential aesthetics, air quality, hydrology and groundwater, land use and planning, noise, and transportation impacts. The City prepared a Draft EIR that was circulated for public review from September 28, 2005 to October 28, 2005. The Final EIR was prepared and City Planning Commission hearings were held on November 16, 2005, and January 5, 2006, and the City Council adopted a resolution certifying the EIR on January 24, 2006. The Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to short-term, long-term, and cumulative air quality; noise from emergency helicopter flights; and cumulative traffic and circulation impacts. It concluded that potentially

significant impacts related to the following would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures: aesthetics (light and glare); operational noise impacts; project transportation impacts. All other impacts were found to be less than significant or result in no impact.

On February 24, 2006, a legal challenge to the project on the grounds that the EIR was inadequate in several respects was filed by two separate groups (California Nurses Association and Citizens Against Noise and Traffic) and resulted in a court ruling that rejected many of the challenges, but found that the EIR did not adequately address the following areas:

- Construction noise impacts;
- Siren noise impacts;
- Mitigation measures for traffic impacts; and
- Potential impacts from underground methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) plumes generated by three gas stations in the vicinity that might have the potential to migrate under the site, contaminate the soil on the site, and generate unhealthful gas vapors.

January 2008 Supplemental Environmental Impact Report

On May 3, 2007, the Riverside County Superior Court issued a Judgment and Peremptory Writ of Mandate and directed the City to vacate the project approvals and not to reconsider the project unless it first circulated, reviewed, and considered a Supplemental EIR (SEIR) that addressed noise impacts, traffic mitigation, and the potential impact of MTBE plumes, as previously described. Other environmental impacts addressed in the prior EIR were considered to be adequate under CEQA and were not revisited in the Supplemental EIR.

New planning applications for the project were submitted [PA07-0198 (General Plan Amendment), PA07-0199 (Zone Change), PA07-0200 (Development Plan), PA07-0201 (Tentative Parcel Map), and PA07-0202 (Conditional Use Permit)], and on July 12, 2007, a scoping session was held in accordance with the Riverside County Superior Court direction. The Supplemental EIR was circulated for public review from November 5, 2007 to December 5, 2007, and on January 9, 2008, the Planning Commission considered the new planning applications and recommended that the City Council certify the Supplemental EIR. The Supplemental EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts related to noise from emergency vehicle sirens; noise generated during construction; and direct project-related and cumulative traffic impacts. It concluded that impacts related to MTBE plumes would be less than significant.

On January 22, 2008, the City Council rescinded and invalidated its previous approvals of PA04-0462 (General Plan Amendment), PA04-0463 (Conditional Use Permit and Development Plan), PA04-0571 (Tentative Parcel Map), and PA05-0302 (Zone Change to PDO-9); approved planning applications for PA07-0198 (General Plan Amendment), PA07-0199 (Zone Change), PA07-0200 (Development Plan), PA07-0201 (Tentative Parcel Map), and PA07-0202 (Conditional Use Permit); and adopted Resolution No. 08-10 certifying the SEIR for the project. No legal challenges were brought forward on the Supplemental EIR or other project approvals.

February 2011 Major Modification and Addendum

On June 18, 2010, UHS filed planning application PA10-0194 for a Major Modification to a Development Plan to change the phasing of the project by reducing the number of beds from 170 to 140 in Phase I, to modify the building facades of the hospital towers, to relocate the truck loading bays and service yards, and to relocate mechanical equipment from an outdoor area at the service yard to an expanded indoor area at the northern portion of the hospital building. An Addendum to the Final SEIR was prepared to assess the potential environmental effects of the approval of the Major Modification application. On December 15, 2010, the City Planning Commission recommended approval of the Addendum and Findings that the Major Modification does not involve significant new effects, does not change the baseline environmental conditions, and does not represent new information of substantial importance that shows that the Major Modification would have one or more significant effects not previously discussed in the Final SEIR. On February 8, 2011, the City Council adopted a resolution to approve the Addendum for the project. No legal challenge was brought forward, and UHS began construction on the project. Construction of Phase I began in June 2011, and Phase I began operating on October 14, 2013.

July 2012 Conservation Easement

In July 2012, a conservation easement of 1.9 acres was approved at the Wilson Creek mitigation site through an agreement with UHS and Wilson Creek Farms, LLC. The easement is provided to satisfy the off-site mitigation requirements for impacts caused by the development of the hospital as set forth by the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region Amendment to Clean Water Act Section 401 and water quality condition 11c-031 from the Section 401 Permit, dated September 26, 2011.

February 2016 Helistop Project Supplemental EIR

In February 2016, the City certified a Supplemental SEIR for a Major Modification to relocate the previously City-approved helistop to two new locations, an interim location for use during preliminary project phases and a permanent location on the roof of a future hospital tower constructed during a later phase, and to develop the location of the previously City-approved helistop location with a single-story, 5,000-square-foot storage building. The SEIR was limited to analysis of aesthetics, hazards, and noise. It concluded that the new helistop locations would result in significant and unavoidable impacts due to helicopter noise. Aesthetics and hazards impacts were found to be less than significant.

CURRENT CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

This current Final SEIR (March 2025) addresses the anticipated environmental effects of the proposed project in conformance with the provisions of CEQA and CEQA Guidelines, as amended. City staff have determined that additional review beyond the previously certified EIRs for the Temecula Hospital Project is necessary to address the impacts of the proposed project. Because the proposed project would result in new significant environmental impacts that were not previously addressed in the certified EIRs, a Subsequent EIR, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, has been prepared to evaluate the project-specific changes.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15150(a) states that an EIR:

> "may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Where all or part of another document is incorporated by reference, the incorporated language shall be considered to be set forth in full as part of the text of the EIR."

In light of the previous environmental review contained in the previously certified EIRs and Addendum, the current SEIR incorporates by reference the relevant analysis of environmental topics considered in the previously certified EIRs and Addendum, which are available for public review at the City of Temecula Community Development Department and online on the City's website: http://laserfiche.temeculaca.gov/WebLink/Browse.aspx?id=197433&dbid=2&repo=Temecula.

The level of specificity of an EIR is determined by the nature of the project and the rule of reason. The City, as lead agency, has determined the key environmental issues that could have significant impacts associated with the proposed project, and that were the focus of the SEIR analysis, include aesthetics; air quality; cultural and tribal cultural resources; energy; geology and soils; greenhouse gas emissions; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; land use and planning; noise; population and housing; public services (fire protection and law enforcement); transportation; and utilities and service systems.

Based on previous environmental analyses, existing conditions of the project site, and details of the proposed project, the following environmental effects were determined not to be significant and were therefore not discussed in detail in the Draft SEIR: agriculture and forestry resources; biological resources; mineral resources; public services (schools, parks); recreational facilities; and wildfire.

4 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The Final SEIR (May2025) identified the potential for the Project to cause significant environmental impacts in the specific areas of: air quality; cultural and tribal cultural resources; noise; paleontological resources; and transportation. Mitigation measures have been identified that would mitigate all of the environmental impacts to these areas to a less than significant level. The City Council finds that the proposed feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final SEIR would reduce the proposed project's impacts to less than significant.

4.1 CULTURAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 3.3-1: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of Unique Archaeological Resources

Construction activities for the proposed project, including any grading, grubbing, trenching, excavation, or earth-moving activities in previously undisturbed areas, or any ground disturbance that extends deeper than the mass grading previously completed in 2011 or has potential to encounter native soil, could encounter and/or damage previously undiscovered archaeological resources that qualify as unique archaeological resources under CEQA. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR. The following mitigation measures reduce potentially significant project impacts to cultural resources to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-1a: Retain a Qualified Archaeologist

Prior to the issuance of each grading permit and before to the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project applicant shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist, defined as an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for archeology and as approved by the City of Temecula, to provide expertise in carrying out all mitigation measures related to archeological resources (Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a through 3.3-1c).

Mitigation Measure 3.3-1b: Develop and Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program

The qualified professional archaeologist, retained by the project applicant, shall prepare a worker environmental awareness program. The program shall be provided to all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter heritage and cultural resources. A copy of the worker environmental awareness program shall be provided to the City Development Services Department before construction activities begin. The topics to be addressed in the worker environmental awareness program will include, at a minimum:

- types of cultural resources expected on the project site;
- types of evidence that indicates cultural resources might be present (e.g., ceramic shards, lithic scatters, soil changes);
- what to do if a worker encounters a possible resource;
- what to do if a worker encounters bones or possible bones; and
- penalties for removing or intentionally disturbing heritage and cultural resources, such as those identified in the Archaeological Resources Protection Act.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-1c: Implement Procedures to Address Discovery of Subsurface Archaeological Features and Tribal Cultural Resources

Where proposed project construction includes any grading, grubbing, trenching, excavation, or earth-moving activities in previously undisturbed areas, or any ground disturbance that extends deeper than the mass grading completed in 2011 or has potential to encounter native soil, the qualified archaeologist shall conduct monitoring of these activities. If any prehistoric or historic-period subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened soil ("midden"), that could conceal cultural deposits are discovered during construction, all ground-disturbing activity within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and the qualified professional archaeologist shall assess the significance of the find and determine the appropriate next steps in consultation with the City of Temecula. If the qualified archaeologist determines the archaeological material to be Native American in nature, the City of Temecula shall contact the Pechanga Tribe for their input on the preferred treatment of the find. If the find is determined to be significant by the archaeologist or the tribal representative (i.e., because it is determined to constitute a unique archaeological resource or a Tribal Cultural Resource, as appropriate), the archaeologist and tribal representative, as appropriate, shall develop, and the project applicant shall implement, appropriate procedures to protect the integrity of the resource and ensure that no additional resources are affected. Procedures could include, but would not necessarily be limited to, preservation in place (which shall be the preferred manner of mitigating impacts to archaeological sites), archival research, subsurface testing, or contiguous block unit excavation and data recovery (when it is the only feasible mitigation, and pursuant to a data recovery plan). No work at the discovery location shall resume until all necessary investigation and evaluation of the resource has been satisfied. The landowner shall relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts that are recovered as a result of proposed project implementation to the Pechanga Tribe for proper treatment and disposition.

If, during the course of monitoring the qualified archaeologist can demonstrate, based on observations of subsurface conditions that the level of monitoring should be reduced, increased, or discontinued, the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the project applicant and the City of Temecula, may adjust the level of monitoring, as warranted.

Facts in Support of Findings

The SEIR analysis of the proposed project determined that with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a, 3-3-2b, and 3.3-1c, impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a, 3.3-1b, and 3.3-1c would avoid substantial adverse changes to the significance of unique archaeological resources by requiring the project applicant to retain a qualified archaeologist, requiring training for all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter archaeological resources, requiring construction to halt if potential archaeological resources are discovered, coordination with the Pechanga Tribe (if applicable), implementation of preservation options (including data recovery, mapping, capping, or avoidance), and proper curation if significant artifacts are recovered. Implementation of these mitigation measures will be enforced through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Impact 3.3-2: Cause a Substantial Adverse Change in the Significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource

Prior development at the project site and surrounding area have resulted in the discovery of artifacts. Additionally, tribal consultation resulted in the identification that the project site is within a Traditional Cultural Property and therefore likely contains additional Tribal Cultural Resources. Therefore, excavation activities associated with proposed project construction may disturb or destroy previously undiscovered significant subsurface Tribal Cultural Resources. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR. The following mitigation measures reduce potentially significant project impacts to tribal cultural resources to less than significant.

Implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-1a (above): Retain a Qualified Archaeologist

Implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-1b (above): Develop and Implement a Worker Environmental Awareness Program

Implement Mitigation Measure 3.3-1c (above): Implement Procedures to Address Discovery of Subsurface Archaeological Features and Tribal Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measure 3.3-2a: Retain a Native American Monitor

At the time a development application is submitted to the City for future individual building/projects associated with the Temecula Valley Hospital Master Plan, as revised by the proposed project, the City shall route each development application to the Pechanga Band of Indians for review and to request the inclusion of any conditions of approval related to the avoidance of substantial adverse changes to the significance of Tribal Cultural Resources.

Prior to the issuance of each grading permit and before the start of any ground-disturbing activity, the project applicant shall retain and compensate for the services of a Tribal monitor/consultant who is approved by the Pechanga Tribe. The project applicant shall contact the Tribal representatives a minimum of seven days before beginning earthwork or other ground disturbing activities in previously undisturbed areas, or any ground disturbance that extends deeper than the mass grading previously completed in 2011 or has potential to encounter native soil; construction activities will proceed if no response is received 48 hours before ground disturbing activities. The Tribal monitor shall only be present onsite during the construction phases that involve ground disturbing activities in previously undisturbed areas, including but not limited to tree removals, boring, excavation, drilling, and trenching, within the project site, or any ground disturbance that extends deeper than the mass grading previously completed in 2011 or has potential to encounter native soil. Monitoring is not required for any ground-disturbing activities that do not meet these criteria. The Tribal monitor shall complete daily monitoring logs that describe each day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The onsite monitoring shall end when the site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal representatives and monitor have indicated that the site has a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.

Mitigation Measure 3.3-2b: Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement

The developer is required to enter into a Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement with the Pechanga Tribe. The Agreement shall be in place prior to issuance of a grading permit. To accomplish this, the applicant should contact the Pechanga Tribe no less than 30 days and no more than 60 days prior to issuance of a grading permit. This Agreement will address the treatment and disposition of cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of professional Pechanga Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered onsite. The Pechanga monitor's authority to stop and redirect grading will be exercised in consultation with the project archaeologist in order to evaluate the significance of any potential resources discovered on the property. Pechanga and archaeological monitors shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and groundbreaking activities, and shall also have the limited authority to stop and redirect grading activities should an inadvertent cultural resource be identified.

The following notes shall be included on all grading plans prior to issuance of a grading permit:

- Discovery of Cultural Resources: "If cultural resources are discovered during the project construction (inadvertent discoveries), all work in the area of the find shall cease, and the qualified archaeologist and the Pechanga monitor shall investigate the find, and make recommendations as to treatment."
- Archaeological Monitoring: "A qualified archaeological monitor will be present and will have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities, in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe and their designated monitors, to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property."

- Tribal Monitoring: "A Pechanga Tribal monitor will be present and will have the authority to stop and redirect grading activities, in consultation with the project archaeologist and their designated monitors, to evaluate the significance of any potential resources discovered on the property."
- Relinquishment of Cultural Resources: "The landowner agrees to relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including all archaeological artifacts that are found on the project area, to the Pechanga Tribe for proper treatment and disposition."

Facts in Support of Findings

The SEIR analysis of the proposed project determined that with the implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a, 3.3-1b, 3.3-1c, 3.3-2a and 3.3-2b impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.3-1a, 3.3-1b, 3.3-1c, 3.3-2a, and 3.3-2b would avoid substantial adverse change to the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource by providing the Pechanga Band the opportunity to review proposed development plans as they are submitted to the City and request conditions related to the protection of Tribal Cultural Resources, requiring the developer to enter into a cultural resources treatment agreement with Pechanga prior to issuance of any grading permits, requiring the project applicant to retain a Tribal monitor, requiring training for all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter Tribal Cultural Resources, requiring construction to halt if potential resources are discovered, implementation of preservation options (including preservation in place, data recovery, mapping, capping, or avoidance) and proper curation if significant artifacts are recovered, if deemed appropriate by the Tribe. Implementation of these mitigation measures will be enforced through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

4.2 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 3.5-4: Directly or Indirectly Destroy a Unique Paleontological Resource or Site or Unique Geologic Feature

Construction activities for the proposed project, including any ground disturbance that extends deeper than the mass grading previously completed in 2011 or greater than 10 feet below the ground surface, whichever is less, or ground disturbance within any previously ungraded areas, could encounter and/or damage previously undiscovered paleontological resources. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR. The following mitigation measures reduce potentially significant project Impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.5-4: Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Protection

The project applicant shall retain a qualified paleontologist to conduct an on-site training that will alert all construction personnel and supervisors involved in equipment training about the possibility of encountering fossils. The qualified paleontologist shall describe the appearance and types of fossils likely that could be seen during construction. Construction personnel shall be trained about the proper notification procedures should fossils be encountered.

The qualified paleontologist shall also monitor all ground disturbing activities that extend deeper than the mass grading previously completed in 2011 or greater than 10 feet below the ground surface, whichever is less, or ground disturbance within any previously ungraded areas.

If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, the qualified paleontologist shall immediately halt operations within 100 feet of the find and notify the City of Temecula. The qualified paleontologist shall identify and salvage fossils so that construction delays can be minimized. If large specimens are discovered, the qualified paleontologist shall have the authority to halt or divert grading and construction equipment while the finds are removed. The qualified paleontologist shall be responsible for implementing all tasks summarized below.

- In the event of discovery, salvage of unearthed fossil remains, typically involving simple excavation of the exposed specimen but possibly also plaster-jacketing of large and/or fragile specimens, or more elaborate quarry excavations of richly fossiliferous deposits.
- Recovery of stratigraphic and geologic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, typically including description of lithologies of fossil-bearing strata, measurement and description of the overall stratigraphic section, and photographic documentation of the geologic setting.
- Laboratory preparation (cleaning and repair) of collected fossil remains to a point of curation, generally involving removal of enclosing rock material, stabilization of fragile specimens (using glues and other hardeners), and repair of broken specimens.
- Cataloging and identification of prepared fossil remains, typically involving scientific identification of specimens, inventory of specimens, assignment of catalog numbers, and entry of data into an inventory database.
- Preparation of a final report summarizing the field and laboratory methods used, the stratigraphic units inspected, the types of fossils recovered, and the significance of the curated collection.

Facts in Support of Findings

The SEIR analysis of the proposed project determined that the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-4 would reduce impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant by providing for the monitoring and protection of paleontological resources through recovery, cataloguing, and reporting. Implementation of this mitigation measure will be enforced through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

4.3 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Impact 3.7-2: Create a Significant Hazard to the Public or the Environment through Reasonably Foreseeable Upset and/or Accident Conditions Involving the Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment

The proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment and result in a potentially significant impact. The project site was reviewed for impact relating to Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE) from nearby gas station underground fuel storage tanks in the 2008 SEIR, and no detectable concentrations of MTBE or Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) were found at the project site. However, although unlikely, it is possible that contaminated soil could be at further distances below ground surface. Encountering contaminated soil, surface water, and groundwater without taking proper precautions during ground-disturbing project construction activities could result in the exposure of construction workers and consequently result in associated potentially significant adverse human health and environmental impacts. This impact would be potentially significant.

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR. The following mitigation measures reduce potentially significant project Impacts to hazards and hazardous materials to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 Monitoring and Disposal of Any Contaminated Soils

Where proposed project construction includes any grading, grubbing, trenching, excavation, or earth-moving activities in previously undisturbed areas, or any ground disturbance that extends deeper than the mass grading completed in 2011 or has potential to encounter native soil, construction personnel shall conduct monitoring of these activities for the potential presence of MTBE or VOCs (e.g., where stained or odiferous soils are encountered). Soils determined to have detectable levels of MTBE or VOCs, if any, shall be segregated, stockpiled on-site in accordance

with applicable regulations, and sampled prior to disposal at an appropriate facility, in accordance with the requirements of the respective disposal facility. All contaminated soils shall be disposed of off-site in accordance with applicable local, State, and federal laws regulating the transport and disposal of hazardous and non-hazardous materials. These materials shall be transported to a permitted disposal facility by a licensed waste hauler. Any soils with detectable levels of MTBE- or other VOC-impacted soil shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations.

Prior to the issuance of any encroachment permit, the project applicant shall provide documentation (for example, all required waste manifests) to the City of Temecula showing that abatement of any soils with detectable levels of MTBE- or other VOCs- has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 790, 792, 797, 798, and 799 and CCR Title 8, Article 2.6).

Facts in Support of Findings

The SEIR analysis of the proposed project determined that the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.7-1 would reduce impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.5-4 would avoid direct and indirect impacts on unique paleontological resources by requiring the project applicant to retain a qualified paleontologist, requiring training for all construction personnel and supervisors who will have the potential to encounter and alter paleontological resources, requiring construction to halt if potential paleontological resources are discovered, and proper curation if paleontological resources are recovered. Implementation of these mitigation measures will be enforced through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

4.4 NOISE

Impact 3.10-6: Generate Substantial Long-term Stationary Noise Level Increases

The proposed project includes a central utility plant, which would include new stationary sources (i.e., boilers, air chillers, cooling towers). Based on the modeling conducted, 24-hour CNEL noise levels at all nearby receptors would exceed applicable City exterior noise standards (i.e., 65 dBA CNEL for single-family homes, 70 dBA CNEL for multi-family homes), and would result in substantial increases (i.e., more than 5 dBA increase where existing noise levels are less than 60 dBA and a more than 3 dBA increase where existing noise levels are between 60 and 65 dBA) in noise. In addition, new HVAC units would be installed on the roofs of new project buildings. However, HVAC units are typical noise sources in urban areas and already exist in the project area. Further, existing noise sources (i.e., Temecula Parkway) would continue to dominate the ambient noise environment as HVAC units are intermittent noise sources that would not result in a substantial increase in noise. Nonetheless, the proposed central utility plant would result in a substantial increase in noise and in noise levels that exceed applicable City exterior noise standards. This impact would be **potentially significant.**

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR. The following mitigation measures reduce potentially significant project central plant noise impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 3.10-2: Reduce Operational Noise from the Central Utility Plant

Prior to approval of final plans for the proposed central utility plant, the applicant shall hire a qualified acoustical specialist to prepare a noise minimization plan for the central utility plant. This plan shall identify design strategies and noise attenuation features that the project will implement to ensure that operation of the central utility plant does not result in exterior noise levels that exceed the following standards:

- 65 dBA CNEL for low-density residential, (single-family residences along De Portola Road);
- 70 dBA CNEL for medium-density residential (residential uses along Margarita Road);
- an increase of 5 dB or higher where existing levels are less than 60 dBA CNEL;

- an increase of 3 dBA or higher where existing levels are between 60 and 65 dBA CNEL; or
- an increase of 1.5 dB or higher where existing levels are higher than 65 dBA CNEL.

The noise minimization plan shall include noise measurements characterizing existing noise levels at the time preparing of the plan is commenced, and/or modeling of noise levels generated by the central utility plant, as needed, to demonstrate compliance with the above standards. This plan also shall demonstrate how one or more of the following measures (or other measures demonstrated to be equally effective) shall be implemented to achieve the required standards.

- Design the central utility plant such that the structure itself is between the onsite noise sources (e.g., chillers, cooling towers) and the offsite receptors, serving as a noise barrier protecting off-site receptors from noise generated by on-site operational equipment. If the structure can completely block the line-of-sight from the source to the receiver, noise levels could potentially be inaudible at offsite locations.
- Enclose the area and individual sources where operational equipment would operate with noise barriers / walls, such that the noise barrier completely blocks the line-of-sight between the source and offsite receptors. Generally, a barrier that breaks the line of sight between a source and a receiver will result in at least 5 dB but can readily achieve a 10 dB reduction and taller barriers provide increased noise reduction.
- Install equipment with pre-installed acoustical reduction technology (e.g., louvers, baffles) to reduce individual equipment noise to the extent technologically feasible.
- Prior to final building inspection and operation of the new central utility plant, a noise test shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical professional, to demonstrate compliance with the City of Temecula's residential noise standards (i.e., 65 dBA CNEL for low density residential and 70 dBA CNEL for medium and high density residential) at all nearby and affected residential land uses. If noise standards are not met, the City shall not grant rights to operate the facility until it can be demonstrated that noise standards would be in compliance.

Measures identified in the noise minimization plan shall be incorporated into the project design as-needed to achieve the noise standards set forth in this measure. Prior to approval of future development plans implementing the proposed project, the City's Community Development Director is responsible for verifying that the noise minimization plan has been prepared in compliance with this measure and measures needed to achieve compliance with the noise standards set forth in this measure are included in the site plan.

Facts in Support of Findings

The SEIR analysis of the proposed project determined that the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.10-2 would reduce project central plant noise impacts to less than significant. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.10-2 would require preparation of noise minimization plan demonstrating that operation of the central utility plant would not result in substantial increases in exterior noise levels at sensitive receptors, including the two adjacent single-family residences and units located at the Madera Vista Apartments, based on objective standards. Measures identified in the noise minimization plan as necessary to achieve exterior noise level standards are required to be incorporated into the proposed project. Implementation of these mitigation measures will be enforced through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

5 POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS DETERMINED TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

The following potentially significant environmental impacts would remain significant and unavoidable with the inclusion of all proposed feasible mitigation measures, as discussed below:

5.1 AIR QUALITY

Impact 3.2-2: Generate Construction and Operational Emissions in Exceedance of SCAQMD's Regional Mass Emission Thresholds

Proposed project construction activities and overlapping construction and operational activities would generate maximum daily project-related criteria pollutant emissions that would exceed SCAQMD regional construction-period thresholds for VOC and NO_X, while the increase in maximum daily project-related criteria pollutant emissions over existing conditions resulting from proposed project operations would not exceed SCAQMD operations-period thresholds for any pollutant. Therefore, the impact of proposed project construction and combined construction and operations, but not operations, would be **potentially significant.**

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which substantially lessen, though not avoid, the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR; implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce construction and overlapping construction and operational emissions but not to a less than significant level. In addition, specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable. (PRC Sections 21081[a][1] and [a][3]; State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091[a][1] and [a][3].) The City concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the proposed project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below (PRC Section 21081[b]).

Mitigation Measure 3.2-1: Construction Low VOC Coatings

To reduce VOC emissions during construction activities involving application of coatings, the City shall require that construction contractors use low-VOC coatings that have a VOC content of 10 g/L or less during all phases of construction.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-2: Construction Equipment Reduction Measures

To reduce VOC and NO_X emissions during construction, the City shall require that construction contractors implement the following:

- Ensure that all off-road diesel-powered equipment over 25 horsepower used during construction will be equipped with an EPA Tier 4 Final engine, except for specialized construction equipment in which an EPA Tier 4 Final engine is not commercially available within 50 miles of the project site. The contractor or project proponent shall submit written evidence to the City prior to commencement of construction activities that Tier 4 or cleaner equipment shall be used, or that Tier 4 or cleaner equipment is not commercially available for use during the entire duration of that project's construction period.
- Use renewable diesel fuel in all heavy-duty off-road diesel-fueled equipment. Renewable diesel must meet the most recent ASTM D975 specification for Ultra Low Sulfur Diesel and have a carbon intensity no greater than 50 percent of diesel with the lowest carbon intensity among petroleum diesel fuels sold in California.
- Use zero or near-zero emissions equipment in lieu of diesel- or gasoline-powered equipment where such zero or near-zero equipment is commercially available within 50 miles of the project site.

- Use diesel particulate filters (or the equivalent) if permitted under manufacturer's guidelines for on-road and off-road diesel equipment.
- Contractors shall limit all construction equipment, haul truck, and delivery truck idling times by shutting down equipment when not in use and adhering to a maximum idling time of no more than 3 consecutive minutes.

Mitigation Measure 3.2-3: Clean Construction Truck Fleet

To reduce VOC and NO_X emissions during construction, the City shall require trucks used by construction contractors to meet the following requirements. Trucks with a Gross Vehicle Weight Rating (GVWR) of 19,500 pounds or greater, including haul trucks and earth movers, shall be zero-emissions (ZE), or near-zero emission (NZE) on-road haul trucks that meet the CARB's adopted optional NOx emissions standard at 0.02 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr), if and when feasible. At a minimum, all trucks shall use 2010 model year or newer engines that meet CARB's 2010 engine emissions standards at 0.01 g/bhp-hr of particulate matter (PM) and 0.20 g/bhp-hr of NOx emissions.

Facts in Support of Findings

All feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the SEIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.2-1 through 3.2-3 would substantially lessen construction-related emissions of the proposed project as described below. Mitigation Measure 3.2-1, which would require low-VOC coatings beyond SCAQMD requirements for non-residential uses, would reduce VOC emissions. The reduction in VOC emissions from coatings is proportional to the change in VOC content. For instance, requiring coatings with a VOC content of 10 g/L instead of 50 g/L would result in an approximately 80 percent reduction in VOC emissions from the application of coatings. Mitigation Measure 3.2-2 requires clean construction and diesel-reduction measures, which would reduce NOx emissions from equipment exhaust. On average, use of Tier 4 equipment reduces NOX, PM, and VOC up to 94 percent, 95 percent, and 50 percent, respectively, relative to Tier 2, and up to 91 percent, 95 percent, and 20 percent, respectively, relative to Tier 3. Furthermore, this measure requires the use of zero or near-zero emission equipment as it becomes commercially available. Mitigation Measure 3.2-3 requires the use of modern and clean trucks for material hauling and deliveries. This measure would substantially lessen emissions relative to use of conventional gasoline or diesel-powered delivery and haul trucks. As shown in Final SEIR Table 3.2-9, implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.2-1 through 3.2-3 would substantially lessen the proposed project's construction air pollutant emissions, but construction-period emissions for NO_X would remain above SCAQMD regional construction thresholds; VOC emissions would not exceed the thresholds with implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Additionally, as shown in Final SEIR Table 3.2-10, overlapping Reasonable Maximum Construction Day (overlap of Phase II and Phase III) with mitigation and full buildout of operations also would exceed SCAQMD regional operations-period thresholds for NO_X only. Therefore, the impact of NO_X emissions during construction and combined construction and operations would be significant and unavoidable. No other feasible mitigation is available that would reduce impacts to less than significant. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

5.2 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Impact 3.6-1: Generate Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Either Directly or Indirectly, That May Have a Significant Impact on the Environment or Conflict with State GHG Reduction Goals

The proposed project would generate annual GHG emissions levels from activities and sources that would conflict with the statewide plans and goals for reducing GHG emissions, including the fuels used to meet hospital energy demand, the rate of VMT per employee, and the level of solid waste generation. Because proposed project annual emissions levels would be inconsistent with statewide GHG reduction goals, the proposed project would result in a significant impact on the environment. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which substantially lessen, though not avoid, the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR; implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce GHG emissions but not to a less than significant level. In addition, specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable. (PRC Sections 21081[a][1] and [a][3]; State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091[a][1] and [a][3].) The City concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the proposed project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below (PRC Section 21081[b]).

Mitigation Measure 3.6-1: Mitigation Measures for Reducing GHG Emissions from Construction Activities

The applicant (or its contractors) shall implement the following emission-reduction measures during project construction:

- All equipment and delivery truck idling times will be limited by shutting down equipment and vehicles when not in use, and requiring the maximum idling time for equipment and vehicles not being used to no more than 3 consecutive minutes. Clear signage will be installed at all delivery driveways and loading areas regarding the limitation on idling time. Vehicle and equipment idling required to perform construction work is not subject to this requirement (e.g., running a motor to spin the drum on a cement mixer truck).
- All construction equipment will be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. Prior to the commencement of construction activities using diesel-powered vehicles or equipment, construction contractors will verify that all vehicles and equipment have been checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to admittance into the project site. A report by the certified mechanic of the condition of the construction and operations vehicles and equipment will be submitted to and approved by the City prior to their use.
- Alternative-fuel (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment (comprising at least 15 percent of the fleet) with lower tailpipe GHG emissions than gasoline or diesel equivalents will be used when commercially available.
- Renewable diesel fuel will be used for all diesel-powered heavy construction equipment and on-road vehicles to the extent that it is commercially available from a local supplier in the Southern California region.
- Local building materials and recycled products, including cement and concrete made with recycled products, will be used, to the extent feasible. A construction waste management plan will be implemented to divert landfilled waste by requiring the recycling of a minimum of 65 percent of all non-hazardous construction waste.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-2: Mitigation Measures for Reducing GHG Emissions from Operational Activities

The applicant shall implement the following GHG reduction measures for all new development under the master plan:

- The applicant (or its contractors) will implement the following water conservation measures, which are in addition to those required by codes and ordinances:
  - Install public bathroom faucet aerators (non-residential & residential over 6 stories) with a flow rate of 0.4 gallons per minute (gpm),
  - Install cooling tower conductivity controllers or cooling tower pH conductivity controllers,
  - Install rotating sprinkler nozzles for landscape irrigation 0.5 to 1.0 gpm,
  - Install drip/subsurface irrigation (i.e., micro-irrigation),
  - Implement proper hydro-zoning (i.e., groups plants with similar water requirements together),
  - Install zoned irrigation,
  - Contour landscaping to minimize precipitation runoff,
  - Install drought tolerant plants in 50 percent of total new landscaping,

  - Install water conserving turf in 100 percent of new turf added to landscaping, and
  - Use recycled water for stationary equipment that requires water cooling, to the extent feasible.
- Prepare a plan demonstrating, based on substantial evidence and to the satisfaction of the City, demonstrating that a minimum 85 percent of organic waste produced by the development would not be disposed of in a landfill. Measures to achieve this standard include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - Operating a program to reduce the generation of food waste and divert food waste from going to a landfill (e.g., sort out food waste separate from other waste for collection or composting),
  - Operating a program to safely recover edible food and divert it to a local food bank,
  - Operating a program to divert green waste (e.g., plant debris from landscaping) from going to a landfill (e.g., sort out food waste separate from other waste for collection or composting).
- Install Energy Star-rated appliances.
- Dedicate five percent of new parking spaces for plug-in vehicles and equip those spaces with installed electric vehicle charging equipment.
- Install a high-efficiency lighting system that takes advantage of natural daylighting.
- Maximize the installation of on-site solar systems, or other systems that provide on-site power from renewable or zero carbon sources.
- Install, high-performance glazing with a low solar heat gain coefficient value that reduces the amount of solar heat allowed into the building, without compromising natural illumination.
- Install cool roofs with an R value (i.e., the measurement of the effectiveness of thermal insulating materials) of 30 or better on proposed new buildings.
- Increase urban tree canopy cover to provide shade to a minimum of 40 percent of the length of internal roadways on the project site.
- Use electric powered landscaping equipment, rather than fossil-fuel powered landscaping equipment.
- Use native plants and trees to provide new, water-wise landscaping that blends the facility with the ecology of the surrounding natural environment.

In addition to the above, the applicant shall also implement the following GHG reduction measures for new development under the master plan, except for the proposed hospital uses (i.e., emergency department expansion, new hospital towers):

- Achieve net zero carbon buildings, in which building operational energy consumption is met through on- or off-site renewable or zero carbon energy sources
- Heating and cooling systems and other appliances and building end uses powered by natural gas will not be installed where electric-powered equivalents capable of meeting the building's operational requirements are commercially available in the project area.

Mitigation Measure 3.13-1: Implement a Voluntary Commute Trip Reduction Program (see Section 5.4 below - Transportation)

Mitigation Measure 3.13-2: Implement No-Cost Transit Pass Program for Employees (see Section 5.4 below - Transportation)

Mitigation Measure 3.13-3: Provide End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities (see Section 5.4 below - Transportation)

Facts in Support of Findings

All feasible mitigation measures have been identified in the SEIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 and 3.6-2, 3.13-1, 3.13-2, and 3.13-3. would reduce the amount of GHG emissions generated from construction and operation of the proposed project, as described below.

Mitigation measure 3.6-1 covers construction activities. The provisions include requiring equipment to not idle excessively, be property maintained, use alternative fueled equipment with lower GHG emissions than gasoline or diesel fuels and renewable diesel instead of traditional diesel if they are commercially available, use locally-sourced materials to reduce the overall transport distance of materials, and divert construction waste away from landfills. These measures are not quantified but would reduce GHG emissions during project construction activities by substantially lessening the amount of fossil fuels (e.g., gasoline and diesel) that are consumed during construction of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 covers operational activities and would reduce the amount of GHG emissions generated during operations. For building energy, Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 would require implementation of energy-efficiency measures in development under the master plan (except for proposed emergency department and hospital towers), including the use of Energy Star rated appliances, use of electric-powered appliances and HVAC, high-efficiency lighting, high-performance glazing on new buildings, and installation of a cool roof on new buildings. Implementation of these measures, along with increases in carbon-free electricity production required by State law, will reduce generation of GHG emissions from operation of proposed project buildings.

For mobile sources, Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 requires a percentage of parking spaces be dedicated to clean air vehicles and have EV charging installed. Additionally, Mitigation Measures 3.13-1 through 3.13-3 would reduce the amount of VMT driven by employees at the project site by establishing a program encouraging commuting by travel modes other than driving alone, providing transit passes at no-cost to all employees, and providing end-of-trip bicycle facilities (e.g., bike parking, lockers, changing facilities, showers) to encouraging biking as a viable means of commuting to work. These measures would reduce the amount of GHG emissions generated by operation of the proposed project by reducing the number and length of vehicle trips, and thereby reducing the amount of gasoline and diesel consumed.

For water use and wastewater generation, Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 will require water conservation measures that will reduce indoor and outdoor water consumption, through water-efficient faucets, efficient irrigation, and drought tolerant landscaping. Reducing indoor water usage not only reduces GHG emissions associated with the electricity embedded in water supply but would also reduce the amount of water that feeds into the wastewater system, thereby reducing emissions associated with wastewater as well. Taken together, these measures would reduce the amount of GHG emissions associated with water supply and wastewater generation by reducing water consumption.

For waste generation, Mitigation Measure 3.6-2 will require the project to achieve a minimum solid waste diversion rate of 85 percent by 2035, by implementing programs, such as a food waste diversion program and onsite recycling. This measure is in line with the State's goal in SB 1383 of reducing methane emissions associated with solid waste. Implementation of these measures will reduce the amount of waste that goes to landfills.

Future phases under the proposed project would aim to implement the actions in Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 and 3.6-2, and Mitigation Measures 3.13-1, 3.13-2, and 3.13-3. If fully implemented, the proposed project would not conflict with the State's long-term emissions reduction goals and targets by implementing all relevant measures in the 2017 and 2022 Scoping Plans. However, if not fully implemented for reasons outside of the City's control, the proposed project would conflict with the State's long-term emissions reduction goals and targets. Implementation of mitigation measures 3.6-1, 3.6-2, 3.13-1, 3.13-2, and 3.13-3 would reduce construction and operational GHG emissions by reducing emissions in various sectors, but may not fully assist the City in meeting the State's long-term emissions reduction target and ensure consistency with the Scoping Plan.

Residual proposed project generated GHG emissions after implementation of mitigation, for example, the GHG emissions generated by the project's residual rate of VMT and reliance on fossil fuels for building and facility energy demand, would conflict with the State's targets and goals for GHG emissions reductions. Therefore, the amount of GHG emissions generated by construction and operations of the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment. Because additional feasible mitigation measures are not available to further reduce the proposed

project's GHG emissions (e.g., achieve additional reductions in the rate of VMT, use zero or lower emissions fuels to meet the hospital's energy demands), this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

5.3 NOISE

Impact 3.10-1: Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Short-Term Construction Noise

Construction of the proposed project would occur in three phases, with construction activities anticipated to begin as early as fall 2025. While construction intensity, duration, and equipment location are not precisely known at this time, reference noise levels for typical construction activities associated with land development were used to assess peak construction noise generated by the proposed project. Based on those reference levels, construction noise could reach levels of up to 89.5 dB L_{eq} and 93.5 dB $L_{max.}$ at 50 feet. In addition, to assess increases in ambient noise levels, 24-hour CNEL levels were also calculated and estimated to be as high as 79 dBA CNEL. Thus, construction activities could result in a substantial temporary and periodic increase in noise during daytime hours at existing and future sensitive land uses. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which substantially lessen, though not avoid, the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR; implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce construction noise levels but not to less than significant levels. In addition, specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable. (PRC Sections 21081[a][1] and [a][3]; State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091[a][1] and [a][3].) The City concludes, however, that the project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the proposed project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below (PRC Section 21081[b]).

Mitigation Measure 3.10-1: Implement Construction-Noise Reduction Measures for Daytime Construction

To reduce noise from construction activities, the City shall require construction contractors to comply with following measures:

Equipment Restrictions

- Locate all stationary equipment (e.g., generators, welders, dehumidifiers) on the construction site as far away from adjacent residential land uses and other noise-sensitive sites as possible and no less than 50 feet from residential uses.
- Position onsite stationary equipment such that existing noise sources (e.g., roadways) or structures (e.g., existing buildings) block the line of sight between the onsite equipment and offsite sensitive land uses.
- All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhaust mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation.
- All construction equipment with back-up alarms shall be equipped with either audible self-adjusting backup alarms or alarms that only sound when an object is detected. The self-adjusting backup alarms shall automatically adjust to 5 dBA over the surrounding background levels. All non-self-adjusting backup alarms shall be set to the lowest setting required to be audible above the surrounding noise levels. In addition to the use of backup alarms, the construction contractor shall implement the use of observers and scheduling of construction activities such that alarm noise is minimized.

Quieter Alternative Methods and Equipment

- Each construction contractor shall use noise reducing operations measures, techniques, and equipment. This requirement shall be enforced through its inclusion on all construction bid specifications for all potential

construction contractors hired within the project site. The bid specifications shall require that construction contractors provide an equipment inventory list for all equipment within the fleet with greater than 50 horsepower engines, which includes (at a minimum), make, model, and horsepower of equipment; operating noise levels at 50 feet, available noise control device that are installed on each piece of equipment; and associated noise reduction from the installed technology. Control devices shall include, but are not limited to, high-efficiency mufflers, acoustic dampening and protected internal noise absorption layers to vibrating panels, enclosures, and electric motors. In addition, the contractor shall specify how proposed alternative construction procedures will be employed to reduce noise at sensitive receptors compared to other more traditional methods. Examples include, but are not limited to, welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete off-site instead of on-site, and the use of thermal lance instead of drive motors and bits. In all cases, the requirement is that the best commercially available noise-reducing technology and noise-reducing alternative construction method shall be used, provided that there are no safety concerns, engineering limits, or environmental constraints preventing it from being used. If a unique circumstance does exist that prevents an alternative quieter construction method to be used, the contractor shall provide evidence to support their proposal. The noise reduction elements of construction bid submittals shall be approved by the City of Temecula, in coordination with a qualified acoustical professional.

- Combine noisy operations (e.g., riveting, cutting, hammering) to occur in the same time period (e.g., day or construction phase), such that the overall duration of these activities is reduced to the extent practical. By performing the noisiest operations together within the same time period, the overall duration that excessive noise would occur is reduced, minimizing the disturbing effects of exposure to prolonged increased noise levels. Where construction activities at any one location on the project site occur for an extended duration of more than 30 days affecting the same offsite receptor, install temporary noise curtains that meet the following parameters:
  - Install temporary noise curtains as close as possible to the boundary of the construction site within the direct line of sight path of the nearby sensitive receptor(s).
  - Temporary noise curtains shall consist of durable, flexible composite material featuring a noise barrier layer bounded to sound-absorptive material on one side. The noise barrier layer shall consist of rugged, impervious, material with a surface weight of at least one pound per square foot.

Facts in Support of Findings

All feasible mitigation measures for construction noise impacts have been identified in the SEIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.10-1 would result in reduced noise levels at sensitive receptors during construction activities by requiring noise-reducing equipment, alternative quieter construction methods, installation of temporary noise barriers, siting equipment as far away from receptors as possible, and relocating or clustering noise-generating activities such that the magnitude and duration of noise levels affecting sensitive receptors are minimized. Effectiveness of these mitigation measures would vary from several decibels (which in general is a relatively small change) to ten or more decibels (which subjectively would be perceived by receptors as a substantial change or a reduction by half), depending upon the specific equipment and the original condition of that equipment, the specific locations of the noise sources and the receivers. Installation of a noise barrier, for example, would vary in effectiveness depending upon the degree to which the line-of-sight between the source and receiver is broken, and typically ranges from 5 to 10 dB (NCHRP 1999). Installation of more effective silencers could range from several decibels to well over 10 decibels. Reduction of idling equipment could reduce overall noise levels from barely any reduction to several decibels.

However, given that construction activities are anticipated to occur over an extended period of time while the proposed project phases are constructed and that construction activities could result in a more than doubling of the existing noise levels at sensitive receptors in the project vicinity, temporary increases in construction-related noise would remain above threshold levels with the implementation of mitigation. This impact would be significant and unavoidable. No other feasible mitigation is available that would reduce impacts to less than significant. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

Impact 3.10-3: Exposure of Existing Sensitive Receptors to Operational Helicopter Noise

The project proposes to relocate the existing helipad from its existing at-grade location onto the top of a proposed four story parking lot structure during Phase III. Additionally, a new flight path alignment is included in the proposed project as shown on Figure 3.10-2. The frequency or time of helicopter arrivals and departures on the project site would not change as a result of the proposed project. To evaluate changes in noise levels associated with the proposed change in helipad location and flight path alignment, noise measurements of helicopter test flights at the existing helipad and flight path alignment were conducted and compared to noise modeling of the proposed project. The modeling shows that project-generated helicopter noise levels would not exceed applicable City exterior noise standards for residential uses of 65 dBA CNEL and no helicopter activity would push existing noise levels to above the City's standards of 65 dB CNEL at low to medium residential areas and 70 dB CNEL at multi-family housing areas. In addition, project-generated helicopter noise increases would be below the FICON-recommended 5.0 dB threshold for ambient noise of less than 60 dBA CNEL, 3.0 dB threshold for ambient noise of 60–65 dBA CNEL, and the 1.5 dB threshold for ambient noise greater than 65 dBA CNEL. Finally, residential development or other sensitive receptors would not be exposed to operation noise level increases exceeding the FAA adopted threshold of 65 dB CNEL. However, helicopter overflights that could occur during the nighttime hours could result in exceedances of the FICAN 65 dBA SEL standard at sensitive receptors along the proposed flight path alignment, which could result in sleep disturbance. Because the change in the helicopter flight path alignment could expose sensitive receptors to noise levels with potential to cause sleep disturbance, this impact would be **potentially significant**.

Findings

Specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any mitigation, and the effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable. (PRC Sections 21081[a][1] and [a][3]; State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091[a][1] and [a][3].) The City concludes, however, that the proposed project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the proposed project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below (PRC Section 21081[b]).

Facts in Support of Findings

Flight related mitigation measures cannot be placed on this type of medical helicopter activity to reduce noise impacts because the California's Public Utility Code Section 21662.4. states that emergency aircraft flights for medical purposes are exempt from local restrictions related to flight departures and arrivals based upon the aircraft's noise level. The City cannot restrict helicopter activity at the hospital that is for medical purposes.

Potential mitigation that could be effective in reducing helicopter noise at residential uses along Calle Los Padres would include upgrades to windows and building insulation and installation of central air conditioning in houses that don't have it already, which would allow people to close their windows. However, these upgrades would not preclude an individual to still open their windows at night. In addition, this type of mitigation may not be completely effective because it is infeasible for the City to require residents to close their windows and doors during all helicopter flights. Thus, the potential remains that if helicopters were to fly over residential uses during the early morning or nighttime hours, it could result in SEL levels that exceed the FICAN standard of 65 dBA, and thus, have the potential to disturb people during sleep. Although this occurrence would be minimal and infrequent, the potential exists, therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

5.4 TRANSPORTATION

Impact 3.13-2: Conflict or be Inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)

The proposed project would result in a higher rate of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) than the threshold amount of VMT set forth in the City's Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines; the proposed project's VMT rate of 38.4 miles per employee (i.e., service population) would be approximately 31 percent higher than the threshold VMT amount of 29.4 miles per employee. This impact would be **potentially significant**.

Findings

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project, which substantially lessen, though not avoid, the significant environmental effects identified in the SEIR; implementation of the following mitigation measures would reduce the rate of VMT generated by the proposed project but not to a less than significant level. In addition, specific economic, legal, social, and technological, or other considerations make infeasible any further mitigation, and the effect therefore remains significant and unavoidable. (PRC Sections 21081[a][1] and [a][3]; State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091[a][1] and [a][3].) The City concludes, however, that the proposed project's benefits outweigh the significant and unavoidable effects of the proposed project, as set forth in the Statement of Overriding Considerations below (PRC Section 21081[b]).

Mitigation 3.13-1: Implement a Voluntary Commute Trip Reduction Program

Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall develop a voluntary commute trip reduction program for employees (program), subject to approval by the City's Community Development Director. Commute trip reduction programs discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, taking transit, walking, and biking, thereby reducing VMT and greenhouse gas emissions. This program shall provide substantial evidence demonstrating a minimum 4 percent reduction in the proposed project's rate of VMT (i.e., VMT per service population), as compared to the proposed VMT rate evaluated in the SEIR. The program shall evaluate how the minimum VMT reduction standard will be achieved through implementation of the following measures, or equally effective measures: employer-provided services, infrastructure, and incentives for alternative modes such as ridesharing, discounted transit, bicycling, vanpool, and guaranteed ride home and information, coordination, and marketing for said services, infrastructure, and incentives.

Mitigation 3.13-2: Implement No-Cost Transit Pass Program for Employees

Prior to the approval of future development applications, the project applicant shall develop a program to provide transit passes at no-cost to employees on an ongoing basis. The transit passes shall be made available at no-cost to all employees of the project during its operational phase. Reducing the out-of-pocket cost for transit improves the competitiveness of transit versus single-occupancy vehicles; thus, increasing the total number of transit trips and decreasing vehicle trips. This decrease in vehicle trips results in reduced VMT and lower GHG emissions (CAPCOA 2021: 95). Given that 100 percent of employees would be eligible for such a program, the VMT reduction depends on the percentage of subsidy provided by the employer (Draft SEIR Appendix H). The transit pass program for all employees would provide a VMT reduction of up to 0.24 percent for the proposed project.

Mitigation 3.13-3: Provide End-of-Trip Bicycle Facilities

In addition to the bicycle parking required by the City of Temecula Municipal Code, the project shall provide end-of-trip bicycle facilities, including installation and maintenance, for employee use. End-of-trip facilities include bike parking, bike lockers, showers, personal lockers, onsite bicycle repair station, signage on or near secure parking and personal lockers with information about how to reserve or obtain access to these amenities. The location and type of these facilities shall be identified in future development applications prior to their approval by the City. The provision and maintenance of secure bike parking and related facilities encourage commuting by bicycle, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions. End-of-trip facilities should be installed at a size proportional to the number of commuting bicyclists and regularly maintained. Providing end-of-trip bicycle facilities would provide a VMT reduction of up to 0.3 percent for the proposed project.

Facts in Support of Findings

All feasible mitigation measures for transportation impacts have been identified in the SEIR. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.13-1, 3.13-2, and 3.13-3 would lower the proposed project's rate of VMT per employee by approximately 4.5 percent by decreasing the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips generated by employees of the proposed project and increasing the number of trips completed by other modes of travel, including walking, biking, public transit, carpooling, vanpooling, and teleworking. However, with implementation of these measures the proposed project would generate VMT at a rate approximately 26 percent higher than the City's threshold amount. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project's operational VMT would be significant and unavoidable. No other feasible mitigation is available that would reduce impacts to less than significant. A Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

6 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

6.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED IN THE SEIR

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) provides that the range of potential alternatives for the project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. Alternatives that fail to meet the fundamental project purpose need not be addressed in detail in an EIR. (*In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165-1167.)

In determining what alternatives should be considered in the EIR, it is important to acknowledge the objectives of the project, the project's significant effects, and unique project considerations. These factors are crucial to the development of alternatives that meet the criteria specified in Section 15126.6(a). Although, as noted above, EIRs must contain a discussion of "potentially feasible" alternatives, the ultimate determination as to whether an alternative is feasible or infeasible is made by lead agency decision-maker(s). (See Pub. Resources Code, § 21081(a)(3).) At the time of action on the project, the decision-maker(s) may consider evidence beyond that found in this EIR in addressing such determinations. The decision-maker(s), for example, may conclude that a particular alternative is infeasible (i.e., undesirable) from a policy standpoint, and may reject an alternative on that basis provided that the decision-maker(s) adopts a finding, supported by substantial evidence, to that effect, and provided that such a finding reflects a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and other considerations supported by substantial evidence. (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* (1982) 133 Cal.App.3d 401, 417; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 957, 998.)

The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected during the planning or scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. The following alternative was considered by the City but is not evaluated further in the SEIR.

Alternative Location

When a lead agency considers alternatives to a project, "the key question and first step" is whether "putting the project in another location" would avoid or substantially lessen the project's significant impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f][2][A]). If no feasible alternative locations exist, the lead agency must disclose the reasons for this conclusion in the EIR.

No feasible alternative locations exist for the proposed project for the following reasons. The proposed project involves revisions to an existing master plan for Temecula Valley Hospital, the first phase of which involved construction of an existing hospital building that has been operating since 2013. The first phase also included mass grading of the project and installation of backbone infrastructure, including utilities, onsite access roads, and surface parking areas. The proposed revisions to the approved master plan include expanding the emergency department of the existing hospital building, providing additional hospital towers, and providing medical office buildings that complement the existing hospital facility. It would not be economically feasible for the applicant to put the proposed project in another location because doing so would require the applicant to pay for the tremendous cost of providing a comparable hospital facility and associated backbone infrastructure on a new site, and abandon the existing hospital and project site. Abandoning the existing hospital and project site would also result in potentially substantial detrimental effects to the City, including loss of healthcare services for residents. As a result, the City rejected an alternative location from further consideration.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE SEIR

Three alternatives, representing a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, were selected for detailed analysis. The goal for evaluating these alternatives is to identify ways to avoid or lessen the significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed project, while attaining most of the project objectives.

The following sections provide a general description of each alternative, its ability to meet the project objectives, and a qualitative discussion of its comparative environmental impacts. As provided in Section 15126.6(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, the significant effects of these alternatives are identified in less detail than the analysis of the proposed project in the SEIR.

6.2.1 Alternative 1: No Project–No Future Development

Summary of Alternative

CEQA requires a "no project" alternative to be evaluated in an EIR. Alternative 1, No Project–No Future Development, assumes that the proposed project would not be approved and that no new development would occur on the project site in the future; the existing physical conditions of the project site would not change.

Under this alternative the project site would not be developed in accordance with the approved master plan or as contemplated by the proposed project. Specifically, the existing hospital facility would continue to be operated, and other existing physical elements of the project site would remain the same, including the existing paved surface parking lots, internal access roads, modular offices/storage facilities, ambulance parking, and service yard. The helipad would remain in its interim location in the northwest portion of the project site and the helicopter flight path would retain its existing northeast-southwest arrival/departure alignment.

Reasons for Rejecting Alternative

Alternative 1, the No Project/No Future Development Alternative would avoid the significant impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed project, except for helicopter noise impacts, which are greater under this alternative (Draft SEIR Table 4-3). However, the No Project–No Development Alternative would not meet any of the objectives the project (Draft SEIR Table 4-2). The City Council hereby finds that each of the reasons set forth above is an independent ground for rejecting Alternative 1, and by itself, independent of any other reason, justifies rejection of Alternative 1.

6.2.2 Alternative 2: No Project-Approved Master Plan Buildout

Summary of Alternative

Alternative 2, No Project–Approved Master Plan Buildout, assumes that the proposed project would not be approved and that the project site would be developed in accordance with the approved master plan.

Under this alternative, the existing hospital facility would continue to operate, and the following new development would occur on the project. Alternative 2 would expand the capacity of the existing hospital by providing one additional 6-story hospital tower (170,855 SF). Approximately 140,000 SF of medical office space would be provided, including one 80,000 SF, 4-story building and one 60,000 SF, 3-story building. A 10,000 SF, 1-story cancer center and 8,000 SF, 1-story fitness center also would be developed. Hospital-supportive infrastructure would be provided along the eastern edge of the hospital, including cooling tower, generators, transformers, fuel tank, and a bulk oxygen storage area. A new permanent helipad location would be provided atop the 6-story hospital tower (second tower) located in the southeast portion of the project site. Helicopters utilizing the helipad follow a northeast-southwest helicopter arrival/departure alignment.

Alternative 2 would result in approximately 184,961 SF less total building area than the proposed project. It would also result in 244 fewer patient beds, and 470 fewer parking spaces. As result, this alternative would result in less overall construction activity (e.g., ground disturbance, on-site use of construction equipment and vehicles, application of coatings, frequency of materials deliveries to and from the project site) relative to the proposed project.

Reasons for Rejecting Alternative

Alternative 2, the No Project–Approved Master Plan Buildout Alternative would not avoid any significant impacts of the proposed project or reduce any significant impacts to less than significant levels (Draft SEIR Table 4-3). In addition, this alternative would not meet the proposed project objective to relocate the existing helipad to a central location and change the helicopter flight approach/departure path to minimize helicopter noise impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses because this alternative would not relocate the helipad to a central location within the project site and would have greater helicopter noise impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses (Draft SEIR Table 4-2). This alternative would partially meet the objective to increase the size of the originally proposed hospital and emergency department to accommodate a growing regional population and number of patients but to a lesser extent than the proposed project because this alternative would provide one additional 6-story hospital tower (170,855 SF) but would not expand the existing emergency department. In addition, this alternative would partially meet the objective to provide a mix of medical facilities to meet the demand for a variety of inpatient and outpatient medical services, including behavioral health services but to a lesser extent than the proposed project because this alternative would provide 140,000 SF of medical office space, which is similar to the 160,000 SF provided by the proposed project, but would not provide any behavioral health services. The Behavioral Health Building has since been eliminated from the proposed project. The City Council hereby finds that each of the reasons set forth above is an independent ground for rejecting Alternative 2, and by itself, independent of any other reason, justifies rejection of Alternative 2.

6.2.3 Alternative 3: No Medical Office Development

Summary of Alternative

Alternative 3, No Medical Office Development, assumes that the project site would be developed the same as the proposed project, except that no medical office buildings would be provided. Specifically, this alternative would not provide the 160,000 SF of medical office space that is included in the proposed project (two 80,000 SF, 4-story buildings). Alternative 3 would also provide proportionately fewer surface parking spaces than the proposed project to account for the lower parking demand from not developing 160,000 SF of medical office building space. Because it involves less total development, this alternative would result in less overall construction activity (e.g., ground disturbance, on-site use of construction equipment and vehicles, frequency of materials deliveries to and from the project site) relative to the proposed project.

Alternative 3 was developed to lessen the significant GHG emissions and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) impacts of the proposed project. The medical office buildings have the highest vehicle trip generation rate of the uses including the proposed project, at 31.86 daily vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet of building area (Draft SEIR Appendix H). This rate is approximately three times greater than for the hospital towers (10.77 daily vehicle trips per 1,000 square feet of building area). Omitting the medical office buildings from the proposed project would substantially lessen the VMT generated by the proposed project by removing the highest trip generating use from the proposed project; it would substantially lessen GHG emissions resulting from vehicle trips, as well as from medical office building energy use, solid waste generation, and construction.

Reasons for Rejecting Alternative

Alternative 3, Reduction Medical Office Development, would decrease the amount of adverse physical environmental change for seven significant impacts of the proposed project, but still would not avoid any significant impacts of the proposed project or reduce any significant impacts to less than significant levels (Draft SEIR Table 4-3). In addition, this alternative would not meet two of the five project objectives (Draft SEIR Table 4-2). It would not diversify Temecula's employment base because it would not provide medical office buildings for development of biomedical, research, and office facilities that are included in the proposed project, and it would not meet the needs of doctors and patients who need ready access to the hospital for medical procedures because it would not provide medical office space adjacent to the hospital facility. In addition, this alternative would partially meet the demand for a variety of inpatient and outpatient medical services, including behavioral health services, but to lesser extent than the proposed project because this alternative would meet demand for behavioral health services but would not provide any medical office space for other types of medical services. . The Behavioral Health Building has since been eliminated from the proposed project. The

City Council hereby finds that each of the reasons set forth above is an independent ground for rejecting Alternative 3, and by itself, independent of any other reason, justifies rejection of Alternative 3.

6.2.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

As required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, one of the alternatives must be identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Because Alternative 1, the No Project–No Development Alternative, would avoid all significant impacts resulting from construction and operation of the proposed project (except for helicopter noise impacts, which are greater under this alternative), it is the environmentally superior alternative. However, the No Project–No Development Alternative would not meet the objectives the project.

When the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126[d][2]) require selection of an environmentally superior alternative from among the other action alternatives evaluated. Alternative 3: No Medical Office Development, is identified as the environmentally superior action alternative in the Draft SEIR because although it would not completely avoid any significant impacts of the proposed project, it would decrease the amount of adverse physical environmental change for seven significant impacts of the proposed project, and it would not increase the amount of adverse physical change for any of the proposed project's significant impacts. Alternative 3: No Medical Office Development would meet many but not all of the basic objectives of the proposed project. Alternative 3 is considered the environmentally superior alternative, but for the reasons provided in Section 6.2.3, the City Council has rejected this alternative.

7 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the lead agency to balance the economic, social, legal, technological, and other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. Specifically, PRC Section 21002 provides that, "In the event specific economic, social and other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects can be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof." In addition, PRC Section 21002.1(c) provides that, "In the event that economic, social, or other conditions make it infeasible to mitigate one or more significant effects of a project on the environment, the project may nonetheless be approved or carried out at the discretion of a public agency...." Finally, CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR) Section 15093(a) provides that "[i]f the benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered 'acceptable.'"

The City Council (City Council) of the City of Temecula has carefully balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the significant unavoidable environmental effects identified in the SEIR that cannot be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level. Notwithstanding the significant unavoidable environmental effects that are identified in the SEIR that cannot feasibly be eliminated, lessened, or mitigated to a less than significant level, the City Council, acting pursuant to PRC Sections 21002 and 21002.1 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15092 and 15093, hereby determines that significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable as set forth below, are acceptable due to the overriding considerations described below. The City Council finds that each one of the following benefits of the proposed project as set forth below, independent of each of the other benefits, warrants approval of the proposed project notwithstanding the unavoidable environmental impacts of the proposed project.

7.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Significant and unavoidable project impacts are summarized below:

- Air Quality – construction and overlapping construction and operational emissions
- Greenhouse gas emissions
- Noise – construction
- Noise – helicopter flights for medical purposes
- Transportation – Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

7.1.1 Project Benefits

Based on the objectives of the proposed project identified in the SEIR, the City Council has determined that the proposed project should be approved and that the significant unavoidable environmental effects attributable to the proposed project are outweighed by the following environmental, economic, social, technological and other overriding considerations, each one being a separate and independent basis upon which to approve the proposed project. Substantial evidence in the record demonstrates that approval and implementation of the proposed project will provide the benefits listed below. The City Council thus finds as follows:

- The proposed project provides for comprehensive high-quality hospital and health care services, in response to existing and future demand in the surrounding region. The proposed project will better meet the needs of the community than the currently approved Master Plan in terms of the types of healthcare facilities proposed to be built.
- The proposed project will create a substantial number of high-quality construction and operational jobs.

- The proposed project will stimulate the local and regional economy through additional construction and operational jobs, and additional hospital and healthcare support services.
- The Project will create a development compatible with and sensitive to the existing land uses in the Project area.
- The Project will relocate the existing helipad to a central location and change the helicopter flight approach/departure path to minimize helicopter noise impacts on surrounding sensitive land uses, thereby preserving the ability to meet emergency healthcare needs while reducing impacts, for a net benefit.

In conclusion, the City Council finds that the foregoing benefits provided through approval of the proposed project outweigh the identified significant adverse environmental impacts. The City Council further finds that each of the individual benefits discussed above outweighs the unavoidable adverse environmental effects identified in the SEIR and, therefore, finds those impacts to be acceptable. The City Council further finds that each of the benefits listed above, standing alone, is sufficient justification for the City Council to override these unavoidable environmental impacts.

This page intentionally left blank.