

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

City of Temecula Planning Department

Initial Environmental Study

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Name of Project: New Community Lutheran Church
2. Case Numbers: Planning Application No. 93-0187, Amendment No. 1 (Public Use Permit)
3. Location of Project: North side of Pauba Road, approximately 2500 feet east of the intersection of Ynez and Pauba Roads
4. Description of Project: A church and associated facilities to be constructed in five (5) phases. The first phase will consist of a worship/fellowship building, a maintenance building, and a Sunday School building totalling 9,290 square feet. The second phase will be a 4,832 square foot preschool building. Phase 3 is a 17,568 square foot Christian Day School. Phase four will be a 9,980 square foot sanctuary. Phase five will be an approximately 4,527 square foot School Activity Center.
5. Date of Environmental Assessment: December 10, 1993
6. Name of Proponent: New Community Lutheran Church
7. Address and Phone Number of Proponent: 27393 Ynez Road, Suite 161
Temecula, CA 92591
(909) 676-1492

II. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

(Explanations to all the answers are provided in Section III)

- | | <u>Yes</u> | <u>Maybe</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---|------------|--------------|-----------|
| 1. Earth. Will the proposal result in: | | | |
| a. Unstable earth conditions or in changes geologic substructures? | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| b. Disruptions, displacements, compaction, or over covering of the soil? | <u>X</u> | — | — |
| c. Change in topography or ground surface relief features? | <u>X</u> | — | — |
| d. The destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? | — | — | <u>X</u> |

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
e. Any increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	<u>X</u>	—	—
f. Changes in siltation, deposition or erosion?	—	<u>X</u>	—
g. The modification of any wash, channel, creek, river or lake?	—	—	<u>X</u>
h. Exposure of people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, liquefaction, ground failure, or similar hazards?	<u>X</u>	—	—
i. Any development within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone?	—	—	<u>X</u>
2. Air. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Air emissions or deterioration of ambient air quality?	<u>X</u>	—	—
b. The creation of objectionable odors?	<u>X</u>	—	—
c. Alteration of air movement, temperature, or moisture or any change in climate, whether locally or regionally?	—	—	<u>X</u>
3. Water. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements, in either marine or fresh waters?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<u>X</u>	—	—
c. Alterations to the course or flow of flood waters?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Change in the amount of surface water in any water body?	—	—	<u>X</u>
e. Discharge into surface waters, or in any alteration of surface water quality, including but not limited to, temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?	<u>X</u>	—	—
f. Alteration of the direction or rate of flow of ground waters?	—	—	<u>X</u>
g. Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions, withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations?	—	—	<u>X</u>
h. Reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
i. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	—	—	<u>X</u>
4. Plant Life. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Change in the diversity of species, or number of any native species of plants (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?	—	<u>X</u>	—
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species of plants?	—	<u>X</u>	—
c. Introduction of new species of plants into an area of native vegetation, or in a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species?	—	<u>X</u>	—
d. Reduction in the acreage of any agricultural crop?	—	—	<u>X</u>
5. Animal Life. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Change in the diversity of species, or numbers of any species of animals (animals includes all land animals, birds, reptiles, fish, amphibians, shellfish, benthic organisms, and/or insects)?	—	<u>X</u>	—
b. Reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species of animals?	—	<u>X</u>	—
c. The introduction of new wildlife species into an area?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. A barrier to the migration or movement of animals?	—	<u>X</u>	—
e. Deterioration to existing fish or wildlife habitat?	—	<u>X</u>	—
6. Noise. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Increases in existing noise levels?	<u>X</u>	—	—
b. Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	<u>X</u>	—	—
c. Exposure of people to severe vibrations?	—	—	<u>X</u>
7. Light and Glare. Will the proposal produce or result in light or glare?	<u>X</u>	—	—
8. Land Use. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Alteration of the present land use of an area?	<u>X</u>	—	—

	Yes	Maybe	No
b. Alteration to the future planned land use of an area as described in a community or general plan?	—	—	<u>X</u>
9. Natural Resources. Will the proposal result in:			
a. An increase in the rate of use of any natural resources?	—	<u>X</u>	—
b. The depletion of any nonrenewable natural resource?	—	<u>X</u>	—
10. Risk of Upset. Will the proposal result in:			
a. A risk of an explosion or the release of any hazardous substances in the event of an accident or upset conditions (hazardous substances includes, but is not limited to, pesticides, chemicals, oil or radiation)?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. The use, storage, transport or disposal of any hazardous or toxic materials (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation)?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Possible interference with an emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan?	—	—	<u>X</u>
11. Population. Will the proposal alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?	—	—	<u>X</u>
12. Housing. Will the proposal affect existing housing or create a demand for additional housing?	—	—	<u>X</u>
13. Transportation/Circulation. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Generation of substantial additional vehicular movement?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Effects on existing parking facilities, or demand for new parking?	<u>X</u>	—	—
c. Substantial impact upon existing transportation systems, including public transportation?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods?	<u>X</u>	—	—
e. Alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic?	—	—	<u>X</u>
f. Increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians?	<u>X</u>	—	—

	Yes	Maybe	No
14. Public Services. Will the proposal have substantial effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:			
a. Fire protection?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Police protection?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Schools?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Parks or other recreational facilities?	—	—	<u>X</u>
e. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	<u>X</u>	—	—
f. Other governmental services: _____	—	—	<u>X</u>
15. Energy. Will the proposal result in:			
a. Use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Substantial increase in demand upon existing sources or energy, or require the development of new sources of energy?	—	—	<u>X</u>
16. Utilities. Will the proposal result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to any of the following utilities:			
a. Power or natural gas?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Communications systems?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Water systems?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Sanitary sewer systems or septic tanks?	—	—	<u>X</u>
e. Storm water drainage systems?	<u>X</u>	—	—
f. Solid waste disposal systems?	—	—	<u>X</u>
g. Will the proposal result in a disjointed or inefficient pattern of utility delivery system improvements for any of the above?	—	—	<u>X</u>
17. Human Health. Will the proposal result in:			
a. The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. The exposure of people to potential health hazards, including the exposure of sensitive receptors (such as hospitals and schools) to toxic pollutant emissions?	—	—	<u>X</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
18. Aesthetics. Will the proposal result in:			
a. The obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public?	—	<u>X</u>	—
b. The creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view?	—	<u>X</u>	—
c. Detrimental visual impacts on the surrounding area?	—	<u>X</u>	—
19. Recreation. Will the proposal result in an impact upon the quality or quantity of existing recreational resources or opportunities?	—	—	<u>X</u>
20. Cultural Resources. Will the proposal result in:			
a. The alteration or destruction of any paleontologic, prehistoric, archaeological or historic site?	—	—	<u>X</u>
b. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, or object?	—	—	<u>X</u>
c. Any potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	—	—	<u>X</u>
d. Restrictions to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	—	—	<u>X</u>

III. DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Earth

- 1.a. No. The proposal will not result in unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures. Manufactured slopes will be created on the site, however, any unstable conditions will be mitigated through planting of slopes for erosion control (that is consistent with Uniform Building Code Standards and Ordinance No. 457) and through proper compaction of the soils. Construction and grading for this development will not be at depths which would affect any geologic substructures. No impacts are foreseen as a result of this project.
- 1.b. Yes. The proposal will result in the disruption, displacement, compaction, or overcovering of the soil. All grading activity requires disruptions, displacements, compaction and overcovering of the soil. The amount of disruption, displacement, compaction and overcovering of the soil will be the minimum amount needed to realize the project. The western portion of the site will not be disturbed. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 1.c. Yes. The proposal will result in a change in the site topography and ground surface relief features. A portion of the site has already been previously modified. Additional grading is proposed for the project, therefore the topography and ground surface relief features will again be modified. The slopes on the western portion of the site will not be disturbed. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 1.d. No. The proposal will not result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features. No unique geologic features exist on the site. As mentioned in response 1.c., topography on a portion of the site will be altered to realize the project; however, most of the slopes will remain undisturbed. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 1.e. Yes. Development of the site will result in increased wind and water erosion of soils both on and off-site. Grading will occur for the creation of building area and the parking lot. In addition, the potential for wind and water erosions of soil may increase from the creation of manufactured slopes. Any impacts will be mitigated through planting of slopes and the site and the construction of hardscape. Erosion control measures will be implemented as a condition of approval for the project and will have to be consistent with Uniform Building Code Standards and Ordinance No. 457. This will ensure that no significant impacts arise as a result of this project.
- 1.f. Maybe. The proposal may result in changes in siltation, deposition, and erosion. Reference response 1.e. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 1.g. No. The proposal will not result in modifications to any wash, channel, creek, river or lake. None exist on the project site, nor are proximate to the site. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 1.h. Yes. Development of the site will expose people and property to earthquake hazards since the project is located in Southern California, an area which is seismically active. Any potential impacts will be mitigated through building construction which is consistent with Uniform Building Code standards. The project will not expose people or property to geologic hazards such as landslides,

mudslides, ground failure or liquefaction. No known landslides are located on the site or proximate to the site. The same is true for mudslides. The potential for ground failure and liquefaction is also low in this area. The above mentioned assumptions are based upon information contained in the City of Temecula General Plan Environmental Impact Report (dated August 12, 1992) and the Southwest Area Community Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (adopted May, 1989). No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

1. i. No. The proposal does not include development within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone as identified by the State of California, Resource Agency Department of Conservation Special Studies Zone Map. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Air

- 2.a,b. Yes. The project will result in air emissions both in the short and long-run. Air emissions and objectionable odors will occur during the construction phase of the project. These impacts will be of short duration and are not considered significant. The hours of operation of the church and its ancillary facilities will not contribute significantly to traffic during peak hours. Level of service of intersections affected by the project will not decline from their already acceptable standards (with the exception of the intersection of Pauba and Margarita Roads where there is no traffic signal). Long-term impacts from auto emissions will not be considered significant.
- 2.c. No. The project will not result in alterations of air movement, temperature, or moisture, or in any change in climate either locally or regionally. The scale of the project precludes it from creating any significant impacts on the environment in this area.

Water

- 3.a. No. The proposal will not result in changes to currents, to the course or direction of water movements in either marine or fresh waters. The project site is not located adjacent to either marine or fresh water sources. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 3.b. Yes. The proposal will result in changes to absorption rates, drainage patterns and the rate and amount of surface runoff. Previously permeable ground will be rendered impervious by construction of buildings, accompanying hardscape and driveways. While absorption rates and surface runoff will change, impacts are mitigated through site design. Drainage conveyances will be required which will safely and adequately handle any of the runoff which is created by the realization of the project. According to the Conceptual Hydrology Plan prepared by Robert Bein, William Frost and Associates dated December 8, 1993, the approximate amount of runoff contributed by the project is 3 cubic feet per second (c.f.s.) to the north, 4 c.f.s. to the west, 17 c.f.s. to the southwest and .5 c.f.s. to the south. These assumptions are preliminary and are based upon a 100 year storm event discharge of 2 c.f.s. per acre. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 3.c. No. The proposal will not result in alterations to the course or flow of flood waters. The project is not located within or adjacent to an identified floodway. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

- 3.d. No. The proposal will not result in a change in the amount of surface water in any waterbody. A retention pond is located to the north of the subject project site. The site (presently vacant) naturally drains into the pond. Drainage added from the project is approximately 24 cubic feet per second (c.f.s.). The site will be designed in such a manner that the parking lot area will serve as an on-site detention basin for the amount of runoff in excess of the natural condition. This will mitigate any possible impacts to the pond. In addition, erosion control measures will be included in the project design that will reduce the amount of sediment that is carried into the pond. Both of the above mentioned methods will be conditions of approval for the project. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 3.e. Yes. The proposal will result in discharges into surface waters or in any alteration of surface water quality. Prior to issuance of a grading permit for the project, the developer will be required to comply with the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board. No grading shall be permitted until an NPDES Notice of Intent has been filed or the project is shown to be exempt. By complying with the NPDES requirements, any potential impacts can be mitigated to a level less than significant. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 3.f. No. The proposal will not result in an alteration of the direction or rate of flow of groundwaters. Construction on the site will not be at depths sufficient to have a significant impact on ground waters. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 3.g. No. The proposal will not result in a change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions, withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations. Reference response 3.f. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 3.h. No. The project will not result in the reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies. Water service will be provided by Rancho California Water District (RCWD) upon completion of financial arrangements between RCWD and the property owner (based upon transmittal dated October 14, 1993, a copy of which is on file with the Planning Department). No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 3.i. No. The proposal will not expose people or property to water related hazards such as flooding. Reference responses 3.c. and 3.d.

Plant Life

- 4.a. Maybe. The proposal may result in a change to the diversity of species, or number of any native species of plants. A small portion of the site has been previously graded. The remainder of the site has been identified by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. (letter dated November 3, 1993) as Coastal Sage Scrub (habitat for the California Gnatcatcher - an endangered species). As of the date of this assessment, the habitat may not be disturbed (i.e. graded). However, it is anticipated that a forthcoming interpretation of the Federal Endangered Species Act. An interpretation is forthcoming from the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife (the agency that oversees the Endangered Species Act) will permit grading. In addition, according to the letter prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc., studies must be performed on the habitat during the Gnatcatcher's nesting period (February 15 to July 15). If no evidence is found that the Gnatcatcher exists on site, then habitat may be disturbed. Information obtained from the Deputy

Riverside County Council suggests that a focused biological survey may be done now to determine if Gnatcatchers exist on the site. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has also stated that if the gnatcatcher survey results indicate the presence of the gnatcatcher (or any other Federally endangered species), then the applicant could apply for a Federal incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). These factors will determine whether the project may be developed.

- 4.b. **Maybe.** The proposal may result in a reduction of the numbers of any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species of plants. Reference response 4.a.
- 4.c. **Maybe.** Development of the site may result in the creation of a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species. Reference response 4.a.
- 4.d. **No.** The proposal will not result in a reduction in the acreage of any agricultural crop. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project since no prime farmland, farmland of statewide or local importance, or unique farmland is located within the project site.

Animal Life

- 5.a,b,d,e. **Maybe.** The project may result in a change in the diversity of species, or numbers of species of animals. The project site lies within the Riverside County Stephens Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan Preliminary Study Area, however, the project itself will not impact the habitat of the Stephens Kangaroo Rat. The site has been previously graded and consists of sporadic ground cover. Development exists to the north, south, and west of the site. There is no potential for the change in the diversity and number (reduction) of the species, or in producing a barrier to the migration of Stephens Kangaroo Rat as well as the deterioration of its habitat exists within the project area. Since a Habitat Conservation Plan has not been established as of this date, the impacts to the Stephens Kangaroo Rat may be mitigated through the payment of the Interim Mitigation Fee pursuant to Ordinance No. 663. This fee will be imposed as a Condition of Approval for a project at this site. No other sensitive species have been identified upon the site. As of the date of this assessment, the habitat may not be disturbed (i.e. graded). However, it is anticipated that a forthcoming interpretation of the Federal Endangered Species Act. An interpretation is forthcoming from the U.S. Department of Fish and Wildlife (the agency that oversees the Endangered Species Act) will permit grading. In addition, according to the letter prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc., studies must be performed on the habitat during the Gnatcatcher's nesting period (February 15 to July 15). If no evidence is found that the Gnatcatcher exists on site, then habitat may be disturbed. Information obtained from the Deputy Riverside County Council suggests that a focused biological survey may be done now to determine if Gnatcatchers exist on the site. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service has also stated that if the gnatcatcher survey results indicate the presence of the gnatcatcher (or any other Federally endangered species), then the applicant could apply for a Federal incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act). These factors will determine whether the project may be developed.
- 5.c. **No.** The proposal will not result in the introduction of any new wildlife species into the area. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Noise

- 6.a. Yes. The proposal will result in increases to existing noise levels. The site is currently vacant and any development of the land would logically result in an increase to noise levels. This would occur both during construction phases as well as an overall increase to noise in the area over the long run. These impacts will not be considered significant because of the specific location of the church. The western portion of the site is a slope that will not be used in the development of the project. A Metropolitan Water District easement is to the west of the slope. Both of these items will serve as a buffer to the single-family residences to the west of the site. Single family residences exist to the south of the site. Pauba Road will serve as a buffer to these homes. The Community Recreation Center is nearing completion and is located to the north of the project site at the bottom of a slope. The land is vacant to the east of the project site. No significant impacts from noise are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 6.b. Yes. The project will expose people to severe noise levels during the development/construction phase short run. Construction machinery is capable of producing noise in the range of 100+ DBA at 100 feet which is considered very annoying and can cause hearing damage from steady 8-hour exposure. This source of noise will be of short duration and therefore will not be considered significant. No significant impacts are anticipated either in the short- or long-run.
- 6.c. No. The proposal will not result in the exposure of people to severe vibrations. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Light and Glare

7. Yes. The proposal will ultimately produce and result in light/glare, because development of the site will create new light sources. All light and glare has the potential to impact the Mount Palomar Observatory and surrounding development. A condition of approval has been added that requires light standards to be a maximum of four (4) feet high, with the exception of areas where security concerns are paramount. Lights will be required to be turned off at 11 p.m., unless security is an issue. In addition, the project is conditioned to be consistent with Ordinance No. 655 (Ordinance Regulating Light Pollution). No impacts are foreseen from light and glare.

Land Use

- 8.a. Yes. The proposal will alter the present land use of the area, because the site is currently vacant. When the project is realized the use of the land will be altered. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan which states: "Additional public and institutional uses, including churches and daycare, may be developed in the residential or non-residential land use designations under the procedures established in the Development Code. The Development Code is currently being prepared and has yet to be adopted. In the interim, Staff utilized Ordinance No. 348 as the "development code." Under Ordinance No. 348, a church is permitted in any zone provide a public use permit has been granted. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 8.b. No. The proposal will not result in an alteration to the future planned land use of the site as described City's General Plan. Reference response 8.a. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Natural Resources

- 9.a,b. **Maybe.** The proposal may result in an increase in the rate of use of any natural resource or the depletion of any nonrenewable resource. Development of the site will result in an increase in the rate of use of natural resources (construction materials, fuels for the daily operation, asphalt, lumber) and the subsequent depletion of these non-renewable natural resources. Due to the scale of the proposed development, these impacts are not seen as significant.

Risk of Upset

- 10.a,b. **No.** The proposal will not result in a risk of explosion, or the release of any hazardous substances in the event of an accident or upset conditions, since none are proposed in the request. The same is true for the use, storage, transport or disposal of any hazardous or toxic materials. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 10.c. **No.** The project will not interfere with an emergency response plan or an emergency evaluation plan. The subject site is not located in an area which could impact an emergency response plan. The project will take access from a maintained street (Pauba Road) and will therefore not impede any emergency response or emergency evacuation plans. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Population

11. **No.** The project will not result in altering the location, distribution, density or growth rate of the human population of the area. Projects of this nature do not cause people to relocate. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Housing

12. **No.** Reference response 11. Projects of this nature do not cause people to relocate, and therefore, additional housing needs will not be created. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Transportation/Circulation

- 13.a. **No.** The proposal will not result in the generation of substantial additional vehicular movement. Information contained in the Focused Traffic Analysis (prepared by Robert Kahn, John Kain and Associates, Inc., dated August 20, 1993) indicates that opening year development of the site will result in the maintenance of Levels of Service (LOS) "B" for intersections affected by the project (Ynez and Rancho Vista, Ynez and Pauba, and Ynez and Santiago). In addition, opening year development of the site will result in the maintenance of LOS "E" and "F" at the intersection of Margarita and Pauba Roads during peak AM and PM hours respectively. Currently, this intersection is a four-way stop. The project will be conditioned to pay signal mitigation fees. Upon installation of a traffic signal at that intersection, LOS is anticipated to improve to "B" or better. No significant impacts are expected from development of the site.
- 13.b. **Yes.** The project will result in an increased demand for new parking. Ultimate buildout of the site would require 328 parking spaces under the requirements of Ordinance No. 348. The applicant

has stated in the parking needs analysis that the Worship/Fellowship Building and the Sanctuary will not be used simultaneously for assembly purposes. Parking needs for maximum use of the site (Sunday) are determined as follows: Sanctuary (167 spaces), Day School used as Sunday School (23 spaces), and Sunday School (45 spaces) for a total of 235 spaces. Two hundred thirty-six (236) parking spaces are provided on site. The applicant has submitted a formal request for a reduction in the amount of parking required under Ordinance No. 348, as well a justification for the reduction. The request can be supported based upon the hours of operation for the uses on site and how this is a typical occurrence for churches and associated facilities. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

- 13.c. No. The proposal will create impacts upon existing transportation systems, including public transportation. The project proponent will be required to improve Pauba Road to its ultimate right-of-way along its border with Pauba Road. Due to the time of operation of the proposed project (off-peak traffic generation), no significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project. Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) route are not available in the area where the project is located, and therefore, no impacts from this project are foreseen on RTA's level of service.
- 13.d. Yes. The proposal will result in alterations to present patterns of circulation or movement of people and/or goods. The site is currently vacant and therefore, no one is traveling to the site. Upon development of the site, approximately 830 weekday and 840 weekend trips will be to a site which previously had no one travelling to it. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 13.e. No. The proposal will not result in alterations to waterborne, rail or air traffic since none exists currently in the proximity of the site and none are proposed. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 13.f. Yes. The proposal will result in an increase in traffic hazards to motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians, however, they are not seen as significant. Impacts have been mitigated to a level less than significant through the site design, which is consistent with City standards.

Public Services

- 14.a,b. No. The proposal will not have a substantial effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered fire or police protection. The church and associated buildings will incrementally increase the need for fire and police protection, however, due to the scale of the proposed development, these impacts are not seen as significant.
- 14.c. No. The proposal will not have a substantial effect upon or result in a need for new or altered school facilities. Any potential impacts can be reduced to a level less than significant through the payment of school fees which will be required to be paid prior to the issuance of building permits for the project. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 14.d. No. The proposal will not have a substantial effect upon or result in a need for new or altered parks or other recreational facilities. Projects of this nature do not cause people to relocate into the area or require additional housing. Therefore additional recreational facilities above those provided on site will not be needed. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

- 14.e. Yes. The proposal will result in a need for the maintenance of public facilities, including roads. Funding for maintenance of roads is derived from the Gasoline Tax which is distributed to the City of Temecula from the State of California. Impacts to current and future needs for maintenance of roads as a result of development of the site are incremental, are not considered significant. This is because the Gasoline Tax is sufficient to cover any of the proposed expenses.
- 14.f. No. The proposal will not have a substantial affect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Energy

- 15.a. No. The proposal will not result in the use of substantial amounts of fuel or energy. As mentioned in responses 9.a. and 9.b. the proposal may result in an increase in the rate of use of any natural resource or the depletion of any nonrenewable resource. Development of the site will result in an increase in the rate of use of natural resources (construction materials, fuels for the daily operation, asphalt, lumber) and the subsequent depletion of these non-renewable natural resources. Due to the scale of the proposed development, these impacts are not seen as significant.
- 15.b. No. The project will not result in a substantial increase in demand upon existing sources of energy, nor will the project require the development of new sources of energy. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Utilities

- 16.a. No. The proposal will not result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to power or natural gas. The project site is within proximity of existing facilities. Development exists to the north, south, and west of the site and they already receive these services. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 16.b. No. The proposal will not result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to communication systems (reference response No. 16.a.). No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 16.c. No. The proposal will not result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to water systems. As mentioned in response 3.h., water service will be provided by Rancho California Water District (RCWD) upon completion of financial arrangements between RCWD and the property owner (based upon transmittal dated October 14, 1993, a copy of which is on file with the Planning Department). No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 16.d. No. The proposal will not result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to sanitary sewer systems. The project is located within Eastern Municipal Water District's (EMWD) sanitary sewer service area. According to a letter from EMWD dated October 22, 1993: "...the provision of service will be based on the detailed plan of service requirements, the timing of the project the status of the District's permit to operate, and the service agreement between the District and the developer of the subject property. In addition, information contained in the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (Certified November 9, 1993) states that adequate facilities exist (and are proposed) which will adequately service the project. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

- 16.e. **Yes.** The proposal will result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to on-site storm water drainage systems. The proposal will result in changes to absorption rates, drainage patterns and the rate and amount of surface runoff. Previously permeable ground will be rendered impervious by construction of buildings, accompanying hardscape and driveways. While absorption rates and surface runoff will change, impacts are mitigated through site design. Drainage conveyances will be required which will safely and adequately handle any of the runoff which is created by the realization of the project. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 16.f. **No.** The proposal will not result in a need for new systems or substantial alterations to solid waste disposal systems. Any potential impacts from solid waste created by this development can be mitigated through participation in any Source Reduction and Recycling Programs which are implemented by the City. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 16.g. **No.** The proposal will not result in a disjointed or inefficient pattern of utility delivery system improvements for any of the above. (reference response No. 16.a.). No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Human Health

- 17.a,b. **No.** The proposal will not result in the creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard. The County of Riverside Health Services Agency has reviewed the project and their comment will be included as a condition of approval for the project (County of Riverside Health Services Agency transmittal dated October 6, 1993, a copy of which is on file with the Planning Department). In addition, the proposal will not expose people to potential health hazards. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Aesthetics

- 18.a. **Maybe.** The proposal may result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public. The project site is currently vacant and affords views to the north and east. These views will be blocked by buildings on the site. Although the scenic vista will be impeded, any development of the site with structures would have the same result. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 18.b. **Maybe.** The proposal may result in the creation of an aesthetically offensive site open to public view. Manufactured slopes that will be created on the site will be in open view, especially from the north and the west. Landscaping of these slopes will combine the utilization of materials that blend in with the natural vegetation on the site; thereby minimizing any potential impacts. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 18.c. **Maybe.** The proposal may result in detrimental visual impacts on the surrounding area. Potential visual impacts will be mitigated to a level less than significant. Reference response 18.b.

Recreation

19. No. The proposal will not result in impacts to the quality or quantity of existing recreational resources or opportunities. The site is currently vacant and is not being used for either passive or active recreational purposes. Projects of this nature do not cause people to significant numbers of people to relocate into the area; therefore, additional housing will not be required. Recreational facilities are provided on site; therefore, none will be needed above that provided on-site. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

Cultural Resources

- 20.a. No. The proposal will not result in the alteration or destruction of any paleontologic, prehistoric, archaeological or historic site. Although both the City of Temecula General Plan Environmental Impact Report (Certified November 9, 1993) and the Southwest Area Community Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (adopted May, 1989) indicate that there is a possibility that paleontologic, prehistoric, archaeological or historic sites may exist on the subject project site, a letter from the California Archaeological Inventory Eastern Information Center (dated November 29, 1993) states: "A Phase I cultural resource study identified no cultural resources. Further study is not recommended." The letter further states: "if, during construction, cultural resources are encountered, work should be halted or diverted in the immediate area while a qualified archaeologist evaluates the finds and makes recommendations." This will be included as a condition of approval for the project. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 20.b. No. The proposal will not result in adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure or object. Reference response 20.b. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 20.c. No. The project will not have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values. No "unique" ethnic cultural values exist on-site or in proximity to the site. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.
- 20.d. No. The proposal will not result in restrictions to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area. None currently exist on the site. No significant impacts are anticipated as a result of this project.

IV. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Yes Maybe No

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|----------|
| 1. Does the project have the potential to either: degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish, wildlife or bird species, cause a fish, wildlife or bird population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant, bird or animal species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short term, to the disadvantage of long term, environmental goals? (A short term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long term impacts will endure well into the future.) | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 3. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project's impact on two or more separate resources may be relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.) | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| 4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | — | — | <u>X</u> |

V. DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME "DE MINIMUS" IMPACT FINDINGS

Does the project have the potential to cause any adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively, on fish and wildlife resources? Wildlife is defined as "all wild animals, birds, plants, fish, amphibians, and related ecological communities, including the habitat upon which the wildlife depends on for it's continued viability" (Section 711.2, Fish and Game Code).

Yes No

X —

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the Mitigation Measures described on the attached sheets and in the Conditions of Approval that have been added to the project will mitigate any potentially significant impacts to a level of insignificance, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

X

I find the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

Prepared by: Matthew Fagan, Assistant Planner


Signature

Matthew Fagan, Assistant Planner December 10, 1993