I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Shaw

- Pledge of Allegiance: Commissioner Price
- Roll Call: Commissioners Krick, Price, Schuler, Chairman Shaw

II. **PUBLIC COMMENTS - On Items Not on the Agenda**

   A five-minute limitation shall apply to each member of the public who wishes to address the Chairman and Commissioners for items not on the agenda. No member of the public shall be permitted to “share” his/her five minutes with any other member of the public. (Items received under this heading may be referred to staff or future study, research, completion and/or future Commissioner Action.) PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.

III. **CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:**

   **Note:** All items listed on the Consent Calendar may be enacted by a single motion without separate discussion. If a discussion or a separate vote on any item is desired by a Planning Commissioner, that item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered separately. All remaining items not removed from the Consent Calendar by a Planning Commissioner shall be voted on prior to discussion of the item(s) requested to be pulled.

IV. **PUBLIC HEARING:**

   I. DESIGN REVIEW 18-7006 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF 13 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS LOCATED AT THE NORTH EAST CORNER OF SAN GORGONIO AVENUE AND WESLEY STREET (APN’S 543-150-007 THROUGH 019)

   Staff Report – Sonia Pierce..................................................
Recommendation:

That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2018-13

1. Approve Design Review 18-7006 for the construction of 13 single family residential dwelling units and associated improvements

2. Find the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to section 15162, Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations, a subsequent environmental document is not required and that the project is exempt from CEQA.

Order of Procedure:

1. Staff report presentation
2. Applicant Presentation
3. Planning Commission questions for staff and applicant
4. Open public comments
5. Close public comments
6. Planning Commission discussion
7. Motion and Second
8. Planning Commission discussion on motion
9. Call the question (Roll call vote)

V. PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

VI. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR’S COMMENTS:

VII. ADJOURNMENT:

The City of Banning Planning Commission is hereby adjourned to the Regular Planning Commission meeting of October 3, 2018 starting at 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Division (951) 922-3125. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting [28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA title II].
CITY OF BANNING
Planning Commission Report

MEETING DATE: September 5, 2018
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Patty Nevins, Community Development Director
PREPARED BY: Sonia Pierce, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: DESIGN REVIEW 18-7006 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF 13 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DWELLING UNITS FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTH EAST CORNER OF SAN GORGONIO AVENUE AND WESLEY STREET IN THE VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LAND USE DISTRICT (APN 543-150-007 THROUGH 019)

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 2018-13:

I. Finding that in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162, Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations, a subsequent environmental document is not required under CEQA; and

II. Approving Design Review 18-7006 for the construction of 13 single family residential dwelling units and associated improvements.

APPLICANT INFORMATION:

Project Applicant: Othoniel "Tony" Jara
5318 El Rivino RD.
Riverside, CA 92509
Property Owner: Othoniel “Tony” Jara  
5318 El Rivino RD.  
Riverside, CA 92509  

Project Location: Northeast Corner of San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street

APN Information: 543-150-007 THROUGH 019

**APPLICANT’S REQUEST:**

The applicant, Tony Jara, is requesting Design Review approval of 13 single-family residential units and associated improvements on the parcels identified as APN 543-150-007 through 019, located on the Northeast corner of San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street, in the Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) zoning district.

**BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION:**

On August 3, 2004, the Planning Commission considered proposed Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and a Mitigated Negative Declaration and voted to recommend that the City Council approve the proposed project based on the findings and conditions submitted at that time.

On September 14, 2004, the City Council approved Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and a Mitigated Negative Declaration to subdivide an approximately 7.4-acre parcel into 13 single family residential lots in the RA Zone per the conditions of approval and the findings submitted at that time.

Since the 2004 approvals, the City of Banning adopted a General Plan Update on January 31, 2006. The property was rezoned to Very Low Density Residential (VLDR), which allows up to two residential units per acre.

On April 14, 2006, the tract map was recorded and all grading and street improvements have been completed. The subdivision includes graded pads for 13-single-family lots, which have been gated with a chain link security fence until the time of residential construction. The land uses surrounding the project are single-family homes on large lots to the north east and south, Banning High School ball fields and the Banning Stagecoach KOA recreational vehicle park on the west side across San Gorgonio Avenue.

All lots within the subdivision meet the Zoning Code development standard for a minimum 20,000 square feet in area. Access into the site is provided by a central roadway planned at 60 feet in width (40 foot paved width) with a 5-foot sidewalk and 5-foot parkway, which will T-off to two cul-de-sacs.
ANALYSIS:

Per Zoning Ordinance Section 17.08.250 (Single-family architecture), the design and architecture of new development in the Very Low Density Residential zoning district shall be consistent with the Single Family Guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance. New Developments should be compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhoods by providing architectural styles that are similar or harmonious to those of the existing neighborhoods through the use of form, size, color, materials, orientation, and rooflines. While individual residences should be compatible with one another, each design should be unique in its own way.

Land Use Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Site</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single Family Residences</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>residential/vacant parcel</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>residential/vacant parcel</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)</td>
<td>Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Banning High School</td>
<td>Public Facilities School</td>
<td>Public Facilities School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architectural Design

The design and architecture of the single family residences are consistent with the Design Guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance. Desirable elements include four color schemes and two elevation plans, The Ranch and The Hacienda. There are two plans and four color schemes that will be mixed within the 13 lot development depending on the lot dimensions. The single story designs include wall articulations, insets, porches, and pitched roofs and will blend well with the existing neighborhood and create a uniqueness to the residential development.

**Plan 1** is 2,468 s.f. 3-bedrooms + convertible bonus bedroom, 2.5 bathrooms, 3-car garage, formal entry, great room, open kitchen, walk-in pantry, interior laundry room and porch.
Plan 2 is 2,795 s.f. 4-bedrooms + convertible, 3.5 bathrooms, 3-car garage, formal entry, great room, open kitchen, walk-in pantry, interior laundry room and rear terrace.

The Ranch design materials include: concrete flat tiles for the roof, stucco and hardboard siding, wood trim, wood posts and brackets, wood railing, wood shutters, wood fascia and wood beams.

The Hacienda design materials include: concrete "s" tile for the roof, stucco and brick, wood trim, wood post and corbels with metal ties, wood railing, wood shutters and wood trim.

Landscaping and Lighting Design

A conceptual landscape plan has been shown on the colored site map. The tract map has a prior condition of approval to provide submit a conceptual landscape with xeriscape plant material prior to issuance of building permits and to provide a detailed landscape plan prior to certificate of occupancy for any single family residence.

Exterior lighting is conditioned to be shielded or recessed so that light is contained within the boundaries of the parcel on which the lighting is located. All lighting will be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. Additionally, any lighting that would interfere with the nearby airport operations is prohibited in accordance the conditions imposed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Director (see Attachment 3).

The subdivision meets or exceeds the Zoning Ordinance development standards for the VLDR zone as demonstrated in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Zoning Ordinance VLDR</th>
<th>Proposed Site Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Density (units/Ac.)</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min Lot Size</td>
<td>20,000 s.f.</td>
<td>20,000 s.f.-20,218 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100'-112'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>178'-234'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>35'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15'-24'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Setback</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>20'-26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>63'-118'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects Near Airports

The project is located within Airport Compatibility Zones E of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan as adopted by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for Banning Municipal Airport. On July 9, 2018, the Riverside County Airport Land Use Director determined the project is consistent with the Banning Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as amended in 2016, provided the attached recommended conditions are applied (see Attachment 3). The conditions imposed through the ALUC review are incorporated into the Conditions of Approval.

Conclusion

Staff recommends approval of the subject Design Review as the proposed project is consistent with the requirements of the City of Banning General Plan and the City’s Zoning Code. The project adequately meets the standards and design guidelines as discussed in the staff report; or, will meet those requirements as stated in the Conditions of Approval and upon review and approval of the construction plans and specifications.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

On September 14, 2004, the City Council approved Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and adopted an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(b)(2), for Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15162 sets forth the criteria for determining the appropriate additional environmental documentation, if any, to be completed when there is a previously adopted Negative Declaration for the project. Section 15162(a) states that when a Negative Declaration has been adopted for a project, no subsequent Negative Declaration shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole public record, one or more of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Bldg. Coverage (%)</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>16%-18%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height (stories/feet)</td>
<td>2/35</td>
<td>1/17.5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Fence/Wall Height (ft)</td>
<td>6'</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

   a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous Negative Declaration; or

   b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previously adopted Negative Declaration; or

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

   d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous Negative Declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Staff finds that none of these circumstances have occurred and as such, no additional environmental review is required.

Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).

The project is found to be consistent with the MSHCP. The project is located outside of any MSHCP criteria area and mitigation is provided through payment of the MSHCP Mitigation Fee.
PUBLIC COMMUNICATION

The proposed DR 18-7006 was advertised in the Record Gazette newspaper on August 24, 2018 (Attachment No.5). Additionally, notices were mailed to all property owners within 1,200 feet of the project.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Planning Resolution No. 2018-13
   Exhibit A - Project Plans
   Exhibit B - Conditions of Approval
2. Project Plans
3. Airport Land Use Commission Determination
4. TM 31748 City Council Report, Conditions, Initial Study, Mitigation Monitoring Program
5. Public Hearing Notice

Prepared By: Sonia Pierce
Senior Planner

Reviewed and Recommended By: Patty Nevins
Community Development Director
RESOLUTION 2018-13

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BANNING, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING DESIGN REVIEW 18-7006 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF 13 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL UNITS AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAN GORGONIO AVENUE AND WESLEY STREET IN THE VERY LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LAND USE DISTRICT APNS 543-150-007 THROUGH 019

WHEREAS, an application for Design Review approval for the construction of 13 single family residential units and associated improvements has been duly filed by:

Project Applicant: Othoniel “Tony” Jara
5318 El Rivino Rd.
Riverside, CA 92509

APN: 543-150-007 THROUGH 019

Lot Area: 7.35 acres

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has the authority per Chapter 17.56 of the Banning Municipal Code to take action on Design Review No. 18-7006 for the construction of 13 single family residential units and associated improvements in the Very Low Density Residential Land Use District; and

WHEREAS, on August 24, 2018, the City gave public notice by advertising in the Record Gazette, a newspaper of general circulation within the City of Banning, and by mailing notices to property owners within 1,200 feet of the project of the holding of a public hearing at which the project would be considered; and

WHEREAS, on September 5, 2018, the Planning Commission held the noticed public hearing at which interested persons had an opportunity to testify in support of, or opposition to Design Review No. 18-7006; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), staff analyzed Design Review 18-7006 and determined that, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations, a subsequent environmental document is not required.

NOW THEREFORE, the Planning Commission of the City of Banning does hereby resolve, determine, find, and order as follows:
SECTION 1. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

On September 14, 2004, the City Council adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and a Mitigated Negative Declaration ("MND"), in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21152(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(b)(1).

Pursuant to CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines, City staff has considered the potential environmental impacts of Design Review 18-7006 (the "Project"). City staff has also reviewed the Initial Study and MND prepared for Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and adopted by the City Council on September 14, 2004, including the impacts and mitigation measures identified therein. Based on that review, the City of Banning Planning Division has determined that the Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the prior adopted MND. All potential environmental impacts associated with Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and Design Review 18-7006 are adequately addressed by the prior MND, and the mitigation measures contained in the prior MND will reduce those impacts to a level that is less than significant. The Planning Commission has independently reviewed City staff's determination, and based upon the whole record before it, City staff's determination, and its independent review and judgment, finds that that the Project, as designed, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to the Guidelines because: (1) The Project and the circumstances under which the Project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the Project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the prior MND; and (2) All potential environmental impacts associated with Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and Design Review 18-7006 are adequately addressed by the prior MND, and the mitigation measures contained in the prior MND will reduce those impacts to a level that is less than significant. The custodian of records for the prior MND, and all other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Planning Commission's recommendation is based, is the Planning Division of the City Banning. Those documents are available for public review in the Planning Division located at 99 E. Ramsey Street, Banning, California 92220.

Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).
The project is found to be consistent with the MSHCP. The project is located outside of any MSHCP criteria area and mitigation is provided through payment of the MSHCP Mitigation Fee.

SECTION 2. REQUIRED FINDINGS:

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR DESIGN REVIEW No.18-7006:

Section 17.56.050 of the City of Banning Zoning Ordinance requires that Design Review applications meet certain findings prior to the approval by the Planning Commission. The following findings are provided in support of the approval of Design Review No.18-7006:

Finding A: The proposed use is consistent with the General Plan;

Finding of Fact: Design Review No.18-7006 is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Element’s Residential Goals, Policies and Programs which, Goal 1 states to “Preserve and enhance the City’s neighborhoods” and Goal 2 states to have “A broad range of housing types to fill the needs of the City’s current and future residents.” The proposed residential development is consistent with the City Council strategic plan relating to Economic Development Strategy I, in that development of the subdivision is expected to contribute to achieving a stable and diversified economy within the community. The construction of the proposed tract will generate property and sales tax revenues to the City which will help offset the provision of services to the project residents.

Finding B: The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, including the development standards and guidelines for the district in which it is located.

Finding of Fact: The proposed project, the construction of 13 single family residential units and associated improvements in the Very Low Density Residential Land Use District, is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and development standards as the subdivision meets or exceeds the Zoning Ordinance development standards for the VLDR Zone as to lot width, lot depth, setbacks and building height and provides public improvements that meet City standards. Additionally, all other standards and design guidelines have been considered.
Finding C: The design and layout of the proposed project will not unreasonably interfere with the use and enjoyment of neighboring existing or future development, and will not result in vehicular and/or pedestrian hazards. Public Roadway improvement dedications have already been taken.

Finding of Fact: The proposed project is located in an area which is relatively quiet. The project site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Wesley Street and San Gorgonio Avenue. San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street comprise the west and south boundaries respectively. The eastern and northern boundaries are defined by existing single-family residential. The proposed project will be compatible with the existing character of the neighborhood. The residential uses are buffered from San Gorgonio by a 6' block wall.

Finding D: The design of the proposed project is compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Finding of Fact: The project is adjacent to San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street on the west and south boundaries respectively. The eastern and northern boundaries are defined by existing single-family residential on large lots. The proposed residential project will be compatible with the existing character of the neighborhood. Landscaping, walls and fences will be installed complementing the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

SECTION 3. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION:

The Planning Commission hereby takes the following action:

1. Adoption of Planning Commission Resolution 2018-13:

   a. Finding, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21152(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a), that the project, as designed, is not subject to further environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a) because: (1) The project and the circumstances under which the project is undertaken do not involve substantial changes which will result in new significant environmental effects, and that the project does not involve new information of substantial importance which shows that the project will have significant effects not discussed in the prior MND adopted for Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748; and (2) All potential environmental impacts associated with Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 and Design Review 18-7006 are adequately addressed by the prior
MND, and the mitigation measures contained in the prior MND will reduce those impacts to a level that is less than significant; and

b. Approving Design Review No. 18-7006, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

   i. Compliance with the Conditions of Approval for Lot Split #40 4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 in Attachment 4, Exhibit 1 in addition to the Conditions of Approval contained in Attachment 1 Exhibit B.

   ii. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the plans stamped dated, September 5, 2018, approved by the City, which include site plan, architectural elevations, exterior materials and colors, landscaping, and grading on file in the Planning Division.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 5th day of September, 2018.

Eric Shaw, Chairman
Banning Planning Commission

APPROVED AS TO FORM
AND LEGAL CONTENT:

Serita R. Young, Assistant City Attorney
Richards, Watson & Gershon
ATTEST:

Sandra Calderon, Recording Secretary
City of Banning, California

CERTIFICATION:

I, Sandra Calderon, Recording Secretary of the Planning Commission of the City of Banning, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution 2018-13 was duly adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Banning, California, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 5th day of September, 2018, by the following vote, to wit:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Sandra Calderon, Recording Secretary
City of Banning, California
SITE MAP
BANNING ESTATES
TENTATIVE TRACT 31748
BANNING, CALIFORNIA
PROJECT #: Design Review No. 18-7006
SUBJECT: Conditions of Approval (Planning Commission Resolution No. 2018-13)
APPLICANT: Othoniel “Tony” Jara
LOCATION: APN: 543-150-007 THROUGH 019 (Lauren Lane)

EXHIBIT B

* All fair share agreements, covenant agreements and agreements subject to recordation will be subject to review and approval by the City Attorney and will include appropriate enforcement provisions by the City and be properly securitized.

Community Development Department

1. The project shall at all times comply with all Federal, State, County and City laws, codes, regulations and standards including those that relate to hazardous materials.

2. The applicant shall indemnify, protect, defend, and hold harmless, the City, and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof, from any and all claims, demands, lawsuits, writs of mandamus, and other actions and proceedings (whether legal, equitable, declaratory, administrative or adjudicatory in nature), and alternative dispute resolutions procedures (including, but not limited to, arbitrations, mediations, and other such procedures) (collectively “Actions”), brought against the City, and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof, that challenge, attack, or seek to modify, set aside, void, or annul, the action of, or any permit or approval issued by, the City and/or any of its officials, officers, employees, agents, departments, agencies, and instrumentalities thereof (including actions approved by the voters of the City), for or concerning the project, whether such Actions are brought under the California Environmental Quality Act, the Planning and Zoning Law, the Subdivisions Map Act, Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085 or 1094.5, or any other state, federal, or local statute, law, ordinance, rule, regulation, or any decision of a competent
jurisdiction. It is expressly agreed that the City shall have the right to approve, which approval will not be unreasonably withheld, the legal counsel providing the City's defense, and that applicant shall reimburse City for any costs and expenses directly and necessarily incurred by the City in the course of the defense. City shall promptly notify the applicant of any Action brought and City shall cooperate with applicant in the defense of the Action.

3. Approval of this entitlement shall not waive compliance with any sections of the Development Code, other applicable City Ordinances, in effect at the time of building permit issuance.

4. Construction shall commence within two (2) years from the date of project approval, or the Design Review approval shall become null and void. Additionally, if after commencement of construction work is discontinued for a period of one year the Design Review shall become null and void. Projects may be built in phases if pre-approved by the review authority. The Community Development Director may, upon a written application being filed 30 days prior to expiration and for good cause, grant a one-time extension not to exceed 12 months. Upon granting of an extension, the Community Development Director shall ensure that the Design Review comply with all current Ordinance provisions.

5. A copy of the signed resolution of approval and all conditions of approval and any applicable mitigation measures shall be reproduced in legible form on the grading plans, building and construction plans, and landscape and irrigation plans submitted for review and approval as required by the reviewing department.

6. The applicant shall comply with all conditions of approval as stipulated by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) Development Review Director's Determination dated July 9, 2018, and any amendments; including any requirements stipulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Aeronautical Study.

   A. Any new outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.

   B. The following uses shall be prohibited within the site:

      1. Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing or red, white, green, or amber colors associated with airport operations towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport, other than an FAA approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.
2 Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

3 Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling facilities, fly ash disposal, and incinerators.)

4 Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

C. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers of the recorded lots and to tenants of the homes thereon (see page 3 of the ALUC report).

D. Any new aboveground detention basins on the site shall be designed so as to provide for a maximum 48-hour detention period following the conclusion of a storm event design storm event for the design storm (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the detention basin(s) that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be used in project landscaping.

7. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the plans stamped approved by the City, which include site plans, architectural elevations, exterior materials and colors, landscaping, and grading on file in the Planning Division; the conditions contained herein; and, municipal code regulations.

8. The applicant shall install slate, concrete, tile, clay tile, or equal roofing material approved by the Planning and Fire Departments on all units within the subject property.

9. All ground-mounted utility appurtenances such as transformers and AC condensers shall be located out of public view and adequately screened through the use of a combination of concrete or masonry walls, berming, and/or landscaping to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

10. A detailed on-site lighting plan, including a photometric diagram, shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director. Such plan shall indicate style, illumination, location, height, and method of shielding so as not to adversely
affect adjacent properties in accordance with the Zoning Code. Lighting fixtures shall be shielded or recessed to prevent spillage to the adjacent properties. Additionally, all lighting plans and installations shall conform to the requirements of the conditions stipulated by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) review.

11. The project shall implement, at a minimum, and require an increase in building energy efficiency of 15 percent beyond Title 24, and reduce indoor water use by 25 percent. All requirements will be documented through a checklist to be submitted prior to issuance of any building permits with building plans and calculations.

12. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any single family residence constructed within TT 31748 the applicant shall submit to the City for review and approval a detailed landscape and irrigation plan (comprised of xeriscape plant material) indicating type, species and location of the following minimum number of drought tolerant, multi-branched trees on each lot adjacent to the street right-of-way (all trees shall be planted with root barriers):

   A. Cul-de-sac lots - 1 tree; minimum 24" box
   B. Interior lot - 2 trees; one 24" box, one 15-gallon
   C. Corner lot - 3 trees; two 24" box and one 15-gallon.

13. Applicant shall pay all development fees adopted by the City in effect at the time of issuance of any building permits, which shall include, but not be limited to: police and fire safety developer fees, water and sewer fees, park land dedication fees, impact fees, MSHCP fees, TUMF fees, and electric meter installation fees. Applicant shall provide written evidence to the City that school mitigation fees have been paid or other arrangements acceptable to the Banning Unified School District have been met.

14. A six- (6) foot chain link fence must be maintained around the perimeter of the site during all phases of construction.

15. All residential building address numbers shall be identified in a clear and concise manner, including proper illumination.

16. The developer shall submit a construction access plan and schedule for the development of the project for Community Development Director and City Engineer approval; including, but not limited to, public notice requirements, special street posting, phone listing for community concerns, hours of construction activity, dust control measures, and security fencing.
17. Prior to any use of the project site, all Conditions of Approval shall be completed, as required, to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director. Contact the Planning Department at (951) 922-3125 to request a FINAL INSPECTION prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy a minimum of 48 hours in advance of requested inspection.

Public Works Department

General Requirements

18. A Public Works Permit shall be required prior to commencement of any work within the public right-of-way. The contractor working within the public right-of-way shall submit proof of a Class "A" State Contractor's License, City of Banning Business License, and Liability Insurance. Any existing public improvements, or public improvements not accepted by the City that are damaged during construction shall be removed and replaced as determined by the City Engineer or his/her representative.

Water

19. Water Mains shall be flushed, chlorinated, pressure tested, and BacT tested before allowed to connect to the City's water distribution system. Water for flushing shall be obtained through a hydrant meter with approved backflow protection. All valves and fire hydrants shall be exercised and replaced or repaired as needed to be in working condition.

Sewer

20. CCTV inspection of sewer mains and laterals shall be completed, and any deficiencies shall be repaired at the applicant’s expense. Pressure test sewer main before acceptance by the City.

Fees

21. Water and Sewer Connection Fees shall be paid per EDU, at the time of issuance of building permits. Payment of Water Meter Installation Charges at the time of issuance of building permits in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time the fees are paid. Pay all water and sewer frontage fees, applicable when connecting to existing mains.

Electric Utility Department

The following will need to be completed in order to receive electric service.
22. All Street Light and Secondary Handholes will need to be replaced per current utility standards.
23. All damaged or missing substructures and/or grounds will be required to be replaced to current utility standards.
24. Replace any missing or damaged conductor within the Street Light standards.
25. Completing electric utility service conduits to new meter panels.
26. All conduits will be required to be mandrelled with an electric utility inspector present.
27. Paying required fees for electrical permit, plan check fee, inspection fees, meter fee and cost of in aid of construction costs.
28. The City of Banning Electric Utility shall be responsible for:
   A. Inspecting all trenches prior to backfilling. 24-hour prior notice is required before inspection.
   B. Witness conduit mandreling.
   C. Install electrical apparatus including primary & secondary conductors, terminations, metering and transformer to provide electrical service for your project.

**Building Department**

The following comments are required at time of plan check submittal

29. The Site shall be developed in compliance with all current model codes. All plans shall be designed in compliance with the latest editions of the California Building Codes as adopted by the City of Banning.

30. Site development and grading shall be designed to provide access to all entrances and exterior ground floor exits and access to normal paths of travel, and where necessary to provide access. Paths of travel shall incorporate (but not limited to) exterior stairs, landings, walks and sidewalks, pedestrian ramps, curb ramps, warning curbs, detectable warnings, signage, gates, lifts and walking surface material. The accessible route(s) of travel shall be the most practical direct route between accessible building entrances, site facilities, accessible parking, public sidewalks, and the accessible entrance(s) to the site. California Building Code (CBC) 11A and 11B.

   A. City of Banning enforces the State of California provisions of the California Building Code disabled access requirements. The Federal ADA standards differ in some cases from the California State requirements. It is the building owner’s responsibility to be aware of those differences and comply accordingly.
   B. Disabled access parking shall be located on the shortest accessible route. Relocate parking spaces accordingly.
31. Separate submittals and permits are required for all accessory structures such as, but not limited to, trash enclosures, patios, block walls, and storage buildings.

32. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code Section 6737, this project is required to be designed by a California licensed architect or engineer. Based on change of use and potential exiting and fire life safety improvements.

**Fire Department**

33. The installation of fire sprinklers is required for each residence.
34. The illumination of building address is required for each residence. Addresses shall be visible from the street.
35. Occupancy of the facilities shall not commence until such time as all Uniform Building Code and State Fire Marshal regulations have been complied with. Prior to occupancy, plans shall be submitted to the City of Banning Fire Marshal and the Building and Safety Division to show compliance. The buildings shall be inspected for compliance prior to occupancy.

***END***
ATTACHMENT 2

Project Plans
SITE MAP
BANNING ESTATES
TENTATIVE TRACT 31748
BANNING, CALIFORNIA
PLAN 1 - ELEVATIONS

- Choice of Hacienda or Ranch elevation style (depending on Lot)

- Ranch Style has a flat concrete tile roof, siding at the Porch and shutters.

- Hacienda Style has a concrete barrel tile roof, brick at the Porch and shutters.
BANNING ESTATES
BANNING, CALIFORNIA

PLAN 1- 2468 s.f.

- 3 Bedrooms + Convertible Bonus Bedroom
- 2.5 Bathrooms
- Oversized Three Car Garage
- Formal Entry
- Great Room (with Fireplace) with large open Kitchen + Island
- Large Walk-In Pantry
- Oversized Master Bathroom with Walk-In Wardrobe
- Interior Laundry Room
- Entertainment Porch
- Available Options vary per Lot

*Lauren Lane 13, LLC reserves the right to modify/delete features, materials, designs, prices, and offers without prior written notice and/or obligation. Square footages are approximate. Renderings are an artist's concept.
PLAN 2 - ELEVATIONS

- Choice of Hacienda or Ranch elevation style (depending on Lot)
- Ranch Style has a flat concrete tile roof, siding at the Porch and shutters.
- Hacienda Style has a concrete barrel tile roof, brick at the Porch and shutters.

LAUREN

LAUREN Lane 13, LLC reserves the right to modify/delete features, materials, designs, prices, and offers without prior written notice and/or obligation. Square footages are approximate. Renderings are an artist's concept.
PLAN 2 - 2795 s.f.

- 4 Bedrooms + Convertible 5th Bedroom
- 3.5 Bathrooms
- Oversized Three Car Garage
- Formal Entry
- Great Room (with Fireplace) with large open Kitchen + Island
- Large Walk-In Pantry
- Oversized Master Bathroom with Walk-In Wardrobe
- Interior Laundry Room
- Private Courtyard with Porch
- Additional Interior Storage Closets
- Covered Rear Terrace
- Available Options vary per Lot.

BANNING ESTATES
BANNING, CALIFORNIA

*Lauren Lane 13, LLC reserves the right to modify/delete features, materials, designs, prices, and offers without prior written notice and/or obligation. Square footages are approximate. Renderings are an artist's concept.
PLAN 2

BANNING ESTATES
BANNING, CALIFORNIA
LAUREN LANE 13, LLC

HACIENDA MATERIALS LEGEND
1 CONCRETE 'S' TILES
2 STUCCO
3 BRICK
4 WOOD TRIM
5 WOOD POST AND CORBELS W/METAL TIES
6 WOOD RAILING
7 WOOD SHUTTERS
8 WOOD FASCIA

RANCH MATERIALS LEGEND
1 CONCRETE FLAT TILES
2 STUCCO
3 HARDBOARD SIDING
4 WOOD TRIM
5 WOOD POST W/BRACKET
6 WOOD RAILING
7 WOOD SHUTTERS
8 WOOD FASCIA
9 WOOD BEAM

ELEVATION 2A - HACIENDA
ELEVATION 2B - RANCH
July 9, 2018

Ms. Sonia Pierce, Senior Planner
City of Banning Planning Division
99 E. Ramsey Street
Banning CA 92220

RE: AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION (ALUC) DEVELOPMENT REVIEW – DIRECTOR’S DETERMINATION

File No.: ZAP1029BA18
Related File No.: DR18-7006 (Design Review)
APNs: 543-150-007 thru -019

Dear Ms. Pierce:

Under the delegation of the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) pursuant to Policy 1.5.2(d) of the Countywide Policies of the 2004 Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, staff reviewed City of Banning Case No. DR18-7006 (Design Review), a proposal to construct 13 single family residential units (one on each of the 13 lots within recorded Tract Map No. 31748 located easterly of San Gorgonio Avenue and northerly of Wesley Street).

The site is located within Airport Compatibility Zone E of the Banning Municipal Airport Influence Area, where residential densities are not restricted.

The elevation of Runway 8-26 at Banning Municipal Airport is approximately 2,219 feet above mean sea level (2219 feet AMSL). At a distance of approximately 5,550 feet from the runway to the above-referenced area, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) review would be required for any structures with top of roof exceeding 2,274.5 feet AMSL. The project’s finished pad elevation ranges from 2,225 to 2,237 feet AMSL, and the proposed maximum building height is 17.5 feet, for a maximum top point elevation of 2,254.5 feet AMSL. Therefore, FAA Obstruction Evaluation Service review for height/elevation reasons was not required.

As ALUC Director, I hereby find the above-referenced project CONSISTENT with the 2004 Banning Municipal Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, as amended in 2016, provided that the City of Banning applies the following recommended conditions:

CONDITIONS:

1. Any new outdoor lighting that is installed shall be hooded or shielded so as to prevent either the spillage of lumens or reflection into the sky. Outdoor lighting shall be downward facing.

2. The following uses shall be prohibited within the site:

(a) Any use which would direct a steady light or flashing light of red, white, green, or
amber colors associated with airport operations toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing at an airport, other than an FAA-approved navigational signal light or visual approach slope indicator.

(b) Any use which would cause sunlight to be reflected towards an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following takeoff or towards an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach towards a landing at an airport.

(c) Any use which would generate smoke or water vapor or which would attract large concentrations of birds, or which may otherwise affect safe air navigation within the area. (Such uses include landscaping utilizing water features, aquaculture, production of cereal grains, sunflower, and row crops, artificial marshes, wastewater management facilities, composting operations, trash transfer stations that are open on one or more sides, recycling centers containing putrescible wastes, construction and demolition debris facilities, fly ash disposal, and incinerators.)

(d) Any use which would generate electrical interference that may be detrimental to the operation of aircraft and/or aircraft instrumentation.

3. The attached notice shall be provided to all potential purchasers of the recorded lots and to tenants of the homes thereon.

4. Any new aboveground detention basins on the site shall be designed so as to provide for a maximum 48-hour detention period following the conclusion of the storm event for the design storm (may be less, but not more), and to remain totally dry between rainfalls. Vegetation in and around the detention basin(s) that would provide food or cover for bird species that would be incompatible with airport operations shall not be used in project landscaping.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Rull, Urban Regional Planner IV, at (951) 955-6893 or John Guerin, ALUC Principal Planner, at (951) 955-0982.

Sincerely,
RIVERSIDE COUNTY AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION

Simon A. Housman, ALUC Director

Attachments: Notice of Airport in Vicinity

cc: Lauren Lane 13 LLC, Othontiel "Tony" Jara (applicant/property owner)
Carl Szyoyka, Airport Manager, City of Banning
Art Vela, Public Works Director, City of Banning
ALUC Case File
Y:\AIRPORT CASE FILES\Banning\ZAP1029BA18\ZAP1029BA18.LTR.doc
NOTICE OF AIRPORT IN VICINITY

This property is presently located in the vicinity of an airport, within what is known as an airport influence area. For that reason, the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to airport operations (for example: noise, vibration, or odors). Individual sensitivities to those annoyances [can vary from person to person. You may wish to consider what airport annoyances], if any, are associated with the property before you complete your purchase and determine whether they are acceptable to you. Business & Professions Code Section 11010 (b) (13)(A)
Legend

Compatibility Zones
- Airport Influence Area Boundary
- Zone A
- Zone B1
- Zone B2
- Zone C
- Zone D
- Zone E
- Height Review Overlay Zones

Boundary Lines:
- Airport Property Line
- City Limits
- Morongo Indian Reservation

Note:
Dimensions measured from runway ends and centerlines.
See Chapter 2, Table 2A for compatibility criteria associated with this map.
Important maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.
“IMPORTANT” Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.
*IMPORTANT* Maps and data are to be used for reference purposes only. Map features are approximate, and are not necessarily accurate to surveying or engineering standards. The County of Riverside makes no warranty or guarantee as to the content (the source is often third party), accuracy, timeliness, or completeness of any of the data provided, and assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Any use of this product with respect to accuracy and precision shall be the sole responsibility of the user.
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SITE MAP
BANNING ESTATES
TRACT 31748
BANNING, CALIFORNIA
PLAN 1 - ELEVATIONS

- Choice of Hacienda or Ranch elevation style (depending on Lot)

- Ranch Style has a flat concrete tile roof, siding at the Porch and shutters.

- Hacienda Style has a concrete barrel tile roof, brick at the Porch and shutters.

*Lauren Lane 13, LLC reserves the right to modify/delete features, materials, designs, prices, and offers without prior written notice and/or obligation. Square footage is approximate. Renderings are an artist's concept.*
Choice of Hacienda or Ranch elevation style (depending on Lot)

- Ranch Style has a flat concrete tile roof, siding at the Porch and shutters.
- Hacienda Style has a concrete barrel tile roof, brick at the Porch and shutters.

*Bannin Lane 13, LLC reserves the right to modify/delete features, materials, designs, prices, and offers without prior written notice and/or obligation. Square footages are approximate. Renderings are an artist's concept.
SITE MAP
BANNING ESTATES
TRACT 31748
BANNING, CALIFORNIA
Design Review


TO: See Circulation List on Reverse Side

PROJECT NUMBER: DR 18-7006  ZONE: Very Low Density Residential (VLDR)

ADDRESS / APN: 543-150-007 thru 019

APPLICANT: Othoniel “Tony” Jara  SENIOR PLANNER: Sonia Pierce

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed construction of 13 Single-Family Residential Units in association with Tract Map 31748.

COMMENTS REQUIRED: Please review the attached documents and provide your comments and/or conditions in the space below as soon as you have completed your review. Please return to the Planning Department by Wednesday, May 9, 2018.

APPROVED  APPROVED WITH ATTACHED COMMENTS/CONDITIONS  RESUBMITTAL REQUESTED

SIGNATURE:

DEPARTMENT:  DATE:

COMMENTS:
ATTACHMENT 4
Staff Report (TM 31748 City Council Previous Approval, Adopted Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, Conditions of Approval)
CITY COUNCIL AGENDA
PUBLIC HEARING

Date: September 14, 2004
TO: City Council
FROM: Nicole Sauviat Criste, Interim Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Lot Split #04-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 - A proposal by Joseph and Carol Carri to subdivide an approximately 7.4 acre parcel into 13 single family residential lots, located at the northeast corner of San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street, in the Residential Agriculture land use district. AP# 543-150-001.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council:

1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Lot Split #04-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748.
2. Approve Lot Split #04-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748, based on the findings and conditions of approval, as amended.

MOTION:

1. "The City Council finds that approval of Lot Split #04-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore adopts a Mitigated Negative Declaration; the City Council directs staff to file a Notice of Determination in accordance with the City's Environmental Guidelines."

2. "I move the City Council approve Lot Split #04-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 – A proposal by Joseph and Carol Carri to subdivide an approximately 7.4 acre parcel into 13 single family residential lots, located at the northeast corner of San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street, based on the findings and conditions of approval, as amended".

Options:

Continuance:

"I move the City Council continue the public hearing relating to Lot Split #04-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 to its__________, 2004 meeting".

Denial:
"I move the City Council deny Lot Split #04-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748 on the following basis: (the City Council will need to make its findings)."

**FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL:**

1. The proposed map and its design are consistent with the City’s RA Zone Districts because the configuration of the proposed lots meet and/or exceed the minimum requirements for lot width, lot depth and lot area.

2. The proposed land division conforms to law and Chapter 22 (Subdivision) of the Banning Ordinance Code. The proposed lots conform to City requirements and will have proper and sufficient access to public streets, water mains, fire hydrants, drainage structures, utilities, and public services.

**JUSTIFICATION:** The proposed land division is consistent with the General Plan, the Development Code, and the Subdivision Map Act. All development related issues associated with the proposal are addressed in the recommended conditions of approval.

**BACKGROUND:**
The proposed project site is located in the southeastern portion of the City, immediately north of the Banning-Idyllwild Highway. The area surrounding the project site consists of vacant lands and single family homes on large lots. North of the project site, and on the west side of San Gorgonio, is an RV park.

The proposed subdivision would divide the 7.4 acre parcel into 13 single family lots, and lots for streets. All lots exceed 20,000 square feet in area, up to 20,426 square feet.

Public roadway dedications would be included, as would the half-width construction, to City standards, of Wesley (30 foot half-width) and San Gorgonio (40 foot half-width).

Access into the site will be provided by a central roadway, planned at 60 feet in width (40 foot paved width with a 5 foot sidewalk and 5 foot parkway), which will T-off to two cul-de-sacs. Four of the lots will have driveways onto Wesley, with the balance having access onto the newly created interior roadways.

The project will connect to City water and sewer in Wesley Street.

The subdivision meets or exceeds the Zoning Ordinance development standards for the RA zone, as demonstrated in the table below. No house plans have been proposed, therefore, it is not possible to determine conformance with the zoning ordinance on such items as setbacks and building height. This conformance will be required at the time of application for building permits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Standards</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed project includes only one access point from a public street (Wesley). The Fire Department has stated that it would prefer to see the cul-de-sac which ends at San Gorgonio be turned into a through street. The statement made was a request, and Planning staff added a condition of approval to the map requiring that the cul de sac be changed to a through street (Condition #11, attached). The applicant objected to the condition of approval at the Planning Commission hearing. The Planning Commission did not choose to amend or delete the condition. After the Planning Commission hearing, the applicants spoke with Planning staff, objecting to the condition, and requesting that it be removed. Staff explained that once voted on by the Commission, staff did not have the authority to remove the condition. Staff suggested that the applicants write a letter to the City Council, requesting the removal of the condition. Two letters were received, and are attached to this staff report as Exhibit 5. Staff has also conferred with the Fire Marshall on the issue. Although the Fire Marshall would prefer that the street be a through street, he, and Planning staff, believe that given the size of the subdivision, the condition can be deleted without significant impact to public safety.

The site is located in an area which is currently relatively quiet, with the primary noise generator being vehicular traffic. The lots proposed along San Gorgonio Avenue (3 homes), may be impacted by noise levels from traffic, if not at this time, in the future. The construction of a wall may be needed to assure that these homes do not experience excessive noise levels. A condition of approval has been added which requires the preparation of a noise assessment prior to the issuance of grading permits, to determine whether these units will require a wall.

The City requires that all project retain the increases in storm water caused by the project on site. To that end, a Hydrology Study was prepared by the applicant and submitted to the Public Works Division for review. The project has been designed to provide on-lot retention basins, which will provide for percolation of storm water, as well as controlling runoff from the site. The City Engineer will review and approve final hydrology design for this project prior to the issuance of grading permits.

In conclusion, the proposed subdivision is consistent with the goals and objectives of the General Plan, conforms to the development standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and provides public improvements which meet the City’s standards. Findings for approval can be made.

The proposed tract map was determined to constitute a "project" under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Initial Study was prepared. The Initial Study found that although implementation of the proposed project may have significant impacts on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Standard</th>
<th>Zoning Ordinance</th>
<th>Proposed Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100' or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Depth</td>
<td>150'</td>
<td>178' or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard setback</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback, single story</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard setback, two story</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
environment, mitigation measures have been applied which reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. A Mitigated Negative Declaration is proposed.

The Planning Commission considered the proposed tract map at its meetings of August 3, 2004. At the conclusion of the Public Hearing, the Planning Commission considered all testimony, and voted to recommend approval of the proposed project by the City Council, based on the findings and conditions of approval attached to this staff report.

**STRATEGIC PLAN INTEGRATION:** The proposed tract map is consistent with the City Council strategic plan relating to "Economic Development" (Strategy 1), in that development of the subdivision is expected to contribute to achieving a stable and diversified economy within the community.

**FISCAL DATA:** The construction of the proposed tract will generate revenues to the City in the form of property and sales tax, which will help offset the provision of services to the project's residents.

**RECOMMENDED BY:**

Nicole Sauviat Criste  
Interim Community Development Director

**REVIEWED BY:**

Randy Anstine  
City Manager

Attachments:  
Exhibit "1" – Conditions of Approval  
Exhibit "2" – Tract Map  
Exhibit "3" – Initial Study  
Exhibit "4" – Mitigation Monitoring Program  
Exhibit "5" – Letters from Joseph and Carol Carri, with attachment
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
LOT SPLIT #04-4507 / TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 31748

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

1. Approval of Tentative Tract Map 31748 shall be for a period of two (2) years from the date of City Council approval; the expiration date is ?, 2006. All Conditions of Approval must be met on or before the expiration date, or the applicant must request an extension of time at least thirty (30) days prior to the expiration date; otherwise, the approval shall expire and become null and void.

2. The development of the property shall provide for no more than 13 lots as illustrated by Tentative Tract Map 31748. The design of all lots within the subdivision shall meet the minimum property development requirements of the RA Zone District outlined in the City’s Municipal Code.

3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, "typical" building elevations shall be submitted to the Planning Department for design review and approval, in accordance with the provisions and requirements of Article 16E of the Banning Ordinance Code.

4. The applicant shall install slate, concrete, tile, clay tile, or equal roofing material approved by the Planning and Fire Departments on all units within the subject property.

5. Prior to the issuance of any Building Permits, the project proponent shall submit to the City’s Planning Department for review and approval, a conceptual landscape and irrigation plan (comprised of xeriscape plant material) prepared by a licensed landscape architect depicting the proposed placement of landscaping and block walls for the perimeter of the property.

6. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any single family residence constructed within TTM 31748 the applicant shall submit to the City for review and approval a detailed landscape and irrigation plan (comprised of xeriscape plant material) indicating type, species and location of the following minimum number of drought tolerant, multi-branched trees on each lot adjacent to the street right-of-way (all trees shall be planted with root barriers):

   1) Cul-de-sac lots -1 tree; minimum 24” box
   2) Interior lot— 2 trees; one 24” box, one 15—gallon
   3) Corner lot .3 trees; two 24” box and one 15—gallon.

The Plan shall be forwarded to a Landscape Architect for review and the applicant shall pay all fees associated with the review process. The approved landscape plan shall be implemented / installed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any single-family residence constructed within TTM 31748. (Submit landscape and irrigation plans as soon as possible to allow sufficient time for a Landscape Architect review process.)

"Exhibit 1"
Architect to review same).

7. Applicant shall pay all development fees adopted by the City in effect at the time of issuance of any building permits, which shall include but not be limited to: police and fire safety developer fees, water and sewer fees, park land dedication fees, and electric meter installation fees. Project proponent shall provide written evidence to the City that school mitigation fees have been paid or other arrangements acceptable to the Banning Unified School District have been met.

8. Prior to the issuance of any Building Permits, the project proponent shall submit to the City's Building Department a complete hydrology and seismic study conducted by a registered Engineering Geologist.

9. A six- (6) foot chain link fence must be maintained around the perimeter of the site during all phases of construction.

10. Developer shall meet all requirements of responsible agencies, including but not limited to: Southern California Gas Company, and Southern California Edison Company.

11. Unless prohibited by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in their review of the applicant's plans, the westerly cul-de-sac shall be converted to a through street, and the corner improved to City local street standards.

12. A noise analysis shall be prepared and submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of grading permits. The noise analysis shall clearly demonstrate that noise levels, particularly for the lots adjacent to San Gorgonio Avenue, shall not exceed 65 dBA CNEL exterior, and 45 dBA CNEL interior, or shall propose mitigation to assure that this standard is maintained.

ENGINEERING DIVISION:

A. STREET IMPROVEMENT

1. An additional 10' right of way along the entire San Gorgonio Avenue frontage of the proposed subdivision shall be dedicated to the City of Banning, making a half-street width of 40' east of the San Gorgonio Avenue centerline.

2. Submit Street Improvement Plans, prepared by a licensed professional engineer, to the Engineering Division for review and approval. Construct street improvements along San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street. The improvements shall consist of new A.C. pavement, sidewalk, curb, gutter, handicap access ramps, streetlights, traffic signs, striping and street name signs. Curb returns shall have 35' radius on San Gorgonio Avenue and

"Exhibit 1"
Wesley Street. The Geotechnical Engineer shall determine the traffic index for pavement design on San Gorgonio Avenue, Wesley Street and proposed street “A”.

4. A boundary wall shall be constructed along the entire tract at the right of way line. Submit landscape drawings, prepared by a licensed architect, to the Engineering Division.

5. Construct street improvements of the interior streets (with 60’ right of way) consisting of curb, gutter, 5’ wide sidewalk, A.C. pavement, driveway approaches, handicap access ramps, streetlights, street name signs, traffic signs and roadway striping, etc., as per the approved Street Improvement Plans and City of Banning Public Works Specifications.

B. WATER

1. Submit Water Improvement Plans to the Engineering Division for review and approval. The proposed new waterlines shall connect into the City’s water supply on Wesley Street.

2. Submit a hydraulic analysis, prepared by a licensed Civil Engineer, showing that the Tract will meet all required water pressures and fire flows.

3. Fire hydrants shall be installed as per the approved plans and at a 300’ maximum spacing.

4. All dead end water mains shall be provided with 4-inch blow off.

5. All water lines shall be a minimum of 8” diameter, fittings shall be 10-gauge steel pipes, cement/mortar-lined and wrapped, and the entire water system shall be looped to the existing system.

6. A backflow device must be installed for each irrigation water connection and in compliance with the State of California Department of Health Regulations. Contact the City of Banning, Water Operations Division, prior to the installation.

C. SEWER

1. Submit Sewer Improvement Plans to the City Engineer for review and approval.

2. All sewer lines shall be extra strength Vitrified Clay Pipes constructed to and across the property boundaries of the tract, and the sewer main within the tract development shall be a minimum of 8” diameter.
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3. A sewer check valve shall be provided for each lot with a finished pad elevation lower than the rim elevation of the immediate up-stream sewer manhole.

**D. DRAINAGE**

1. The property’s street and lot grading shall be designed in a manner that perpetuates the existing natural drainage patterns with respect to tributary drainage area, outlet points and outlet conditions; otherwise, a drainage easement shall be obtained from the affected property owners for the release of concentrated or diverted storm flows. A copy of the recorded drainage easement shall be submitted to the City of Banning for review prior to the recordation of the Final Map.

2. The Storm Drain Plan for the proposed subdivision shall be accompanied by hydrology and hydraulic analysis, for both developed and undeveloped conditions, prepared by a licensed engineer.

3. The 10-year storm flow shall be contained within the curb and the 100-year storm flow shall be contained within the street right-of-way. When either of these criteria is exceeded, additional drainage facilities shall be installed.

4. File a Notice of Intent, prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), obtain an NPDES Construction Activity General Permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board and submit a copy of each to the Engineering Division prior to obtaining the Grading Permit. Ensure that Best Management Practices (BMPs) are followed, per NPDES requirements to reduce storm water runoff during construction and thereafter. Temporary erosion control measures shall be implemented immediately following rough grading to prevent deposition of debris into downstream properties or drainage facilities.

**E. BONDINGS**

1. Amount of bonding of public improvement shall be as follows:

   Faithful Performance Bond.......................... 100% of Estimated Cost
   Labor & Material Bond.............................. 100% of Estimated Cost
   Monumentation Bond................................. $5,000

   The amounts shall be on file in the City Clerk’s Office prior to the Final Map going to City Council for approval.
2. Unit prices for bonding estimates shall be those specified or approved by the City Engineer.

F. FEES

1. A Plan Check fee for Final Map review and all Improvement Plans for the proposed subdivision shall be paid prior to plan checking proceedings in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time the fees are paid.

2. The Public Works Inspection fee shall be paid prior to the Final Map going to the City Council for approval in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time of the Final Map approval. Public Works permits are required prior to construction within the public right-of-way.

3. Water and Sewer Connection fees and Water Meter installation charges shall be paid on a per lot basis, at the time of issuance of building permits, for each lot within this subdivision in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time the fees are paid. Also, pay all water and sewer frontage fees, if applicable, and in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time the fees are submitted, prior to plan checking proceedings.

4. A Plan Storage fee shall be paid prior to approval of Final Maps and improvement plans in accordance with the fee schedule in effect at the time the fee is paid.

5. A Traffic Signal Mitigation fee or any other applicable transportation fees (TUMF, MSHCP, etc.) shall be paid on a per lot basis, at the time of issuance of building permits, for each lot within this subdivision.

G. IMPROVEMENT PLANS AND FINAL MAP

1. Improvement Plans for the proposed subdivision shall be prepared as a separate set of drawings for each of the following categories:

   a) Rough Grading
   b) Street, Including Typical Street Cross Sections
   c) Drainage/Storm Drain
   d) Water and Sewer
   e) Precise Grading and Plot
   f) Electrical
   g) Striping
   h) Landscaping
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2. Construct all proposed improvements in accordance with the approved Improvement Plans and the City of Banning Standard Specifications for the proposed tract.

3. A licensed Traffic Engineer shall prepare and submit a preliminary traffic impact and circulation analysis to the City of Banning, Engineering Division for review and approval, and prior to approval of the Final Map.

4. Submit a Rough and Precise Grading Plan to the City for review and approval. All of the grading shall conform to the latest edition of the Uniform Building Code (U.B.C.) and the grading permit must be obtained prior to the commencement of any grading activity. Submit a soil analysis report prepared by a licensed engineer, along with a grading plan.

5. The Developer shall remove and replace any areas of existing improvements that are or may become damaged during any phase of construction, as determined by the City's Public Works Inspector. A Public Works Permit shall be obtained prior to the commencement of any work within the City right-of-way. The contractor working within the right-of-way must submit proof of a Class “A” State Contractor’s License, City of Banning Business License and liability insurance.

6. All street centerline monument ties shall be submitted to the Engineering Division.

7. Submit a copy of the Title Report to the Engineering Division.

8. All plans, including grading plans, shall be drawn on 24” x 36” Mylar.

9. Closure calculations, vesting deeds and title report and record maps of adjoining properties shall accompany the Final Map.

10. The original drawings shall be revised to reflect As-Built conditions by the Design Engineer prior to the final acceptance of the work by the City. Water service lines, water meters, sewer laterals and electric, irrigation lines, etc., within the street right-of-way and 5’ outside of the street right-of-way shall be shown on the As-Built Water/Sewer Plans. Construction plans for gas, telephone, electric and cable TV, etc., shall be submitted to the City for records.

11. A small index map shall be included on the title sheet of each set of plans, showing the overall layout of the public improvements.

12. A map of the proposed subdivision drawn to scale 1” = 200’, showing the outline of streets and street names, shall be submitted to the City to update the City wall atlas map.
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13. An original Mylar of the Final Map (after it is recorded) shall be provided to the City for the City's map files.

14. The street name signs and traffic control devices shall be relocated or installed as required per the approved plans and City of Banning Standard Specifications.

15. Contact all affected agencies, (Army Corps of Engineers, California Department of Fish & Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Riverside County Flood Control & Water Conservation District, etc.), and obtain the necessary approvals with regards to the proposed development. Submit copies of correspondence with the agencies to the Engineering Division.

16. Submit improvement plans to all affected utilities including the Gas Company, Time Warner, Verizon, etc. Provide all correspondence of such to the Engineering Division.

17. Prepare all of the necessary environmental documents and checklist form (Appendix “G”) to conform to all of the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Submit copies of all documents to the Engineering Division, for review and approval.

18. Construct all improvements as per the Electrical Improvement Plans approved by the Electric Division.

H. CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS

1. All required water lines and fire hydrants shall be installed and made operable before any building permits for framing are issued. This may be done in phases if the construction work is in progress for emergency vehicles.

2. Vehicular access shall be maintained at all times to all parts of the proposed subdivision, where construction work is in progress, for emergency vehicles.

3. All precautions shall be taken to prevent washouts, under mining and subsurface ponding, caused by rain or runoff to all surface structures (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, paving, etc.). The Engineering Division may order repair, removal and replacement, extra compaction tests, load tests, etc. or any combination thereof for any such structure that was damaged or appears to have been damaged. All of the additional work, testing, etc., shall be at the expense of the Developer.
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4. All required public improvements for each tract shall be completed, tested and approved by the Engineering Division prior to the issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy for such tract.

5. Individual property owners, in accordance with the existing City policy, shall maintain sewer laterals.

6. A standard agreement for Construction of Public Improvements for the proposed subdivision shall be executed prior to Final Map approval.

FIRE DEPARTMENT:

The following are the minimum Fire Department requirements. There may be additional requirements when the project specifics are defined and the final proposal is submitted for approval.

1. FIRE DEPARTMENT DEVELOPER FEES:

   Fees are increased annually and may be different at the time of construction. The fee schedule at the time of plan submittal shall apply.

   Residential Dwelling Units - $543.00 per unit +
   $  5.00 per unit Disaster Planning
   Apartments - Condominiums - $543.00 per unit
   Mobile Home Parks - $543.00 per unit
   Recreational Vehicle Units - $274.00 per unit
   Plan Check & Inspection - $ 42.00 per unit
   Commercial, Industrial and/or Office Complex -
   $ .275 per square foot +
   $ 25.00 per unit Disaster Planning
   Plan Check and Inspection - $ 42.00 per hour
   *Exception, Sprinkler and Alarm System Plan Check
   See Number (7) for Fee Schedule.

2. CITY OF BANNING BUSINESS LICENSE AND PROOF OF INSURANCE:

   All contractors, subcontractors etc. are required to obtain a City of Banning Business license prior to submitting plans or starting construction.

3. CODE COMPLIANCE:

   All Plans, Specifications and Construction shall comply with and conform to the current edition of the Uniform Fire Code (UFC), Uniform Building Code (UBC), and other state and local laws as applicable.

4. PLAN SUBMITTAL:
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Five (5) Sets of Plans and Specifications shall be submitted for review prior to obtaining a permit. This requirement applies to all work regardless of the size of the job; new construction or remodel.

5. SPRINKLER SYSTEMS REQUIRED:

Fire Sprinkler Systems shall be installed as required by the UFC or in any and all structures that are ten thousand (10,000) sq. ft. or more, or that are at or beyond the Fire Department's response time of ten (10) minutes beginning at the time the call is received at Dispatch.

6. SPRINKLER AND ALARM SYSTEMS:

Three (3) sets of plans and calculations, including three (3) sets of manufacturer's hardware specifications, shall be submitted to a State Certified Fire Protection Engineering Firm, designated by the Fire Marshal, for review for compliance with recognized codes and standards. Alarm monitoring stations must be located within 100 miles of the City of Banning or approved by the Fire Marshal.

7. SPRINKLER AND ALARM SYSTEM FEE SCHEDULE:

Inspections - Fire Department: $42.00 per hour, per person. (One-hour minimum)

Additional fees as charged by the designated Fire Protection Engineering Firm.

Plan Checks - Established by the Fire Protection Engineering firm designated.

8. SPRINKLER SYSTEM UNDERGROUND:

No work shall be started prior to issuance of the permit.

The minimum size for water supply to the base of the riser shall be six (6) inches for commercial systems.

An approved AWWA double check detector check assembly, as approved by the C.O.B Water Department located as close to the property line as possible, and a minimum of twelve (12) inches above the ground shall be provided.

The Water Department shall approve all plans involving water main service.

9. FIRE HYDRANTS:
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Prior to construction or renovation, fire hydrants shall be provided when any portion of any structure exceeds 150 feet from a water supply on a public street.

All hydrants must be installed, working and inspected by the Public Works Department before any combustible materials can be placed at the worksite.

Spacing of fire hydrants shall comply with UFC Appendix III B and the City of Banning Public Works Standards. (maximum 300 feet between hydrants.)

Minimum 6-inch riser, street valve, approved shear valve and blue dot identification marker shall be provided for each fire hydrant.

The City standard fire hydrant is the Commercial, James Jones #13765, Residential, James Jones #J3700, or an equivalent approved by the Fire Marshal.

Fire Hydrants are to be painted by the developer, contractor, etc., prior to the final inspection. (EOS Standard W714) Rustoleum Red, damp proof #769 and two (2) coats of Rustoleum semi-gloss yellow #659, or an approved equivalent.

10. WATER SUPPLY:

Fire flow shall be established by the Fire Department using the information provided in the UFC Appendix III A. Fire Flow may be adjusted upward where conditions indicate an unusual susceptibility to fire. (1000 gallons/minute for 2 hours.)

11. FIRE DEPARTMENT ACCESS:

Shall be required when any portion of the first story of any structure is more than 150 feet from Fire Department apparatus access.

Minimum clearances or widths may be increased when the minimum standards are not adequate for Fire Department access.

Surfaces shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus. Surfaces shall have all-weather driving capabilities, including bridges.

Minimum unobstructed width shall be 20 feet.

Minimum unobstructed vertical clearance shall not be less than 13 feet 6 inches.

Minimum turning radius shall be 42 feet.

All dead-end access roads in excess of 150 feet shall have approved provisions for turning around of fire apparatus.
Maximum grade shall be established by the Fire Department.

Vehicles shall not be parked or otherwise obstruct the required width of any fire apparatus access.

Two means of ingress/egress shall be provided for emergency vehicles and fire apparatus.

The requirements for this segment are covered in UFC Article 9.

12. PREMISES IDENTIFICATION:

Approved numbers or addresses shall be placed on all new and existing buildings in such a position as to be plainly visible and legible from the street or road fronting the property. Said numbers shall contrast with their background.

Commercial - 6” mm. Size

Residential - 3-1/2" mm. Size

13. DIRECTORIES:

Approved illuminated directions shall be provided at the entrance approach to apartments, trailer parks and condominiums. Information to be provided shall be, but is not limited to, a map of the complex showing each dwelling unit and name of the occupant.

14. SPARK ARRESTORS:

Chimneys used in conjunction with fireplaces or heating appliances in which solid or liquid fuel is used shall be maintained with an approved spark arrestor.

15. FIRE EXTINGUISHING EQUIPMENT FOR PROTECTION OF KITCHEN GREASE HOODS AND DUCTS.

An approved fire-suppression system shall be provided for the protection of commercial type food heat-processing equipment.

Three (3) sets of plans and a copy of the manufacturers installation manual are required.

16. FLAMMABLE LIQUID:

The storage, use, dispensing and mixing of flammable and combustible liquids shall be in accordance with UFC Article 79 and UBC Section 307.
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Underground tank installation requires three (3) sets of plans approved by the Riverside County Health Department Hazardous Material Division. The Fire Department will inspect the product lines and supervise the test thereof.

Above ground tanks may be approved for non-commercial use in certain zones by the Fire Marshal. Only above ground tanks that are UL listed, provide two (2) hour firewall protection and which exceeds 110% minimum interstitial, or 150% exterior containment shall be considered.

17. SPRAY FINISHING:

Spray Booth/Spray Room/Spray Area shall conform to the provision of Article 45 of the UFC Article 45, UBC Section 307 and all other state and local laws, ordinance and regulations.

18. INSPECTIONS:

Inspections shall be requested a minimum of forty-eight (48) hours prior to the time the required inspection is needed.

Fee for each inspection is $42.00 per hour per person. Exception, residential inspections are $21.00 per unit per person.

Work begun without a permit or without an approved set of plans at the job site will result in a triple fee and/or the work stopped.

19. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

The storage, dispensing, use or handling of hazardous materials shall be in accordance with the provisions of UFC Article 80 and UBC Section 307 in addition to all federal, state and local laws or ordinances.

Business Plans may be required per SB 2186 and 2187 including MSDS, HMMP and RMPP.

20. A GREENBELT OR FUEL MODIFICATION ZONE MAY BE REQUIRED.

Requirements will be site specific to the project. The Greenbelt/Zone Plan and the provisions for maintenance shall be approved by the Fire Marshal.

21. OTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Fire Department prefers that the proposed street “B” connect through to San Gorgonio Avenue.
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INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

This form and the descriptive information in the application package constitute the contents of Initial Study pursuant to Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Carri Construction, Tentative Tract Map 31748

2. Lead Agency: City of Banning
   Address: 99 E. Ramsey
   Banning, CA 92220

3. Contact Person: Roger Derda
   Phone number: (909) 922-3125

4. Project Location: The proposed project is located on the northeast corner of Wesley Street and San Gorgonio Avenue in the City of Banning. The site is located on the 1988 Beaumont and Cabazon U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangles. It is found in Section 15, Township 3 South, Range 1 East of Riverside County. The site is found on page 722 of the Thomas Brothers Map for Riverside County, grid B-5.

5. Project Sponsor: Carri Construction
   730 W. Southern Ave
   Orange, CA 92865

6. Zoning: Residential Agriculture

7. Proposed use of site: Single-family residential

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed development project is located in the City of Banning in Riverside County. The City of Banning is approximately 30 miles west of Palm Springs, and is bisected by Interstate 10 (I-10). The region is called the San Gorgonio Pass, which connects the Inland Empire and the Coachella Valley with scenic vistas of both Mount San Jacinto and Mount San Gorgonio. The City of Banning is bordered on the northwest by Cherry Valley, on the north, east, and south by the Morongo Indian Reservation, and to the west by the City of Beaumont. All of these areas are included in the County of Riverside. The project site is located in the northwest corner of Section 15, Township 3 South, Range 1 East of the 1988 Beaumont and Cabazon USGS 7.5-minute series topographic quadrangles. Exhibit 1 shows the regional location.

More specifically, the project site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Wesley Street and San Gorgonio Avenue. San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street comprise the west and south boundaries, respectively. The eastern and northern boundaries are defined by existing single-family residential development. Exhibit 2 shows the project site location.
Midland
A Schematic

EXHIBIT "3"
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Carri Construction proposes to build 13 single-family residential homes on 7.5 acres of land in Banning, California. The lots would range from approximately 20,020 square feet to approximately 20,517 square feet. Each unit would be one to stories in height and would include one or two off-street parking spaces. The site would be accessed from Wesley Street. Refer to Exhibit 3 for the site plan.

**LAND USE**

Historically, the project site and the vicinity have been used for agricultural purposes, primarily cattle grazing. The project site is comprised of dense nonnative grasses approximately 2 to 3 feet in height. Wildlife species on site are common for southern California and are consistent with developed, disturbed areas. The site is flat with no drainages or other significant features. The project site is vacant; there are no structures and no cultivation or agricultural activity is being performed. Exhibit 4 includes photographs of the project site in its current state.

Immediately adjacent to the site on the north is very low-density, single-family residences; to the north of these residences are medium-density residential and industrial areas. Land use to the east of the project site consists of low and very low-density residential. The project is bounded on the west by San Gorgonio Avenue. On the southwest side of San Gorgonio Avenue is an RV park and on the northwest side is Banning High School. The project site is bounded on the south by Wesley Street. To the south of Wesley Street is a vacant parcel and the Morongo Indian Reservation. Exhibit 4 includes photos of the surrounding land use.

Table 1 describes the existing land uses in the area. Per the City of Banning General Plan, the current land use of the project site is Very Low-Density Residential (VLDR) and it is zoned as Residential Agriculture. The surrounding areas are zoned as Residential Agriculture and R-1-10,000, Single-Family Residential, by the City of Banning.

**Table 1: Existing Land Use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single-Family Residence</td>
<td>LDR and VLDR</td>
<td>R-1-10,000 &amp; R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Wesley Street; Vacant parcel</td>
<td>VLDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morongo Indian Reservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single-Family Residence</td>
<td>LDR and VLDR</td>
<td>R-1-10,000 &amp; R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>San Gorgonio Avenue</td>
<td>P &amp; VLDR</td>
<td>R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RV Park and High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLDR:</td>
<td>Very Low-Density Residential; 0-2 dwelling units per acre</td>
<td>R-A: Residential Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDR:</td>
<td>Low-Density Residential; 3-5 dwelling units per acre</td>
<td>R-1-10,000: Single-Family Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 4
Site Photos

Northwest Corner of Site, Facing Southeast

Nonnative Grassland On Site
Residential Development to the East, Morongo Indian Reservation to the South

South Side of Site, Facing North

Nonnative Grassland On Site, Residential Development to the North
South Side of Site, Facing Southwest

Vacant Lot South of Wesley Street, RV Park West of San Gorgonio

Northwest Corner of Site, Facing West

Banning High School on West Side of San Gorgonio Ave
PERMITS

Other public agencies whose approval may be required:

The project will require various permits from the City of Banning, including grading, building, easements, etc. Mandatory construction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for construction are issued through the State Water Resources Control Board.
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
I. AESTHETICS — Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Substantiation:

a) Less than Significant Impact. The development of 13 single-family residential units would have a less than significant impact on a scenic vista. The view of the San Jacinto Mountains, seen from the project site facing south, is identified as a scenic resource by the City of Banning General Plan. The proposed project includes the development of single-family residential units, consistent with residential development to the north and east of the project site. The proposed development would not significantly obstruct the view of the San Jacinto Mountains of current residents or of vehicular traffic traveling south on San Gorgonio Avenue (Exhibit 5).

b) No Impact. Caltrans has designated a total of three scenic routes within Riverside County: Route 62 (from I-10 to the San Bernardino County Line), Route 74 (from the west end of the San Bernardino National Forest to Route 111 in Palm Desert), and Route 243 (from Route 74 to the Banning city limit). The designated scenic highway portion of Route 243 is immediately to the southwest of the project site. No substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway would occur as the proposed project is not within a state designated scenic highway.

c) Less than Significant. The development of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The portion of San Gorgonio Avenue adjacent to the project site on the west is designated as a scenic resource by the City of Banning General Plan. This section of San Gorgonio Avenue affords a good view of the San Jacinto Mountains when travelling south and it is an entry portal to the City when travelling north, giving visitors their first impression of Banning. The view of the San Jacinto Mountains would not be significantly obstructed by the proposed project for vehicular traffic travelling south on San Gorgonio Avenue. The proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the site to vehicular traffic travelling north on San Gorgonio Avenue. The site currently consists of low-growing nonnative grassland, with no buildings on site. Areas to the west consist of an RV park and a high school. Areas to the north and east are occupied by single-family residential units. The development of single-family residential units on the site would not result in loss of visual character. The conversion of a vacant lot into single-family residential units is likely to improve the initial impression of Banning to visitors travelling north on San Gorgonio Avenue (Exhibit 5).

d) No Impact. The development would incrementally add to the overall amount of light in the area; however, the development would be compatible with existing subdivisions to the north and east and would include logical extensions of streetlights to provide safety and security. No spotlighting or flood lighting would be used or installed on the project site either prior to, during, or following construction. Therefore, no adverse affect on nighttime views would occur.
Exhibit 5
Aesthetics Photos

North Side of Project Site, Facing Southeast

View of San Jacinto Mountains from Project Site

Northwest End of Parcel, West Side of San Gorgonio Ave, Facing South

View of San Jacinto Mountains Traveling South on San Gorgonio Ave
Southwest Corner of Wesley Street, Facing Northeast

View of Project Site Traveling North on San Gorgonio Ave

EXHIBIT "3 -
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES — In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

Substantiation:

a) No Impact. The project site is not utilizing land established as one of the three agricultural preserves in unincorporated areas per the City of Banning General Plan. The General Plan states that most land south of the I-10 Freeway is used for cattle grazing. The site is designated as Very Low Density Residential by the General Plan Land Use Map South. Currently the land is vacant with no activity taking place.

b) No Impact. Existing zoning is R-A, Residential Agriculture, and there are no known Williamson Act contract(s) on the property. Additionally, the project site is surrounded on three sides by development.

c) No Impact. The project site is zoned by the City as Residential Agriculture. The soils are classified as type VII: soils with severe limitations or hazards that make them generally unsuited for cultivation. Additionally, the City General Plan indicates that the only agricultural lands which might reasonably be preserved in agricultural operation are the lands of the Banning Bench, northwest of the City.
III. AIR QUALITY — Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Substantiation:

a) **No Impact.** The development of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. The City General Plan states as its policy to cooperate with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), County, etc., to establish and implement regional air quality strategies and tactics.

b-c) **Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.** The project site is located in the Banning Pass portion of the South Coast Air Basin. Air quality for this area is the responsibility of the SCAQMD. The closest air quality monitoring station to the project site is the Banning Airport. Air quality data from that station is included in Appendix A. The project is well under the threshold of potentially significant air quality impacts as indicated in the SCAQMD’s 1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The project is 7.5 acres and 13 units; the thresholds are 30 acres and 166 units (Tables 6-2 and 6-3 of the Handbook).

The proposed project has the potential to contribute to temporary air pollutant sources. Although the project is not expected to produce significant emissions during construction or after, the following mitigation measures shall be incorporated to minimize project impacts.
### Mitigation Measures:

#### Table 2: Mitigation Measures for Windy Days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fugitive Dust Source Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth moving</td>
<td>1. Cease all active operations; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Apply water to soil not more than 15 minutes prior to moving such soil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed surface areas</td>
<td>3. On the last day of active operations prior to a weekend, holiday, or any other period when active operations will not occur for not more than 4 consecutive days: apply water with a mixture of chemical stabilizer diluted to not less than 1/20 of the concentration required to maintain a stabilized surface for a period of 6 months; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Apply chemical stabilizers prior to wind event; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Apply water to all unstabilized disturbed areas three times per day. If there is any evidence of wind driven fugitive dust, watering frequency shall be increased to a minimum of four times per day; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Establish a vegetative ground cover within 21 days after active operations have ceased. Ground cover must be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting, and at all times thereafter; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Utilize any combination of mitigation measures 3 and 7 found in Table 3 such that, in total, these actions apply to all disturbed surface areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved roads</td>
<td>8. Apply chemical stabilizers prior to wind event; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Apply water twice per hour during active operation; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Stop all vehicular traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open storage piles</td>
<td>11. Apply water twice per hour; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Install temporary coverings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paved road track-Out</td>
<td>13. Cover all haul vehicles; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Comply with the vehicle freeboard requirements of Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code for public and private roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Categories</td>
<td>15. Any other control measures approved by the Executive Officer and the U.S. EPA as equivalent to mitigation measures 1 through 14 may be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Mitigation Measures for Dust Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fugitive Dust Source Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earth-moving</td>
<td>1. For any earth moving that is more than 100 feet from all property lines, conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible dust emissions from exceeding 100 feet in length in any direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth-moving: Construction cut areas</td>
<td>2. Conduct watering as necessary to prevent visible emissions from extending more than 100 feet beyond the active cut area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed surface areas (except completed grading areas)</td>
<td>3. Apply dust suppression in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface. Any areas that cannot be stabilized, as evidenced by wind driven fugitive dust, must have an application of water at least twice per day to at least 80 percent of the unstabilized area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbed surface areas: Completed grading areas</td>
<td>4. Apply chemical stabilizers within 5 working days of grading completion; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Take mitigation measures 6 or 8 from this table specified for inactive disturbed surface areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive disturbed surface areas</td>
<td>6. Apply water to at least 80 percent of all inactive disturbed surface areas on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind driven fugitive dust, excluding any areas that are inaccessible to watering vehicles because of excessive slope or other safety conditions; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Apply dust suppressants in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Establish a vegetative ground cover within 21 days after active operations have ceased. Ground cover must be of sufficient density to expose less than 30 percent of unstabilized ground within 90 days of planting, and at all times thereafter; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Utilize any combination of control actions 6, 7 and 8 from this table such that, in total, these actions apply to all inactive disturbed surface areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved roads</td>
<td>10. Water all roads used for any vehicular traffic at least once per every 2 hours of active operations; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Water all roads used for any vehicular traffic once daily and restrict vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Apply a chemical stabilizer to all unpaved road surfaces in sufficient quantity and frequency to maintain a stabilized surface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fugitive Dust Source Category</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open storage piles</td>
<td>13. Apply chemical stabilizers; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Apply water to at least 80 percent of the surface area of all open storage piles on a daily basis when there is evidence of wind driven fugitive dust; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Install temporary coverings; OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Install a three-sided enclosure with walls with no more than 50 percent porosity that extend, at a minimum, to the top of the pile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Categories</td>
<td>17. Any other control measures approved by the Executive Officer and the U.S. EPA as equivalent to the methods specified in this table may be used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The only potential local sensitive receptor in the vicinity of the project site is the high school on the west side of San Gorgonio Avenue, directly across from the project site. However, high school students are generally not considered to be sensitive receptors as they are physically similar to mature adults and are not as sensitive to air pollution as younger children. Additionally, pollution from mobile sources would be minimal; the intersections surrounding the high school do not experience congestion. The addition of 13 single-family residences would not substantially increase the traffic in this area, as indicated on the project traffic analysis provided in Appendix E. The project proposes that Wesley St. would be the main arterial, additionally reducing the potential for queues of traffic on San Gorgonio Avenue in front of the high school.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** No significant long term odor increase would occur. Odors would be limited to temporary activities during construction, such as asphalt paving, and are not expected to result in a nuisance to nearby receptors.
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Substantiation:

a) **No Impact.** There are no Federal or State listed sensitive species or suitable habitat for such species within the project site.

b) **No Impact.** No riparian habitat or other sensitive plant communities exist within the project site. The project site consists of disturbed nonnative grasslands. According to the City General Plan, grasslands are the least sensitive vegetative type present in the City as they have been significantly altered in the past. Loss of this vegetative type for development is not considered to be significant.

c) **No Impact.** No jurisdictional water features exist within the project site.
d) **No Impact.** No migratory wildlife corridors exist within the project site. Although the Morongo Indian Reservation, an open space area, occurs to the south of the project site, there are no other open space areas adjacent to the site and thus the project site does not provide a connection for wildlife to migrate.

e) **No Impact.** There are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources relevant to the project site.

f) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed development would not conflict with any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan. The site does fall within the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP), but the parcel does not fall within a proposed criteria area. Two species are listed for which the MSHCP requires habitat assessments, the burrowing owl and Marvin's onion. According to Biological Resources report, the site does not support suitable habitat for either of these species and no further assessment if required (Appendix B, Biological Resources Report).

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorpor.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substantiation:**

a, b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Although no prehistoric or historic archaeological, or cultural sites are expected to occur within the project site the following mitigation measure would be incorporated to minimize the potential for project impacts. If artifacts are found during grading, the developer will be required to halt work and retain a qualified archaeologist to evaluate prehistoric or historic archaeological, or cultural resources, and take appropriate steps to preserve and protect the resource.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Site grading may impact sub-subsurface paleontologic resources. The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to minimize any impacts. If fossils are found during grading, the developer shall halt grading and retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate sub-surface paleontological resources. Fossils will be collected, curated and provided to the Riverside County Museum. The developer shall pay reasonable costs associated with archiving artifacts.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** Although the site is not expected to contain any human remains, the following mitigation measure would be incorporated to minimize the potential for project impacts. If any human remains are encountered during grading, the City will halt construction and the Riverside County
Coroner shall be immediately advised. Should remains of Native Americans be found, the developer will be required to pay reasonable costs associated with re-internment of the deceased.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS — Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
   iv) Landslides?

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

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

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

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorpor.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXHIBIT 3
Substantiation:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The site contains a less than significant risk to people, structures in regards to loss of property, injury, or death. According to the geotechnical investigation conducted by Dale Hinkle, P.E. Inc. (Appendix C), the project site is located in a region of generally high seismicity, as is all of Southern California. The closest fault is the San Andreas Fault, approximately 6.1 miles north of the project site. The maximum horizontal acceleration is expected to be 0.5 g. The site location is expected to experience ground motions from earthquakes on regional and local causative faults up to but not exceeding magnitude 7.4. The area is not mapped as a liquefacation area by the California Division of Mines and Geology; the area has a very low (less than 1%) probability of liquefaction. There was no evidence of landsliding in the area and the flat slope indicates that the site is geologically stable.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Soil erosion would be controlled on site during construction through the implementation of the dust control mitigation measures presented under section III, Air Quality. With these measures, there would not be a significant impact due to erosion.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** Provided regrading of the near surface soils is performed as recommended in the geotechnical report, settlement, landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse is not considered to be a site restraint.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** According to the geotechnical investigation, the upper material on the site was found to be non-expansive.

e) **No Impact.** No use of alternative wastewater disposal systems or septic tanks would be used as the project site would be supported by a sewer system.

### VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS —

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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

Substantiation:

a) Less than Significant Impact. The project is a residential development in a residential zone, therefore hazardous materials would not be routinely transported, used, or disposed as a result of the project.

Less than Significant Impact. The project is a residential development in a residential zone, so hazardous materials would not be released into the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions. The potential for accidental release of hazardous materials is relatively minor given the size and type or project to be built. Existing state and federal regulations address such accidental releases and related cleanup procedures.

c) Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project is within one-quarter mile of Banning High School, located on the west side of San Gorgonio Avenue. However, the type and size of the proposed project make the potential for accidental release of hazardous materials extremely low.

d) No Impact. The site is not on or near any abandoned or uncontrolled hazardous waste sites which are listed on the National Priorities List (NPL), and no superfund sites are located in Banning or the surrounding area.
e) Less than Significant Impact. The project site is within the Banning Municipal Airport influence area; however the project site falls within the FAR Part 77 definition for the conical surface. The limit of the Traffic Pattern Zone, which corresponds to the FAR Part 77 definition for the horizontal surface, abuts the project site on the east. There are no safety concerns for the conical surface. The elevation of the conical surface is 2,569 feet above mean sea level. The maximum building height of 35 feet for the Residential Agriculture zone does not pose a problem beneath the conical or the horizontal surface. The Traffic Pattern Zone discourages places of public assembly and the manufacture, storage, or distribution of explosives or flammable materials. The development of single-family residences would not violate the Traffic Pattern Zone guidelines.

f) No Impact. The project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

g) No impact. No impact would occur in regards to the mobilization of emergency response plans as the existing streets would be improved, thus enhancing the potential effectiveness of emergency response and emergency evacuation plans.

h) Less than Significant Impact. The project site is located adjacent to the Morongo Indian Reservation, an open space area, which provides the potential for the development to be threatened by wildland fires. However, the existing and proposed fire hydrants and improved streets provide ample access to the residential units by emergency response teams in the event of a wildland fire.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY — Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Incorpor.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substantiation:**

a) **No Impact.** The project site would be serviced by a sewer system that would comply with applicable standards for water quality and waste discharge. Implementation of the proposed project would result in grading more than 5 acres of land so the contractor will have to submit a Notice of Intent and receive a Construction Permit from the California RWQCB (Santa Ana Region) in compliance with the NPDES. Since grading and excavation activities would take place, topsoil, plant materials and other debris may enter the storm drain system. However, the City and Regional Water Quality Control Board have procedures in place to assure that stormwater runoff from roadway surfaces tainted by sediment and petroleum products commonly utilized as construction materials will not reach local drainage channels – this is accomplished through the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs). BMPs shall be employed to ensure no water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or other degradation of water quality will occur. The developer will be required to implement appropriate BMPs per City and Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** As the project is consistent with the planned growth of Banning, no significant impact is expected. The project proponent must obtain a commitment of service from the local water purveyor prior to recordation of the tract map.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern resulting in substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on or off site. However, while construction is taking place, erosion or flooding could occur. These adverse effects of construction are only temporary and would be lessened when construction is complete. Implementation of standard BMPs for construction sites, as required by the City, will effectively mitigate potential impacts.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** While construction of the dwelling units takes place, more runoff is expected to occur. The runoff created would include pollutants that would not normally occur in the area. These adverse effects of construction are only temporary and would be lessened when construction is
complete. However, implementation of standard BMPs for construction sites, as required by the City, will effectively mitigate potential impacts.

g, h) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is not located within a 100-year flood plain designation, according to the [FEMA Digital Q3 Flood Data](http://example.com). The proposed project would improve existing flood control facilities to control off site drainage run-on as well as future on site drainage/runoff. Proposed improvements are designed to convey the 100-year storm runoff. Drainage improvements include individual catch basins on each lot.

i) **No Impact.** The project does not significantly change the topography of the site. Storm drains, curbs, and gutters would be constructed to control for flooding. On this basis, the project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. No dams or levee would be constructed near or on the project site.

j) **No Impact.** The project does not significantly change the topography of the site, nor is it geographically located such that there would be any risk or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow; on this basis, there are no impacts associated with it.

### IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING — Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Physically divide an established community?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Mitigation Incorpor.</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td>❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substantiation:**

a) **No Impact.** The site is located at the edge of the city limits. There is scattered residential development to the north and east, a high school and RV park to the west, and vacant land and the Morongo Indian Reservation to the south. Implementation of the project would not divide any portion of the community.

b) **No Impact.** The project site and surrounding land areas are zoned as Very Low Density Residential, 0-2 dwelling units per acre. The tentative tract map proposes 13 units on 7.5 acres (1.7 units per acre), therefore the proposed project is in conformance with the City General Plan.

c) **No Impact.** The project site is subject to the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). The project does not conflict with the MSHCP and will pay the established MSHCP fee.
X. MINERAL RESOURCES — Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substantiation:**

a, b) **No Impact.** The City General Plan states that no known mineral source of great value to the region occurs within the project site. No loss of valuable mineral resource would be lost as the project site is not zoned for mineral extraction.

XI. NOISE — Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantiation:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The development of this proposed project would increase noise levels in the area, consistent with single-family residential units. However, these noise levels would not exceed the standards established in the City of Banning Noise Ordinance (Section 11D of the Banning Municipal Code).

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** It is anticipated that there would be some groundborne vibration during the construction phase of the project. However, the vibration would be temporary and no substantial vibrations would occur to disrupt people in the vicinity of the project site.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The development of this proposed project would increase noise levels in the area, however, the noise would be consistent with a residential area and would not result in a substantial increase.

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** During construction of the housing units a temporary rise in the areas noise level would occur; however, the level of noise would not be substantial. The noise levels would affect the neighborhood only during daytime construction hours in compliance with the City's noise ordinance.

e) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site falls within the Banning Municipal Airport Influence area; however it is within the outer limits of the influence area and is not significantly impacted by noise from the airport. The project site occurs outside the 55 decibel CNEL contour. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

f) **No Impact.** The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

Substantiation:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is expected to generate approximately 34 new residents, based on 13 units times an average household size of 2.6 persons per household (2000 US Census). Based on the current population of the City (approximately 26,000 residents) the population increase generation is less than 0.01 percent and would not result in significant population growth or exceed population projections.
b,c) **No Impact.** No housing or people are currently located on the project site, and, therefore, no homes or people would be displaced.

### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES —

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

- **Fire protection?**
- **Police protection?**
- **Schools?**
- **Parks?**
- **Other public facilities?**

#### Substantiation:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project would not result in a substantial adverse physical impact associated with the provision of public services. Adequate local facilities including fire stations, police stations, schools, or other public facilities are in place and no additional facilities would need to be built in order to sustain the project. However, impact fees would be paid by the developer as required by the City. The developer will pay established mitigation fees for impacts to public services (e.g., school fees).

### XIV. RECREATION —

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

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?
Substantiation:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The development of 13 housing units would incrementally increase the use of public facilities in the vicinity, however a less than substantial impact would occur as the number of individuals that would occupy the area is relatively low. The developer would pay any applicable development fees as required for recreational facilities.

b) **No Impact.** The development project does not include constructing any recreational facilities on the project site. It is not anticipated that other area recreation facilities would be adversely affected.

---

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:**

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

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

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

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

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

---

**Substantiation:**

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project would generate approximately 140 average daily trips (ADT) with 14 peak hour trips. According to the traffic evaluation performed by Urban Crossroads, the project will not produce significant traffic impacts or require special mitigation (Appendix E, Traffic Analysis).

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** The analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads demonstrates that traffic from the project will not exceed local standards (Appendix E, Traffic Analysis).
c) **No Impact.** The Banning Municipal Airport is within 2 miles of the project site. Moderate amounts of air traffic is supported by this airport; however, the proposed project would not significantly increase air traffic levels in the development area.

d) **No Impact.** No substantial traffic hazards would be created by the construction of new roads that are necessary for the development.

e) **No Impact.** The project includes the additional road and fire hydrant necessary for emergency access to the development. The project would not impact emergency access to any existing structures.

f) **No Impact.** The sizes of the new lots would sufficiently support the parking capacity for the development. No additional parking space would be necessary.

g) **No Impact.** The development would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substantiation:

a) **No impact.** The development would use a sewer system to control and manage the wastewater that it creates; therefore it would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements set forth by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b) **Less than Significant impact.** The development would be served by the existing wastewater treatment facilities. Proof of service capacity would be presented to the City of Banning prior to recordation of the tract map.

c) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project would provide small detention basins on each lot which would enable existing storm water drainage facilities to accommodate the development (Appendix D, Preliminary Hydrology Report).

d) **Less than Significant Impact.** The future residents of the project will consume approximately 6,800 gallons per day of water (34 residents x 200 gallons per day) or approximately 7.6 acre feet per year. The project is far below the SB 221/610 threshold for water certification (i.e., 500 units). Sufficient water supplies are available from existing entitlements and resources.

e) **Less than significant impact.** The project would be served by the existing water treatment facilities. Proof of service capacity would be presented to the City of Banning prior to recordation of the tract map.

f) **Less than significant impact.** The project area would be served by a County of Riverside landfill, and would have a miniscule impact on the capacity of the landfill.

g) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project would comply with federal, state and local statues related to solid waste.

---

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE—**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorp.</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
Substantiation:

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project site does not support any sensitive fish or wildlife species or habitats supporting such species. The project site does not support any plant or wildlife species that would be eliminated as a result of the project. The project site is not expected to support any important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. If such resources are discovered, mitigation measures included in this Initial Study would reduce the project impacts to less than significant levels.

b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Although any impacts to air and water quality would add to the cumulative conditions, the project is consistent with local land uses and the City General Plan. Therefore the impacts are not considered to be cumulatively considerable.

c) **No Impact.** The project does not have an environmental effect which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
REFERENCES


Preliminary Hydrology Study.


Appendix A
Air Quality Data
## 2001 AIR QUALITY

**SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source/Receptor Area No.</th>
<th>Station No.</th>
<th>Carbon Monoxide</th>
<th>Ozone</th>
<th>Nitrogen Dioxide</th>
<th>Sulfur Dioxide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOS ANGELES COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Central LA</td>
<td>087</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Northwest Coastal LA</td>
<td>091</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Southwest Coastal LA</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 South Coastal LA</td>
<td>091</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 West San Fernando Valley</td>
<td>074</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 East San Fernando Valley</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>066</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 East San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>066</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Pomona/Walnut Valley</td>
<td>076</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 South San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>086</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Central LA</td>
<td>091</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ORANGE COUNTY**        |             |                 |       |                 |               |
| 16 North Orange County   | 3177        | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 17 Central Orange County | 3176        | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 18 North Coastal Orange County | 3195  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 19 Saddleback Valley     | 3812        | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 20 Norco/Corona          | 4155        | --              | --    | --              | --            |
| 23 Metropolitan Riverside County 1 | 4144  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 24 Metropolitan Riverside County 2 | 4146  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 25 Momus                  | 4149        | --              | --    | --              | --            |
| 26 Cochelela Valley**    | 4137        | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 30 Coachella Valley**    | 4157        | --              | --    | --              | --            |

| **SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY** |             |                 |       |                 |               |
| 32 Northwest San Bernardino Valley | 5175  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 33 Northwest San Bernardino Valley | 5175  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 34 Central San Bernardino Valley 1 | 5197  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 35 Central San Bernardino Valley 2 | 5203  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 36 Central San Bernardino Mountains | 5181   | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 37 East San Bernardino Valley 1 | 5197  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |
| 38 East San Bernardino Valley 2 | 5203  | 365             | 0     | 0               | 0             |

| **DISTRICT MAXIMUM**      |             |                 |       |                 |               |
| 12 7.71                   |             | 0               | 0     | 0               | 0             |

**Notes:**
- ppm = Parts Per Million parts of air, by volume.
- AAM = Annual Arithmetic Mean
- Pollutant not monitored.
- Less than 12 full months of data. May not be representative.
- Salton Sea Basin.
- a) The federal 1-hour standard (1-hour average CO > 35 ppm) and state 1-hour standard (1-hour average CO > 20 ppm) were not exceeded.
- b) The state standard is 1-hour average > 0.25 ppm. No location exceeded state standard.
- c) The federal standard is annual arithmetic mean NO₂ greater than 0.0534 ppm. No location exceeded this standard.
- d) The state standards are 1-hour average > 0.25 ppm and 24-hour average > 0.045 ppm. No location exceeded state standards.
- The federal standards are annual arithmetic mean SO₂ > 0.03 ppm, 3-hour average > 0.50 ppm, and 24-hour average > 0.14 ppm. SO₂ concentrations were well below the federal standards.

South Coast Air Quality Management District
21865 East Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4182
http://www.scaqd.gov

The map showing the locations of source/receptor areas can be accessed via the Internet at [http://www.scaqmd.gov/smog/areamap.html](http://www.scaqmd.gov/smog/areamap.html). Locations of source/receptor areas are shown on the "South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Monitoring Areas" map available free of charge from SCAQMD Public Information.

Station relocated in May 2001.
## 2001 AIR QUALITY

### SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source/Receptor Area</th>
<th>Suspended Particulates PM10 ≤2.5</th>
<th>Suspended Particulates PM2.5 ≤2.5</th>
<th>Particulates TSP ≤2.5</th>
<th>Lead ≤2.5</th>
<th>Sulfate ≤2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No (%) Samples Exceeding Federal Standard</td>
<td>No (%) Samples Exceeding State Standard</td>
<td>Annual Averages</td>
<td>No (%) Samples Exceeding Federal Standard</td>
<td>No (%) Samples Exceeding State Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOS ANGELES COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Central LA</td>
<td>067</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20(33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Northwest Coastal LA County</td>
<td>091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Southwest Coastal LA County</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 South Coastal LA County</td>
<td>072</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 West San Fernando Valley</td>
<td>074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 East San Fernando Valley</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 West San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 East San Gabriel Valley 1</td>
<td>060</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 East San Gabriel Valley 2</td>
<td>091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Pomona/Walnut Valley</td>
<td>075</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 South San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Central San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Santa Clarita Valley</td>
<td>060</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXHIBIT 1.**

- PM10 samples were collected every 6 days (every 3 days at Station Numbers 4144 and 4157) using the size-selective inlet high volume sampler with quartz filter media.
- PM2.5 samples were collected every 3 days at all sites except for the following sites: Station Numbers 060, 072, 087, 3176, and 4144 where samples were taken every day, and Station Number 5818 where samples were taken every 6 days.
- Total suspended particulates, lead, and sulfate were determined from samples collected every 6 days by the high volume sampler method, on glass fiber filter media.
- Federal PM10 standard is AAM > 50 μg/m³; and state standard is AAM > 30 μg/m³.
- Federal PM2.5 standard is AAM > 15 μg/m³.
- Federal lead standard is quarterly average > 1.5 μg/m³; and state standard is monthly average > 1.5 μg/m³. No location exceeded lead standards.
- Special monitoring immediately downwind of stationary sources of lead was carried out at four locations in 2000. The maximum monthly average concentration was 0.57 μg/m³, and the maximum quarterly average concentration was 0.49 μg/m³, both recorded in Area 1, Central Los Angeles.
- The data for the samples collected on high-wind-days (245 μg/m³ on 6/3/01, 180 μg/m³ on 6/12/01, 155 μg/m³ on 7/3/01, 204 μg/m³ on 8/7/01 and 165 μg/m³ on 9/13/01 at Station Number 4157; and 432 μg/m³ on 7/3/01 at Station Number 4137) were excluded in accordance with EPA's Natural Events Policy.
- Station relocated in May 2001.
# Table 6-2. Screening Table for Operation – Daily Thresholds of Potential Significance for Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY LAND USE</th>
<th>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Housing</td>
<td>166 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>261 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>297 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>340 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Community</td>
<td>612 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>220,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>177,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>150,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>813 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Airport</td>
<td>15 Daily Commercial Flights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>136,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>26,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Discount Store</td>
<td>32,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food w/o Drive-Thru</td>
<td>3,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food with Drive-Thru</td>
<td>2,800 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hardware Store</td>
<td>28,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>213 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office</td>
<td>61,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>220 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Movie Theatre</td>
<td>30,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Car Sales</td>
<td>43,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (small, 10–100)</td>
<td>98,221 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (medium, 100–200)</td>
<td>139,222 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office (large, 200–1,000)</td>
<td>201,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Park</td>
<td>171,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquet Club</td>
<td>98,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Center</td>
<td>245,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Hotel</td>
<td>199 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>23,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Restaurant (high-turnover)</td>
<td>9,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center (small, 10–500)</td>
<td>22,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center (medium, 500–1,000)</td>
<td>30,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center (large, 1,000–1,600)</td>
<td>64,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)

**NOTES:**

* Trip generation rates from the 5th Edition ITE Manual were based upon small sample sizes.

These size construction projects have the potential to exceed the daily emissions significance thresholds. Local governments should use these thresholds as screening tools when a project proponent first approaches the lead agency for a permit, to determine whether or not the proposed project will be significant. Moreover, using these thresholds, a project proponent should be advised to include feasible mitigation measures at the project design level rather than in the later stages of the project.

**DEFINITIONS:**

"Manufacturing" means to make goods and articles by hand or by machinery, often on a large scale and with division of labor.

"Industry" means any large-scale business activity or manufacturing productive enterprises collectively, especially as distinguished from agriculture.

---

Refer to Appendix 6 for methodologies and assumptions used in preparing this table.
### Table 6-2. Screening Table for Operation – Daily Thresholds of Potential Significance for Air Quality (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY LAND USE</th>
<th>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMERICAL (continued)</td>
<td><strong>Special Activity Centers</strong> 87 Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(Stadiums and Amusement Parks)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Supermarket</em> 12,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Light Industrial</strong> 276,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL/</td>
<td><em>Heavy Industrial</em> 276,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINING</td>
<td><em>Industrial Park</em> 276,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aircraft Manufacturing &amp; Repairs</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bulk Terminals</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cement Plant</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chemical Plant</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hazardous Waste Treatment &amp; Storage</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Manufacturing</em>** 500,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mining</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Pulp/Paper Mills</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Refinery</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONAL/</td>
<td><strong>Clinic</strong>* 94,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENTAL</td>
<td><strong>Government Center</strong>* 83,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hospital</strong>* 176 Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Library</em>** 51,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nursing Home</em>** 741 Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>U.S. Post Office</em>** 26,000 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Freeway Lane Addition</em>** All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Designation of a New</em>** All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Transportation Corridor</em>** All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>New Freeway/Highway</em>** All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Auxiliary Lanes</em>** Beyond One Ramp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Waterport</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sewage Treatment Plant</em>** All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rail</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cogeneration Project</em>** All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Landfill</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Inceration</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Power Generating Facility</em>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Waste-To-Energy Plant</em>** Hazardous, Medical or Municipal Waste***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to Appendix 6 for methodologies and assumptions used in preparing this table.

**NOTES:**

* Trip generation rates from the 5th Edition ITE Manual were based upon small sample sizes.

** New facilities, expansions or other change that could result in emissions exceeding the significance thresholds.

These size construction projects have the potential to exceed the daily emissions significance thresholds. Local governments should use these thresholds as screening tools when a project proponent first approaches the lead agency for a permit, to determine whether or not the proposed project will be significant. Moreover, using these thresholds, a project proponent should be advised to include feasible mitigation measures at the project design level rather than in the later stages of the project.

**DEFINITIONS:**

"Manufacturing" means to make goods and articles by hand or by machinery, often on a large scale and with division of labor.

"Industry" means any large-scale business activity or manufacturing productive enterprises collectively, especially as distinguished from agriculture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY LAND USE</th>
<th>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT AIR QUALITY IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Housing</td>
<td>1,309,000 sq. ft. GFA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>1,410,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>1,455,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>1,455,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>660,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>559,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Care Center</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discount Store</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office Complex</td>
<td>559,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware Store</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>745,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Office</td>
<td>559,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel</td>
<td>745,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Theatre</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>559,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort Hotel</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>975,000 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL</td>
<td>1,102,520 sq. ft. GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPAVED ROADS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Vehicle</td>
<td>1,750 Vehicle Miles Traveled (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load Truck</td>
<td>430 Vehicle Miles Traveled (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAVED ROADS</td>
<td>24,000 Vehicle Miles Traveled (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Road</td>
<td>5,000 Vehicle Miles Traveled (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION</td>
<td>23,214,000 Cubic Feet of Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADING</td>
<td>177.00 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*GFA = GROSS FLOOR AREA

NOTES:
(1) YMT is a function of linear road length and average daily trips.

These size construction projects have the potential to exceed the quarterly emissions thresholds of significance. Local governments should use these thresholds as screening tools when a project proponent first approaches the lead agency for a permit, to determine whether or not the proposed project will be significant. Moreover, using these thresholds, a project proponent should be advised to include feasible mitigation measures at the project design level rather than in the later stages of the project.

For daily thresholds, divide thresholds by 65, not 91.
Appendix B
Biological Resources Report
August 5, 2003

Mr. Joseph Carri
Carri Construction
730 W. Southern Ave.
Orange, CA 92865
714.508.4100

SUBJECT: Due Diligence Letter Report for a 7.5 acre site in Banning, Riverside County, California

Dear Mr. Carri:

This report contains the findings of Michael Brandman Associates' (MBA) biological due diligence investigation of the proposed 14 home project site on 7.5 acres located in the City of Banning, California. This report includes a literature review and a site assessment that identifies the potential opportunities and constraints related to the proposed development of the property.

METHODOLOGY

A preliminary literature review followed by a field assessment provided information regarding the biological conditions of the property. MBA biologist Marrie McKernan conducted a field survey on July 31, 2003. The objective of the field survey was to document the existing conditions on the property and to evaluate the property for any potential constraints with regard to project implementation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior to the survey, a record search was conducted using a current version of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) for information on sensitive biological resources known to occur in the vicinity of the project area. These records are organized by U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles. The California Native Plant Society Electronic Inventory (CNPSEI), The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) sensitive wildlife lists were also referenced. Special status wildlife species include all federal- and state-listed endangered and threatened species, former federal candidate species, and California species of special concern. Field guides and other literature pertinent to the project area were also consulted.

FIELD SURVEY METHODS

The entire property was surveyed on foot by MBA biologist Marrie McKernan on July 31, 2003. Meandering transects were walked throughout the project site to identify existing conditions and to
Jurisdictional Waters/Wetlands

The United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board regulate discharge of fill into waters of the United States under Section 404 and 401 of the federal Clean Water Act, respectively. The CDFG regulates alterations to stream courses including adjacent riparian habitat areas under Section 1600 of the state Fish and Game Code.

The project site contains no jurisdictional water features.

Recommendation: No actions are recommended for jurisdictional waters or wetlands.

Please feel free to call me at (909) 884-2255 if you have any questions concerning the information in this report. We look forward to continuing to assist you with work on this and other sites.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BRANDMAN ASSOCIATES

Thomas J. McGiff, Ph.D.
Regional Manager

Attachments: Exhibit 1- Project Location Map
            Site Photos
Appendix C
Geotechnical Investigation
Mr. Joe Cani
Cani Construction Company
730 West Southern Avenue
Orange, California 92865

Dear Mr. Cani:

Re: Geotechnical Investigation
Proposed 14-Lot Subdivision
Assessor Parcel No. 543-150-001, Lot 73, Block 3, Page 149
Banning, California

At your request, we have conducted a geotechnical investigation at the above-referenced property. It is proposed to build a 14-lot residential subdivision at the site. The property is currently vacant.

The soil conditions consist of a natural, loose to medium dense sand and silty sand of unknown depth (estimate 50 to 100 feet). The lower sand appears to be natural alluvial-type deposits and is very dense. The sand appears to be deposited by the San Gorgonio River and Smith Creek.

The proposed structures can be supported on conventional spread foundations approximately 24 inches deep. The houses should be placed on a compacted fill pad approximately four feet deep. This consists of excavating three feet below present grade, compacting the base of the excavation to 90%, then placing compacted fill to finished grade.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to call our office.

Sincerely,

R. D. Hinkle
RGE #402

T. C. Welch
CEG #1204
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EXHIBIT 3
Introduction

At your request, we have performed a geotechnical investigation of the property located at the northeast corner of San Gorgonio Avenue and Westly Street in the City of Banning. It is intended to construct 14 single-family residences on the site. The following is a detailed report of our findings, results of laboratory testing, and recommendations for the proposed construction. The site plan is shown on Figure 2.

Purpose

The purpose of the investigation was to determine the condition of the subsurface soils on the site and to provide foundation design parameters for the proposed construction.

This report presents the results of our field investigation and laboratory tests conducted for this site. The test results were used as a basis for design of the foundations and pavement for the project.

Scope

The scope of our investigation was as follows:

1. Five, 24-inch wide by 12-foot deep backhoe test pits were performed in the area of the proposed construction. The locations of the test pits are shown on Figure 2. The test pits were logged in the field by a certified engineering geologist.

2. Laboratory testing was performed to determine the moisture content, density, shear strength, maximum density and consolidation behavior of the subsurface soils.

3. Provide a report of findings, results of laboratory testing, and recommendations for design parameters.

4. The test pit locations, laboratory test data, and related information are included in the Appendix to this report.
Field Investigation

Five backhoe test pits were excavated in the area of new construction to a maximum depth of 12 feet. The locations of the test pits are shown on Figure 2.

During excavation procedures, samples were retrieved using a 2½-inch I.D. California ring sampler. Samples of the subsurface materials were obtained for laboratory testing from all of the test pits. Both undisturbed and bulk samples were obtained. These samples reflect the subsurface soils encountered on the site.

During construction, the excavations should be inspected to verify that the subsurface soil properties are consistent with those encountered in the test pits and as shown on the Test Pit Logs included in the Appendix to this report.

No groundwater was encountered in the test pits during our investigation. Groundwater is expected to be over 50 feet deep depending on the seasonal rainfall and flows in the river.

Laboratory Investigation

The ring samples obtained from the test pits were preserved in a relatively undisturbed condition. Both the ring samples and bulk samples were transported to our laboratory in Irvine for testing. Tests were performed for moisture content, field density, shear strength, maximum density, expansion potential and consolidation. Direct shear tests were performed in a saturated condition to simulate worst-case conditions. The samples reflect the subsurface soils encountered in the test pits. Results of laboratory tests are included in the Appendix. All tests were performed according to the latest ASTM standards and procedures. Our laboratory is a City of Los Angeles approved soils laboratory.

Subsurface Soil Conditions

The site soils consist of tan loose to medium dense sand, silty sand, and natural gravelly sand material. Our test pits were located in the area of proposed construction. It appears that the area investigated is natural sand and silty sand. Below the upper sand is natural dense sand which gets denser with depth. The upper soil has occasional loose pockets. The excavation inspection and compaction will correct this condition.

Site Description

The site is of San Gorgonio Avenue and north of Westley Street in the City of Banning. The lot is located in a relatively flat area where the natural slope was approximately three to five percent to the southeast. The area is covered with sparse brush and grass.

Regional Geology

This site appears to be alluvial sand deposits of unknown depth. No bedrock was encountered. There was no evidence of landsliding in the area. The flat slope indicates that the site is
geologically stable. We could not penetrate the sand deposits so we cannot determine their depth. The geologic conditions indicate that the sand is very deep (over 100 feet). Footings for the proposed structures will be in dense recompacted sand deposits.

**Regional Setting**

The site is located in the City of Banning which is located in an alluvial basin bracketed by the south branch of the San Andreas Fault Zone to the northeast and the San Jacinto Fault Zone to south-southwest. The closest active fault to the project location is the south branch of the San Andreas Fault at approximately 6.1 miles northeast.

**Alluvial Soil Conditions**

The soil conditions from the current surface to the maximum explored depth of approximately 12 feet consist predominantly of fine grained sandy soil with occasional pebble and cobbles either layered or scattered throughout the matrix of the soil. They are light tan to brown in color, contain various levels of silt, arkosic in nature, dry to moist with increasing depth and loose to medium dense in consistency.

The general lack in well-defined stratification indicates an environment of relatively quick deposition. However, the high blow counts and tactile examination suggest that the soil is normally consolidated, non-expansive and suitable for foundation support, providing that the recompaction recommendations with this report are adhered to. Porosity of the samples and the possible potential for hydro-consolidation have been recognized and evaluated as part of this investigation.

**Grading Conditions**

Temporary cut slopes of 1:1 (horizontal to vertical), up to five feet deep, should be stable in the soil on the site. However, if during construction, the soils are found to differ significantly from those indicated on the test pit logs, a re-evaluation should be made. Temporary cuts deeper than five feet should be performed no steeper that 1.25:1 (horizontal to vertical) slope. Any permanent slopes should be at a slope of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical).

Temporary cuts over six feet deep may encounter caving conditions. This office must evaluate any temporary cuts on the site. The cuts should be performed during the dry season or sloughing could occur. Caving can be expected in this sand.

**Seismicity**

Since the site lies in earthquake-prone Southern California, there is always the potential of ground shaking strong enough to cause structure damage. The maximum credible earthquake and distance from known active faults to the site are shown in the EQ Fault table included in the Appendix.
The 10 percent probability of exceedence published by the California Department of Mines and Geology in 1996 for this site is approximately 50g. The design load for the structure is the responsibility of the owner and structural engineer.

TABLE 1
1997 SEISMIC CODE REQUIREMENTS
The following are the design parameters to be used for the 1997 Uniform Building Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seismic Zone Factor</th>
<th>Z = 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil Profile</td>
<td>S_D Stiff Soil Profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Type A - San Andreas Fault</td>
<td>= 9.8 kilometers = 6.1 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Coefficient</td>
<td>C_a = .44 N_a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Source Factor</td>
<td>N_a = 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic Coefficient</td>
<td>C_v = .64 N_v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near-Source Factor</td>
<td>N_v = 1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The site is approximately six miles south of the San Andreas Fault Zone. The site location is shown on the attached Figure 4.

Liquefaction

No liquefaction analysis was performed for this study. The area is not mapped as a liquefaction area by the California Division of Mines and Geology. The area has a very low (less than 1%) probability of liquefaction unless groundwater is raised due to unforeseen conditions.

Conclusions and Recommendations

We recommend that the proposed new structures be founded on continuous or spread footings, a minimum of 24 inches into competent recompacted soil. There should be no mixing of foundations in natural material, fill or bedrock. We recommend that the building pad excavations be made to the 36-inch depth, then the bottom of the excavation compacted. The fill can then be compacted to finished grade. The compaction will extend a minimum 18 inches below the finished foundation and must extend a minimum five feet outside the foundations.

Any compaction is required to be a minimum of 90% relative compaction per ASTM standard D1557-00. A vibratory sheepsfoot or wacker-type compactor should be used to provide compaction. No jetting or flooding will be allowed. The bottom compaction will extend to a depth of approximately 24 inches below the base of the excavation. The footing bottoms should
be inspected and tested by this firm prior to steel placement. Roads and driveways must be recompacted a minimum one foot below the base layer.

**Foundation Design**

We have evaluated the proposed foundation design. The intent was to have the calculated settlements at less than ¼ inch differential and one inch overall. It is our opinion that the spread footing system is most applicable and will balance the overall settlement. For the foundations, we recommend that they be founded a minimum of 24 inches deep. A safe allowable bearing pressure is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footing Depth Below Finish Grade (feet)</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>3250</td>
<td>3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>3700</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allowable Lateral Bearing**

Active: $K_a = 0.27$

Passive: $K_p = 3.65$

Any surcharge load above the retaining wall must be added to these loads. Trucks parked above a retaining wall are considered surcharge loads.

$\phi = 30^\circ$

Friction between soil and concrete = 0.4

All footings must be a minimum 18 inches wide

This bearing value is applicable for either square or continuous footings. Any recompaction must be performed to 90% relative compaction per ASTM D1557-00 using a vibratory sheepfoot or wacker-type compactor. These capacities may be increased by a factor of one third for wind or seismic loads. If the pad area is recompacted and the bottom compacted prior to fill placement, footing recompaction will not be necessary.

**EXHIBIT 3**
All footings must be continuously reinforced with a minimum four #4 bars (two top and two bottom). A member of this firm must verify that the excavations are into competent foundation soil and free of loose debris or uncompacted fill.

Any temporary shoring should be designed for a 20 H loading condition and a rectangular load distribution. Because of the proximity of existing structures, any excavation or shoring should be reviewed by this office. Foundation setbacks from the slope must meet all City of Banning codes.

Expansive Soil

One expansion potential test was performed. The upper material was found to be non-expansive. All footings should be a minimum 24 inches deep and reinforced with four #4 bars, two top and two bottom. Slabs-on-grade should be a minimum four inches (not 3.5 minimal) thick and reinforced with #3 bars at 18 inches each way. Concrete pads for truck traffic should be a minimum six inches thick with #4 bars at 12 inches each way.

Shrinkage and Subsidence

It is estimated that up to 20 percent shrinkage will occur upon compaction of the existing material. Additionally, subsidence of .1 foot can be expected.

Pavement Design

In areas with truck traffic, the pavement should be designed as using a measured R-Value and a City-assigned traffic index. Either asphalt concrete or Portland Cement concrete can be used. However, the slabs and pavement should be founded on 12 inches of recompacted soil (minimum 95% ASTM Standard D1557-00). A reasonable design for truck traffic would consist of four inches of aggregate base overlain by four inches of asphaltic concrete. Pavement design for automobiles should be three inches of asphaltic concrete over four inches of base over 12 inches of recompacted soil.

Concrete Slabs-On-Grade

All floor slabs, sidewalks or patios should have a minimum of #3 bars at 18 inches in each direction (no mesh substitution). The soil beneath the slabs must be cleaned of all debris, scarified and recompacted to a minimum of 12 inches deep. Selective grading will be required to choose the most granular material to place beneath the slabs. A 10 mil PVC or polyethylene membrane with a one-inch sand blanket on each side should be provided beneath all interior slabs to prevent moisture migration. Outside slabs should be expected to move and be fitted with expansion joints at a minimum 12-foot spacing.

111 Statement

The proposed construction is based on spread or continuous footings founded in recompacted soil. The affected area will not disturb any adjacent properties. If the construction and design is
performed according to the requirements in this report, there will be no danger of landslide, slippage or settlement exceeding one inch on this or adjacent properties.

General Site Grading

1. **Clearing & Grubbing**: The site as it exists, has light brush and grass covering most of the area. Recompaction of the house pad area is required. All material over six inches in diameter must be removed from the site.

2. **Preparation of Slab & Pavement Areas**: Subgrade for both concrete slab and asphalt concrete paved areas should be scarified to a depth of 12 inches and recompacted. This means excavate 12 inches, compact the bottom using a vibratory sheepfoot, then place 12 inches of compacted fill to subgrade level.

3. **Placement of Compacted Fill**: Compacted fill is defined as that material which will be replaced in the areas of removal due to the placement of footings and paving, and also where the grade is to be raised. All fill should be compacted to a minimum of 90% based on the maximum density obtained in accordance with ASTM Standard D1557-00.

4. **Review of Grading Plan & Specifications**: We are recommending that the soil engineer have the opportunity to review the grading plan, construction procedures and specifications to assure that they include the items of the soil report for the benefit of the owner and the contractor.

5. **Pre-Job Conference**: Prior to the commencement of grading, a pre-job conference should be held with representatives of the owner, developer, contractor, architect and/or engineer and soil engineer in attendance. The purpose of this meeting shall be to clarify any questions relating to the intent of the grading recommendations and to verify that the project specifications comply with the recommendations of this report.

6. **Testing & Inspection**: During grading, frequent density testing should be performed by a representative of the soil engineer in order to determine the degree of compaction being obtained. Where testing indicates insufficient density, additional compactive effort shall be applied with the adjustment of moisture content where necessary until 90% relative compaction is obtained. The maximum dry density shall be determined in accordance with ASTM Standard D1557-00.

**General**

The recommendations of this report are based on the assumption that all foundations will be founded in dense compacted fill. All footing excavations should be inspected prior to the placement of concrete in order to verify that footings are founded on satisfactory soils and are free of loose and disturbed materials. All grading and fill placement should be performed under the testing and inspection of a representative of the soil engineer.
APPENDIX
**DETERMINISTIC ESTIMATION OF PEAK ACCELERATION FROM DIGITIZED FAULTS**

**JOB NUMBER**: 9842-0000  
**DATE**: 12-09-2003

**JOB NAME**: Carri  
**CALCULATION NAME**: Carri Analysis  
**FAULT-DATA-FILE NAME**: CDMGFLTE.DAT

**SITE COORDINATES**:  
**SITE LATITUDE**: 33.9167  
**SITE LONGITUDE**: 116.8750

**SEARCH RADIUS**: 50 mi

**ATTENUATION RELATION**: 14) Campbell & Bozorgnia (1997 Rev.) - Alluvium

**UNCERTAINTY (M=Median, S=Sigma)**: M  
**Number of Sigmas**: 0.0  
**DISTANCE MEASURE**: cdist  
**SCOND**: 0  
**Basement Depth**: 5.00 km  
**Campbell SSR**: 0  
**Campbell SHR**: 0  
**COMPUTE PEAK HORIZONTAL ACCELERATION**

**FAULT-DATA FILE USED**: CDMGFLTE.DAT

**MINIMUM DEPTH VALUE (km)**: 3.0
# EQFAULT SUMMARY

## DETERMINISTIC SITE PARAMETERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABBREVIATED FAULT NAME</th>
<th>APPROXIMATE DISTANCE (mi)</th>
<th>MAG. (Mw)</th>
<th>PEAK EST. SITE INTENSITY</th>
<th>ACCEL. g</th>
<th>MOD. MERC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANDREAS - Southern</td>
<td>6.1 (9.8)</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANDREAS - San Bernardino</td>
<td>6.1 (9.8)</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JACINTO-SAN JACINTO VALLEY</td>
<td>10.3 (16.6)</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JACINTO-ANZA</td>
<td>12.6 (20.3)</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PINTO MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>13.2 (21.3)</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JACINTO-SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>21.9 (35.3)</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH FRONTAL FAULT ZONE (East)</td>
<td>22.4 (36.0)</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANDREAS - Coachella</td>
<td>23.3 (37.5)</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH FRONTAL FAULT ZONE (West)</td>
<td>24.4 (39.3)</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURNT MTN.</td>
<td>28.7 (46.2)</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUREKA PEAK</td>
<td>31.1 (50.1)</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANDERS</td>
<td>31.4 (50.5)</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELENDALE - S. LOCKHARDT</td>
<td>31.4 (50.5)</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEGHORN</td>
<td>31.6 (50.9)</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSINORE-TEMECULA</td>
<td>32.5 (52.3)</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSINORE-GLEN IVY</td>
<td>33.1 (53.3)</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LENWOOD-LOCKHART-OLD WOMAN SPRNGS</td>
<td>33.2 (53.3)</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON VALLEY (Northern)</td>
<td>37.1 (59.7)</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JACINTO-COYOTE CREEK</td>
<td>38.2 (61.4)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSINORE-JULIAN</td>
<td>38.2 (61.4)</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUCAMONGA</td>
<td>38.3 (61.6)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMERSON So. - COPPER MTN.</td>
<td>41.0 (66.0)</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINO-CENTRAL AVE. (Elsinore)</td>
<td>41.1 (66.3)</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITTIER</td>
<td>43.9 (70.7)</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANDREAS - 1857 Rupture</td>
<td>46.4 (74.7)</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANDREAS - Mojave</td>
<td>46.4 (74.7)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALICO - HIDALGO</td>
<td>46.5 (74.9)</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN JOSE</td>
<td>49.2 (79.1)</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-END OF SEARCH-  28 FAULTS FOUND WITHIN THE SPECIFIED SEARCH RADIUS.

THE SAN ANDREAS - San Bernardino FAULT IS CLOSEST TO THE SITE.
IT IS ABOUT 6.1 MILES (9.8 km) AWAY.

LARGEST MAXIMUM-EARTHQUAKE SITE ACCELERATION: 0.4375 g
### SUMMARY OF TESTS RESULTS

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLE No.</th>
<th>Depth ft.</th>
<th>SAMPLE TYPE</th>
<th>Field Moisture %</th>
<th>FIELD DRY DENSITY lbs/cu. ft.</th>
<th>Gravel %</th>
<th>Sand %</th>
<th>Fines %</th>
<th>% CONSOLIDATION</th>
<th>DEG. φ</th>
<th>COHESION PSF</th>
<th>MAXIMUM DENSITY PCF</th>
<th>DENSITY %W</th>
<th>% RELATIVE COMPACTION</th>
<th>ATTERBERG LIMITS LL</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>108.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>RING</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>117.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>BAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP-2</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>BAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT: N.E. CORNER OF SAN GORGONIO AVENUE AND WESTLY STREET, BANNING**

DALE HINKLE P. E. INC.
## Direct Shear Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>WESTLEY &amp; SAN GORGONIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLE NUMBER</td>
<td>TP-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLE DEPTH</td>
<td>2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMPLE TYPE</td>
<td>UNDISTURBED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESTED BY</td>
<td>DRK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated % W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of Internal Friction</td>
<td>34 DEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>0 P.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Density</td>
<td>108.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Field Moisture</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated Density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit** 3
# Direct Shear Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Westley &amp; San Gorgonio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole Number</td>
<td>TP-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole Depth</td>
<td>5'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Type</td>
<td>Undisturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tested By</td>
<td>DRK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated % W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of Internal Friction</td>
<td>28 Deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>0 P.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Density</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Field Moisture</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated Density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Shear Strength vs Normal Pressure Graph]

**Exhibit "3"**
## Direct Shear Test Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Westley &amp; San Gorgonio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole Number</td>
<td>TP-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hole Depth</td>
<td>8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Type</td>
<td>Undisturbed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tested By</td>
<td>DRK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated % W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angle of Internal Friction</td>
<td>30 Deg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>140 P.S.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Density</td>
<td>116.1 pcf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Field Moisture</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph

- **Shear Strength (PSI)** vs **Normal Pressure (PSI)**
- Graph shows a straight line with a slope corresponding to a 30-degree angle.

---

**EXHIBIT 3**

---

**DALE HINKLE P.E. INC.**

15510 Rockfield Blvd., Suite B

Irvine, California 92618
SOIL CONSOLIDATION TESTS

PROJECT: Westley & Sun Corral
HOLE NO.: TP-1/5
TESTED BY: GS
DATE: 12/8/03

FINAL % W = 22.8%
The American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) has evaluated the precision of the maximum density test method ASTM D1557-78, and has indicated that variations in the test results can occur. ASTM defines the acceptance range of two results in Table 3 in the test of ASTM D1557-78. The range is considered acceptable if the difference between any two results expressed as a percentage of the average value of the two results does not exceed 4.0 percent. As yet, ASTM has not reported precision values for field density test methods, but we expect that variations in the field density test results could also occur. Accordingly, the accuracy of the relative compaction values presented in this report is dependent on the precision of the ASTM test method, and therefore, the test results may be subject to variation.
## LOG OF BORING

**HOLE NO.** TP-1  | **DATE DRILLED** 11/14/03  | **SHEET** 1 OF 1  | **PROJECT** WESTLEY & SAN GORGONIO  | **EXPLORATION METHOD** 24 IN. BACKHOE  
**LOCATION** NE CORNER  | **SIZE OF HOLE**  | **GROUND ELEVATION** ~115 FT. 2240±  | **CONTRACTOR**  
**DEPTH TO WATER TABLE** NE  | **DRILLER**  | **DEPTH TO SOLID ROCK** NE  | **INSPECTOR** T. C. WELCH  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRY (PCF)</th>
<th>UNDISTURBED SAMPLES</th>
<th>WEIGHT LBS.</th>
<th>DROP IN.</th>
<th>INCHES DRIVEN</th>
<th>TOTAL BLOWS</th>
<th>%W</th>
<th>DEPTH FEET</th>
<th>FIELD DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>108.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0</td>
<td>SURFACE SOIL IS NATIVE, BUT DISTRUBED FOR WEED CONTROL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>@ 2 FT. SAND, FINE-GRAIN, DRY, LT. BROWN, FIRM TO MED. DENSE. SOME MINOR GRAVEL TO PEBBLE SIZE ROCK, WITH SILT AND ARKOSIC (SP), POROUS, NON-TO LOW- COHESION.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>@ 5 FT. SAME.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>@ 6 FT. INCREASE IN SILT CONTENT, LESS ROCK FRAGMENTS (SM-ML) DAMP TO SLIGHTLY MOIST.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DEPTH 12 FEET**  
**NO GROUNDWATER**  
**NO CAVING**

---

Dale Hinkle P. E. Inc.  
15510 Rockfield Blvd., Suite B  
Irvine, California 92618  
(949) 458-0498 Fax (949) 458-1918

EXHIBIT 3
# LOG OF BORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLE NO.</th>
<th>DATE DRILLED</th>
<th>SHEET</th>
<th>OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP-2</td>
<td>11/14/03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT**
WESTLEY & SAN GORGONIO  
EXPLORATION METHOD 24 IN. BACKHOE

**LOCATION**
NE CORNER  
SIZE OF HOLE

**GROUND ELEVATION**
-112 FT. (2237)  
CONTRACTOR

**DEPTH TO WATER TABLE**
NE  
DRILLER

**DEPTH TO SOLID ROCK**
NE  
INSPECTOR  
T. C. WELCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRY (PCF)</th>
<th>WEIGHT LBS.</th>
<th>DROP IN.</th>
<th>INCHES DRIVEN</th>
<th>TOTAL BLOWS</th>
<th>%W</th>
<th>DEPTH FEET</th>
<th>FIELD DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>@ 2 FT. SAND, V. FINE GRAIN WIMINOR SILT, LT. BROWN, ARKOSIC, DRY, PEBBLES, RODENT BURROWS AND ROOTLETS, AT 2 FEET, FIRM TO MED. DENSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-1-</td>
<td>@ 4 FT. SAND, V. FINE TO FINE GRAIN WITH INCREASING SILT CONTENT (ML- SM), LT. BROWN, DAMP TO MOIST, SLIGHT TO MED. DENSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>-2-</td>
<td>@ 8 FT. SAME.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DEPTH 12 FT.  
NO GROUNDWATER  
NO CAVING

Dale Hinkle P. E. Inc.  
15510 Rockfield Blvd., Suite B  
Irvine, California 92618  
(949) 458-0498 Fax (949) 458-1918

**EXHIBIT** 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLE NO.</th>
<th>DATE DRILLED</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>GROUND ELEVATION</th>
<th>DEPTH TO WATER TABLE</th>
<th>DEPTH TO SOLID ROCK</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
<th>DRILLER</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP-3</td>
<td>11/14/03</td>
<td>WESTLEY &amp; SAN GORGONIO</td>
<td>NE CORNER</td>
<td>~109 FT. (2234)</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Dale Hinkle P. E. Inc.</td>
<td>T. C. WELCH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Log of Boring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPTH (FEET)</th>
<th>DRY UNDISTURBED SAMPLES</th>
<th>FIELD DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.3 40 18 12 20 32 2.4</td>
<td>@ 2 FT. SAND, V. FINES SILT (SW-SM) DRY, LT. BROWN, SLIGHTLY POROUS, MOIST AND MED. DENSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>97.2 40 18 12 18 31 4.5</td>
<td>@ 5 FT. SAME SOIL COMPOSITION, BUT DAMP &amp; STILL POROUS TO 7 FT. PEBBLE &amp; COBBLE SIZE ROCK, DECREASES WITH DEPTH, MED. DENSE IN CONSISTENCY &amp; POORLY LAMINATED TO MASSIVE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>98.6 40 18 12 20 34 6.5</td>
<td>TOTAL DEPTH 12 FT, NO GROUNDWATER, NO CAVING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dale Hinkle P. E. Inc.
15510 Rockfield Blvd., Suite B
Irvine, California 92618
(949) 458-0498 Fax (949) 458-1918
# LOG OF BORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLO NO.</th>
<th>DATE DRILLED</th>
<th>SHEET</th>
<th>OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP-4</td>
<td>11/14/03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROJECT:** WESTLEY & SAN GORGONIO  
**EXPLORATION METHOD:** 24 IN. BACKHOE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>SIZE OF HOLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE CORNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUND ELEVATION</th>
<th>CONTRACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-106 FT. (2231)</td>
<td>T. C. WELCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPTH TO WATER TABLE</th>
<th>NE DRILLER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPTH TO SOLID ROCK</th>
<th>INSPECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>T. C. WELCH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## DRY UNDISTURBED SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEIGHT LBS.</th>
<th>DROP IN.</th>
<th>INCHES DRIVEN</th>
<th>TOTAL BLOWS</th>
<th>%W</th>
<th>DEPTH FEET</th>
<th>FIELD DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>@ 2 FT. SAND, FINE-GRAIN W/SILT, ARKOSIC, LT. BROWN, DRY, LOOSE TO MED. DENSE BY 2 FT. SCATTERED GRAVEL TO PEBBLES, VERY LOW TO LOW COHESION (SW).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>@ 5 FT. SAME.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>@ 8 FT. SAME.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DEPTH 12 FT.**  
NO GROUNDWATER  
NO CAVING

---

Dale Hinkle P. E. Inc.  
15510 Rockfield Blvd., Suite B  
Irvine, California 92618  
(949) 458-0498 Fax (949) 458-1918

**EXHIBIT 3**
## LOG OF BORING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOLE NO</th>
<th>TP-5</th>
<th>DATE DRILLED</th>
<th>11/14/03</th>
<th>SHEET</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>OF</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td>WESTLEY &amp; SAN GORGONIO</td>
<td>EXPLORATION METHOD</td>
<td>24 IN. BACKHOE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION</td>
<td>NE CORNER</td>
<td>SIZE OF HOLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUND ELEVATION</td>
<td>-118 (2243)</td>
<td>CONTRACTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPTH TO WATER TABLE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>DRILLER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPTH TO SOLID ROCK</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>INSPECTOR</td>
<td>T. C. WELCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DRY UNDISTURBED SAMPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRY (PCF)</th>
<th>WEIGHT LBS</th>
<th>DROP IN</th>
<th>INCHES DRIVEN</th>
<th>TOTAL BLOWS</th>
<th>%W</th>
<th>FIELD DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>@ 2 FT. SANDY FINE TO MED. GRAIN W/MINOR SILT, LT. BROWN, DRY, LOOSE TO MED. DENSE AT 2 FT. ALSO CONSISTING OF POORLY DEVELOPED THIN LAYERS TO PEBBLES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>@ 5 TO 6 FT. CHANNEL-BED DEPOSITS, COARSE GRAIN SAND AND GRAVEL W/PEBBLE &amp; COBBLE CLASTS. BUFF TO WHITE &amp; TAN COLORED, DRY, MED. DENSE AND MODERATELY WELL-STRATIFIED. SOME CAVING NON-COHESIVE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO RECOVERY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>@ 12 FT. SAME. TOTAL DEPTH 12 FT. NO GROUNDWATER NO CAVING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Dale Hinkle P. E. Inc.
15510 Rockfield Blvd., Suite B
Irvine, California 92618
(949) 458-0498 Fax (949) 458-1918
Appendix D
Preliminary Hydrology Report
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 31748
BANNING, CA.

PRELIMINARY HYDROLOGY STUDY

CARRI CONSTRUCTION
730 SOUTHERN AVENUE
ORANGE, CA 92865
(714) 998-1101

EXHIBIT 3
Introduction

The purpose of this preliminary drainage study is to prove the drainage issues and design of flood control and storm drain improvement.

This study is based on Riverside County Hydrology manual and City of Banning Master Plan of Drainage. The total developed site is approximate 7.5 acres with proposed 13 single family lots. The area is subdivided into several small sub areas for the study. The City requires 10-year frequency storm Q10 must be retained between street curbs, and the 100-year frequency Q100 must be retained within the street right-of-way (property line to property line). When the Q's cannot be retained by the curbs or property lines, the storm drain system or detention basins are required to mitigate the unretained Q and no damages will take place downstream.

The project will provide small detention basins (50’ x 30’ x 1’) on each lot even the streets with rolled curb (Type C) can carry the runoff as the study indicated. These detention basins can provide valuable groundwater percolation recharge in additional to reduce the peak runoff on the streets. For drainage purposes, Wesie Street will require 6” curb face instead of rolled curb.
The 100-Year flood shall be contained within street R/W limits.

The 10-Year flood shall be contained within the Top of curbs.

Initiate a storm drain or channel when either condition is exceeded.

NOTES:
Protection criteria shown are the District's typical minimum requirements. Special conditions, or other authorities may require stricter controls; i.e., for reasons of traffic or pedestrian safety, maintenance problems behind curbs, etc., lower maximum depths of flow in streets may be required. Also see Riv. Co. Ord. No. 460.
LIMITATIONS:
1. Maximum length = 1000'
2. Maximum area = 10 Acres

EXAMPLE:
1) $L = 550', H = 5.0', K = \text{Single Family (1/4 Acre)}$
   Development, $T_c = 12.6$ min.
2) $L = 550', H = 5.0', K = \text{Commercial Development}$
   $T_c = 9.7$ min.

KEY
$L = H = T_c = K - T_c'$

Reference: Bibliography item No. 35.

RCFC & WCD
HYDROLOGY MANUAL

TIME OF CONCENTRATION
FOR INITIAL SUBAREA

EXHIBIT 3
RCFC & WCD
HYDROLOGY MANUAL
RUNOFF COEFFICIENT CURVES
SOIL GROUP A
COVER TYPE - URBAN LANDSCAPING
AMC-ll
(RUNOFF INDEX NUMBER 32)

RAINFALL INTENSITY IN INCHES PER HOUR

EXHIBIT "3"
**RCFC & WCD Hydrology Manual**

**RATIONAL METHOD CALCULATION FORM**

**PROJECT**: T.T.M. 3748, Banning, CA.

*(SEE HYDROLOGY MAP)*

**FREQUENCY**: 10 YEARS

**SLOPE SECTION**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAINAGE AREA</th>
<th>Soil &amp; Development</th>
<th>A (Acres)</th>
<th>I (In/hr)</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>ΔQ (CFS)</th>
<th>ΣQ (CFS)</th>
<th>SLOPE</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>V (FPS)</th>
<th>L (FT)</th>
<th>T (MIN.)</th>
<th>ΣT</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>TYPE M</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>GUTTER</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Initial Area H=5.04 L=4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>GUTTER</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>TYPE C CURB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>TYPE A</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Initial Area H=5.04 L=4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>GUTTER</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>TYPE C CURB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>GUTTER</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Initial Area San Gorgonio Ave Assumed the C.S. Will Intersect 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>TYPE A</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>WIRE</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>Initial Area San Gorgonio Ave Assumed the C.S. Will Intersect 90°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADJUSTED</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USE 6&quot; C.P. &amp; WELLES 2T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: These calculations do not consider the effect of the detention basin, however, the peak runoff can be produced by 15% (min.) due to the proposed detention basin on each 1st.

**EXHIBIT #3**
### RCFC & WCD Hydrology Manual
#### Rational Method Calculation Form

**Project:** TTM 31746, Banning, CA

**Frequency:** 100 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAINAGE AREA</th>
<th>Soil &amp; Development</th>
<th>A (Acres)</th>
<th>I (in/hr)</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>ΔQ (CFS)</th>
<th>ΣQ (CFS)</th>
<th>SLOPE</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>V (FPS)</th>
<th>L (FT)</th>
<th>T (MIN.)</th>
<th>ET</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>TYPE A S.F. (½ A)</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>GUTTER</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>INITIAL AREA 1/2 Að12 x 6 = 446'_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>TYPE A S.F. (1/4 A)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>GUTTER</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>INITIAL AREA 1/4 Að12 x 6 = 436'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.53 INTERCEPTED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 INITIAL AREA 1/4 Að12 x 6 = 436'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>TYPE A S.F. (4/4 A)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>GUTTER</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>INITIAL AREA ASSUMED THE C.B WILL INTERCEPT 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>ADJUSTED</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>7.76 = 13.0 MIN.</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.26 CFS</td>
<td>2.26 CFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.26 CFS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 USE 6&quot; C.F &amp; 2/3 C.S. 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** These calculations do not consider the effect of the detention basin. However, the peak runoff can be reduced by 75% (1/4 A) due to the proposed detention basin on each lot.
ATTACHMENTS

A. 100-YEAR --1 HOUR PRECIPITATION
B. COUNTY STANDARD NO. 102
C. COUNTY STANDARD NO. 104
D. CITY BANNING TYPE “C” CURB
TYPICAL SECTION

EXAMPLE:
See Plate D-72

DEPTH AT CURB

FLOW AT R/W LINE WITH 6" CURB

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

VELOCITY DISCHARGE CURVES
COUNTY STANDARD No. 102
64' ROADWAY 6" & 8" CURBS

RCFC & WCD
HYDROLOGY MANUAL

EXHIBIT 3
TYPICAL SECTION

DISCHARGE - C.F.S.
(TOTAL FLOW IN STREET)

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

RCFC & WCD HYDROLOGY MANUAL

EXHIBIT 3
1.418 cu. ft. / l. ft.

Cu. yd. = 0.95 cu. yd. l. ft.

Minimum permissible grade 0.35%

5 1/2 sack mix

All curbs over minimum 4" Class II Base extend under A.C.
Appendix E
Traffic Analysis
A Traffic Analysis is currently being prepared by Urban Crossroads, Inc. since based on data from a comprehensive traffic study they are preparing for another project in the immediate area. A copy of the analysis will be forwarded to the City as soon as it is completed. The traffic engineer at Urban Crossroads indicated by telephone that a project of this size will not have any significant traffic or circulation impacts, and their analysis will document that and determine any fair share contributions to local improvements.
**CITY OF BANNING**  
**MONITORING PROGRAM FOR CEQA COMPLIANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE:</th>
<th>September 3, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSORS PARCEL NO.:</td>
<td>543-150-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE NO.:</td>
<td>Lot Split 04-4507/TTM 31748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA/EIR NO:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICANT:</td>
<td>Carri Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT LOCATION:</td>
<td>Northeast corner of San Gorgonio and Wesley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVAL DATE:</td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE FOLLOWING REPRESENTS THE CITY’S MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM IN CONNECTION WITH THE MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE ABOVE CASE NUMBER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. AIR QUALITY*</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE FOR MONITORING</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE CHECKED BY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water soil within 15 minutes of moving.</td>
<td>Building Dept.</td>
<td>Project Grading</td>
<td>Site inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water inactive areas daily.</td>
<td>Building Dept.</td>
<td>Project Grading</td>
<td>Site inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop grading during winds of more than 25 mph</td>
<td>City Engineer</td>
<td>Project Grading</td>
<td>Site inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply chemical stabilizers on Fridays or before holidays.</td>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td>Project Grading</td>
<td>Site inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water storage piles or apply covering.</td>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td>During grading.</td>
<td>Site inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilize undeveloped areas after 21 days.</td>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td>At end of grading.</td>
<td>Site inspection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See detailed mitigation measures in Initial Study.*
August 30, 2004

Banning Planning Department Staff
99 East Ramsey Street
Banning, CA 92220-0998

Attn.: Nicole Criste

Reference: Lot Split 04-450-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748

Dear Ms. Criste,

Please see the attached Traffic Access Evaluation for the tentative tract map 31748. Based on the traffic engineer's evaluation a secondary access would create more problems, and I would like to request that Condition Number 11 on the Conditions of Approval for tentative tract map 31748 be eliminated.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Carol Carri
President
August 26, 2004

Joseph J. Carri, P.E.
730 W. Southern Avenue
Orange, CA 92865
(714) 998-1101

City Council Members
City of Banning
P.O. Box 998
Banning, CA 92220

RE: Lot Split 04-450-4507/Tentative Tract Map 31748

Dear Council Members:

Thank you for reviewing the Tentative Tract Map listed above which is on the agenda for consideration on September 14, 2004.

Let me give you some background on the process that was taken to arrive at the configuration of the proposed tentative tract map.

Last July 2003 the Land Development Task force, with fire department concurrence, approved a 14 lot subdivision at the same site with a single point of access along San Gorgonio Avenue. Upon further design research our engineer determined this point of access along San Gorgonio to be unsafe since it is currently considered a major highway which requires 650 feet center line to center line from the intersection of Wesley and San Gorgonio to the center line of the single point of access. As a result of this safety violation we abandoned the 14 lot subdivision and have proposed the current 13 lot subdivision as mapped without access onto San Gorgonio.

I would like to call your attention to Item Number 11 on the Conditions of Approval requiring secondary access onto San Gorgonio which has the potential problems listed in the attached traffic engineer’s evaluation. In addition, the proposed secondary access is only 425 feet center line to center line from Wesley and also violates the 650 foot minimum requirement for access to a major highway. We have intentionally not shown this secondary access due to the obvious safety concerns.

Please eliminate Item Number 11 from the Conditions of Approval for Tract Map 31748.

Please call me if you have any questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Joseph J. Carri, P.E.

EXHIBIT "S"
August 26, 2004

Mr. Kent Norton
MICHAEL BRANDMAN ASSOCIATES
621 E. Carnegie Drive, Suite 100
San Bernardino, CA 92408

Subject: Tentative Tract 31748 Access Evaluation

Dear Mr. Norton:

The firm of Urban Crossroads, Inc. is pleased to submit the following access evaluation for the proposed Tentative Tract 31748 development. The site is located north of Wesley Street and east of San Gorgonio Avenue in the City of Banning. Exhibit A illustrates the location of the site.

It is our understanding that a secondary access is currently being considered to San Gorgonio Avenue from the existing terminus on the westerly cul-de-sac. This letter is intended to discuss the potential impacts of this additional access from a traffic circulation standpoint.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Exhibit B illustrates the proposed site plan. The project consists of 13 single-family detached dwelling units. Currently, the site plan illustrates that the development will have direct, full access to Wesley Street. A potential location for the secondary access point to San Gorgonio Avenue is also shown.
ACCESS EVALUATION

Secondary or emergency access points are generally required for developments exceeding 150 residential dwelling units. The proposed project consists of 13 units and is well below the threshold for requiring a secondary access point. An evaluation of the project’s Trip Generation was previously presented in the Tentative Tract 31748 Trip Generation Evaluation (Urban Crossroads, Inc. June 23, 2004). This evaluation indicated that the project would generate 134 trip ends per day with 11 vehicles during the AM peak hour and 14 vehicles during the PM peak hour. Based on these estimates, a Secondary access is not required from a stacking perspective.

Based on the design of the access points, cut-through traffic may occur throughout the site. Traffic going between San Gorgonio Avenue and Wesley Street may elect to go through the site and avoid the intersection of San Gorgonio Avenue/Wesley Street. This would result in an increase in the number of trips on the internal local roadway and thereby increasing the potential for vehicular conflicts.

The site plan illustrates the internal streets serving a total of nine units. It also depicts two cul-de-sacs that have a radius of 40 feet. Based on the turning radius of a fire-truck and the proposed design of the cul-de-sacs, adequate maneuverability will be provided to allow the fire trucks to turn around without having to back up.

CONCLUSION

The evaluation presented above indicates that potential issues may arise as a result of incorporating a second access point for the site. Based on the number of proposed residential dwelling units (13 DU’s) and the potential for cut-through
traffic to occur, it is recommended that the second access point to San Gorgonio Avenue not be implemented and the project be served by the single access point to Wesley Street.

If you have any questions regarding this analysis, please give me a call at (949) 660-1994.

Respectfully submitted,

URBAN CROSSROADS, INC.

Scott Sato, P.E.
Associate Principal

SS:jb
JN:02175-03

Attachments
EXHIBIT A
LOCATION MAP

- Site
- Charles St.
- Wesley St.
- San Gorgonio Ave.

Received: Aug 27, 2004
By: JMB
ATTACHMENT 5

Public Hearing Notice
State of California  
County of Riverside  

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer and publisher of Record Gazette, a newspaper published in the English language in the City of Banning, County of Riverside, and adjudicated a newspaper of general circulation as defined by the laws of the state of California by the Superior Court of the County of Riverside, under the date October 14, 1966, Case No. 54737. That the notice, of which the annexed is a copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

August 24, 2018

Executed on: 08/24/2018
At Banning, CA

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature

Ana Rivera