INITIAL STUDY

FOR THE

COACHELLA TRAVEL CENTRE

Prepared for:

City of Coachella
1515 Sixth Street
Coachella, California 92236

Prepared by:

Tom Dodson & Associates
2150 N. Arrowhead Avenue
San Bernardino, California 92405
(909) 882-3612

April 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

TABLES

TABLES (continued)

FIGURES

FIGURES (continued)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

INTRODUCTION

1. Project Title: Coachella Travel Centre Project Initial Study

2. Lead Agency Name: City of Coachella
   Address: 1515 6th Street, Coachella, CA 92236

3. Contact Person: Luis Lopez
   Phone Number: (760) 398-3102

4. Project Location: The proposed project is located in the City of Coachella, Riverside County, at Avenue 50 and State Route 86 in Coachella, California. The project is located on the west side of State Route 86 just south of Avenue 50. The geographic coordinates of the proposed project are 33.685704, -116.163169 and the proposed project is located within Coachella, USGS 7.5-minute topographic map within Township 6 South, Range 8 East of the San Bernardino Meridian. See Figures 1 and 2 for regional and site locations.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Ed Haddad
   422 Wier Road, San Bernardino, CA 92408

6. General Plan Designation: Suburban Retail District

7. Zoning: Agricultural Reserve (A-R)

8. Project Description:

Introduction

The City of Coachella is located in the middle of Riverside County north of the Salton Sea and abutting the Cities of Indio and La Quinta, near the border between Riverside and Imperial County. As part of a development application filed by AHD Limited Partnership (LP), the City of Coachella (City) will consider entitlements to develop a Travel Centre within a 14.1-acre site that includes a 5 Story Hotel, a Restaurant, a Drive-Thru Restaurant, a Convenience Store, a Gas Station, and a Truck Stop, which includes Truck Fuel Pumps, a Truck Wash Facility, and a Car Wash Facility. AHD, LP is a Real Estate Holding company whose Principal is Ed Haddad. The need for a project of this type at this location is such that this area of the City of Coachella is underserved for this type of use, particularly given that plans have been approved to extend Avenue 50 to Interstate 10, which would create a new freeway on- and off-ramp that will connect this portion of the City with interstate travelers looking to visit the Coachella Valley and beyond.

Project Description

The approximately 14.1-acre site is located in Coachella, California, which is part of the Coachella Valley within Riverside County. It is comprised of one parcel—APN 763-020-021—located generally at the southwest corner of Avenue 50 and Highway 86. The project will require a zone classification change from Agricultural Reserve (A-R) to General Commercial (C-G). The project will also require three conditional use permits for a truck wash, auto washing, and drive-

thru restaurant businesses, and site plan and architectural review by the City of Coachella. Similarly, the sale of alcohol on the premises will require a separate conditional use permit consideration. Additionally, a variance to exceed the allowable height of three stories in the C-G zone for the hotel is required.

The proposed site will be developed with 5 buildings as shown on the site plan provided as Figure 3, which will make up the Coachella Travel Centre. The site is planned to contain a convenience store and gas station at the northwestern corner of the site, at Avenue 50 and Tyler Street. The convenience store will be approximately 3,800 square feet (SF) with a gas pump canopy directly adjacent to it. The interior of convenience store will contain restrooms, a 17-doorwalk-in cooler, a utility closet, a cashier stand, an office, a soda fountain, a to-go food station, a coffee station, a sales area, a walk-in freezer, and several stands for miscellaneous convenience item sales. The entrance will be located facing east with an additional side entrance facing north. The convenience store floor plan is shown on Figure 4. The gas station will include 10 fuel pumps as well as adjacent parking. The gas station floor plan is shown on Figure 5. It is anticipated that the gas station and convenience store will employ a total of about 15 persons.

In the northern middle portion of the site there will be a drive thru restaurant that will be approximately 2,533 SF and a sit down restaurant that will be 5,555 SF. The interior of the drive thru restaurant will contain restrooms, a dining room area, a service area, and a kitchen area with three entryways restricted to employee access and two customer entrances. The drive thru wraps around the majority of the drive thru restaurant structure with parking located northeast of the structure. The drive thru restaurant floor plan is shown on Figure 6. It is anticipated that the drive-thru restaurant will employ a total of about 20 persons. The proposed sit down restaurant will have restrooms, a dining room, and a kitchen area with an entryway restricted to employee access and three customer entrances. The sit down restaurant floor plan is shown on Figure 7. Restaurant parking will surround the restaurant in each direction. It is anticipated that the sit down restaurant will employ a total of about 30 persons.

In the middle of the project site, a 4-story, 11,259 SF hotel will be developed with 116 rooms. The hotel will contain a mixture of king rooms, king suites, and double queen rooms. The lobby of the hotel will include a breakfast bar, registration, a sundry shop, a print station, a brochure station, restrooms and lobby seating. In addition to 9 guest rooms, the first floor will also include a fitness center, a pantry, a board room, and an employee area containing a work area, a linen room, a laundry room, a break room, a mechanic room, a manager's office, a security room, and employee restroom facilities. Outside on the first floor, the hotel will contain an enclosed pool for guest use. The second, third, and fourth floors are identical and each floor contains 25 rooms, elevators, storage, an electrical room, and stairways on either side of the hotel for guest access. The hotel floor plans for each floor are shown on Figures 8-11. It is anticipated that the hotel will employ a total of about 30 persons.

The southern portion of the site will consist of a 2,677 SF car wash station, 4,754 SF truck wash station, and a truck fuel pumps. The car wash will be a self-serve drive thru facility with about 13 vacuum stations adjacent to the car wash structure. The car wash floor plan is shown on Figure 12. The truck wash facility will be self-serve and will allow for three trucks to be washed at a time. The truck wash bay floor plan is shown on Figure 13. The truck fuel canopy will contain 8 canopy islands with 16 pump stations. The truck fuel canopy floor plan is shown on Figure 14. It is anticipated that the car wash and truck was stations will each employ a total of about 2 persons.

Summary of the parking for the entire site is shown in Table 1 below:

TABLE 1
PARKING SUMMARY

Project Component	Building SF	Ratio of Parking Required	Required by the Project	Provided
Convenience Store	3,800 SF	1 Space per 250 SF	15.2	-
Quick Serve Rest (QSR)	1,200 SF	1 Space per 200 SF of non-customer area and 1 Space per 45 SF of customer area	12.0	-
Gas Pump Canopy	-	-	-	-
Car Wash Station	2,677 SF	1 Space per 2 Employees	2.0	-
Truck Wash Station	4,754 SF	1 Space per 2 Employees	2.0	-
Drive Thru Restaurant	2,533 SF	1 Space per 100 SF	25.3	-
Restaurant	5,555 SF	1 Space per 100 SF	55.6	-
Hotel (116 Rooms)	11,259 SF	1 Space per Guest Room plus 1 space per 3 employees and 1 space per 3 person capacity of meeting rooms	116.0	-
TOTAL	**77,831 SF**	**-**	**229**	**415**

The project will provide various types of parking stalls as follows in Table 2:

TABLE 2
PARKING STALL SUMMARY

Stall Type	Stall Size	Stalls Provided
Regular Stall	9 x 18	405 Stalls
Accessible Stall	9 x 18	10 Stalls
Loading Stall	10 x 22	5 Stalls
Semi-Truck Stall	12 x 86	62 Stalls
Bicycle Stalls	-	12 Proposed

As demonstrated in Tables 1 and 2 above, the proposed Coachella Travel Centre will have ample parking above and beyond the amount of parking required by the City.

The Landscape plan for the proposed project is provided as Figure 15 and includes a mixture of trees, shrubs, and cactus that are drought resistant and common to the desert landscape of the Coachella Valley. The project site will have landscaping around the perimeter that will screen the site from the surrounding roadways and development. Landscaping will account for a minimum of 15% of the entire site as required by the City of Coachella.

Construction Scenario

Construction of the proposed Coachella Travel Centre is anticipated to require approximately one year, with the anticipated start date of construction in the December 2019 and the completion date by the January 2021. The Project site was agricultural land, and has been previously disturbed, which ceased approximately 30 years ago; development of the site would

require site preparation (i.e., grading and excavation), paving, and construction of buildings. There is no irrigation water infrastructure serving the site at this time. The project is anticipated to require minimal cut and fill with any cut being reused to balance of the site through grading, which will minimize import/export of material. The proposed project will develop underground storage tanks to support the fueling station, which will require some excavation, but it is anticipated that the site will balance. Development of the Coachella Travel Centre will require installation of pavement, curbing and sidewalk throughout the site as shown on the Preliminary Grading Plan (Figure 16-17). Additionally, the project will require installation of drainage inlets at several locations within the project site and installation of a stormtech subsurface stormwater management system. Delivery of construction supplies and removal of any excavated materials, if necessary, will be accomplished using trucks during normal working hours, with a maximum of 50 round trips per day. It is anticipated that a maximum number of 50 employees will be required to support the construction of the project each day. Grading will be by traditional mechanized grading and compaction equipment. Equipment utilized will be traditional site development equipment of front end graders, vibratory compactors, petroleum powered fork lifts, and various hand tools traditional to commercial construction.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings)

The project site is located adjacent to State Highway 86, which generally is surrounded on either side in the project area by the Suburban Retail District land use designation.

- To the west of the site, the land use is Open Space (OS); the Whitewater River is directly adjacent to the project site, which is an important stormwater management facility within the Coachella Valley. Further to the west of the project site the land use designations are Suburban Neighborhood and Urban Employment;

- To the north of the site, the land use is Suburban Retail District;

- To the east of the site, the land use is Suburban Retail; and

- To the south of the site, the land use is Open Space (OS). Further to the south of the project site the land use is Suburban Neighborhood).

10. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

    - Coachella Valley Water District (Flood Control)
    - California Department of Transportation (SR 86 boundaries)
    - State Water Resource Control Board
    - South Coast Air Quality Management District
    - Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board
    - County of Riverside Fire Department

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and cultural affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun? Yes, the City has initiated AB 52 with the following tribes: Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, and Cabazon Band of Mission Indians. The letters were sent out on February 7, 2019. The Agua Caliente Band

of Cahuilla Indians responded on February 26, 2019 and defers to the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, concluding consultation efforts. The Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians responded on February 25, 2019, requesting a copy of the cultural report, and also noting that they elect to be a consulting party under CEQA. No other Tribes responded during the 30-day consultation period.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

☒ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☒ Geology / Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☒ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☒ Hydrology & Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☒ Transportation / Traffic	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources	☒ Utilities / Service Systems
☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the following finding is made:

☐	The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☒	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
☐	The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
☐	The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
☐	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Tom Dodson & Associates — April 24, 2019

Prepared by — Date

Lead Agency (signature) — Date

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 "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, 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.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
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 With Mitigation Incorporated* – Adverse impacts to scenic vistas can occur in one of two ways. First, an area itself may contain existing scenic vistas that would be altered by new development. A review of the project area determined that there are no scenic vistas located internally within the area proposed for the development of the Coachella Travel Centre Project. The proposed project is located adjacent to Highway 86 and is separated from the nearest developments by the Whitewater River Channel. Therefore, given the distance of the project from any nearby residences, and also the project's location adjacent to the Highway at a Highway off-ramp, it is not anticipated that the Coachella Travel Centre Project would impact any important scenic vistas in the project area. A scenic vista impact can also occur when a scenic vista can be viewed from the project area or immediate vicinity and a proposed development may interfere with the view to a scenic vista. The Coachella Valley is located between several mountain ranges, the Little San Bernardino Mountains to the north and east, and the Santa Rosa Mountains to the south and west. The City of Coachella General Plan generally states that the City desires to preserve scenic views of the mountains. However, views around the proposed project are limited because of existing man-made features. It is assumed that nearby residences would experience a minimal change in views to the surrounding mountains as a result of the project development; however, the proposed project would develop a 4-story hotel that would obstruct some views in the vicinity of the project, generally along roadway corridors such as Avenue 50, Tyler Street, and Highway 86 in which the building's height would be most obvious. However, the City's height limit in the CG zone is 50 feet or three stories, whichever is less. Therefore, the proposed hotel will require a height variance to be pursued. As previously stated, due to the distance between the proposed project site and nearby residences, the height of the hotel will only minimally impact views to the surrounding mountains. Furthermore, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented to ensure that the structures are painted using appropriate colors to blend in with the surrounding environment:

AES-1 The proposed structures shall be painted in colors that closely match the surrounding desert landscape, so as to create continuity in the potentially obscured views. The colors chosen shall be approved by the City of Coachella's architectural review process.

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, development of the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista.

b. *No Impact* –The project site does not contain any scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway corridor. The project

site is vacant and has been previously disturbed as it formerly served as an active agricultural site. The site contains some loose to slightly compacted dirt and non-native vegetation that is approximately at-grade. No trees, rock outcroppings, or scenic features existing on site. According to Caltrans, the proposed project is not located adjacent to a state scenic highway, as Highway 86 is not designated as such, and the City of Coachella does not identify any locally important scenic roadways. Therefore, the proposed project cannot affect any scenic resources within a state scenic highway corridor. Based on the site condition and immediate surroundings, the project site itself does not contain any significant scenic resources. Therefore, no damage to a scenic resource will occur and any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The Coachella General Plan has designated the area for Entertainment Commercial uses, and the zoning classification is Agricultural Reserve; the project will require a zone change to ensure that the zoning classification and general plan land use designations are compatible. It is anticipated that the proposed scale, architectural design and articulation of the development on the site will enhance the site and surrounding developed environment compared to the existing visual setting. Thus, even though the on-site existing visual setting will be altered in the future, the proposed change to the visual setting is not forecast to cause significant adverse degradation to the existing visual character or quality of the Project area. The project would develop Lodging, a Restaurant, a Drive Thru Restaurant, and Automotive uses. Lodging is a secondary use within the Suburban Retail District; Restaurants are a primary use within the Suburban Retail District; Drive Thru Restaurants are a primary use within the Suburban Retail District; Automotive uses are a primary use within the Suburban Retail District. Secondary uses are support uses that are allowed but shall not be the primary use. By developing this vacant/abandoned site in accordance with City design guidelines for Suburban Retail District uses and the site development plans, the visual character of this site and its surroundings will be enhanced. However, in order to ensure that the proposed structures blend in with the surrounding desert environment, mitigation measure **AES-1** shall be implemented. Thus, with implementation of mitigation measure **AES-1** above, and with the design elements incorporated in the Project, implementation of the City's design standards will mitigate the potential aesthetic impacts to a less than significant level.

d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The Implementation of the proposed project will create new sources of light during the operational phases of the Project. Light and glare from interior and exterior building lighting, safety and security slighting, and vehicular traffic accessing the site will occur once the site is in operation. According to the City of Coachella General Plan, the project site is located within a Suburban Retail District. The Coachella Travel Centre would be developed in accordance with City requirements for the Suburban Retail District. Adherence to the City's Zoning Code would ensure that any building or parking lighting would not significantly impact adjacent uses. The Coachella Travel Centre will require lighting, both exterior and interior; the greatest source of lighting within the project site would be the Hotel. This will introduce a new source of light and glare into the project area. To ensure that light or glare (particularly off of structures with glass exteriors) does not result in intrusive lighting or glare to existing structures or persons in the project area, the following mitigation measure will be implemented:

AES-2 ***Prior to approval of the Final Design, an analysis of potential glare from sunlight or exterior lighting to impact vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. This analysis shall demonstrate that due to building orientation or exterior treatment, no significant glare may be caused that could negatively impact drivers on the local roadways or impact adjacent land uses. If potential glare impacts are identified, the building orientation, use of non-glare reflective materials or other design solutions acceptable to the City of Coachella shall be implemented to eliminate glare impacts.***

With the implementation of mitigation measure **AES-2**, the proposed Coachella Travel Centre Project would have a less than significant potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located within a site that is designated by the California Department of Conservation's California Important Farmland Finder as Farmland of Local Importance (Figure II-1). The City of Coachella recently updated the City's General Plan, and the project site is designated for Entertainment Commercial use; however, the zoning has not been updated to reflect this change as it is the current zoning designation is Agricultural Reserve. The City's Municipal Code defines Agricultural Reserve Zoning as follows:

17.10.010 - Intent and purpose.
This zone is intended to preserve certain designated prime agricultural lands within the city and protect those lands, which are deemed to be agricultural preserves, from the intrusion of urban development incompatible with agricultural land uses. This zone designation is reserved for only those lands which are subject to recorded Williamson Act contracts pursuant to Government Code, Section 51200 et seq.

Based on a review of the Riverside County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 Map (Figure II-2), the project site is not designated as Williamson Act land, which would indicate that the proposed project site is not appropriately zoned at present.

The project site is located within the General Plan's Designated Subarea 9 – Central Coachella Neighborhoods. The General Plan notes the following about Subarea 9 that are applicable to the proposed project:

2. *Require a variety of neighborhood types throughout the central Coachella Neighborhoods Subarea*
9. *Allow higher intensity, non-residential uses in the western portion of the subarea in order to complements and support the Downtown and nearby employment centers.*
11. *Pursue an auto mall or auto dealers adjacent to SR86S.*

The question posed as part of the CEQA process refers to the conversion of 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. While the proposed project would convert a site that is designated Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use, the site does not contain any agricultural lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Furthermore, the project site is currently vacant and does not contain any agricultural activities at present.

The City of Coachella General Plan has several policies related to the preservation of Agricultural Land. The following policies depict the importance of agricultural land to the City's character:

Preserve the natural beauty and scenic quality of the City. The City is located in an area of striking natural beauty. While the landscape will be altered with future development, the views of the mountains and the rural, agricultural character should be respected. In general, the natural topography of the hills should be maintained, some of the existing agricultural uses should be preserved or integrated into the landscape and views of the surrounding mountains should be maintained.

4.1 Agricultural land preservation. Provide for the protection and preservation of agricultural land as a major industry for Coachella and sufficient to maintain the rural character of the City. Explore and allow a variety of methods of preserving land in sizes that are viable economic units for continuing agricultural activities including:

- *Density transfers to allow a greater portion of proposed development on other in order to allow productive sites to remain in agricultural production.*
- *Use of the Williamson Act.*
- *Implementation of a "right-to-farm" ordinance.*
- *Adopting a farmland protection program.*

4.2 Agricultural land conversion. Actively discourage the urbanization of agricultural land when other land not in agricultural use within the city limits is available for development.

4.3 Agricultural elements in urban landscape. Where feasible, incorporate existing agricultural elements, such as date farms, vineyards and citrus trees into the urban landscape as part of

development projects. This preservation will enable the agricultural history of the City to remain visible and provide unique urban landscape features that can distinguish Coachella from other cities in the Coachella Valley.

Goal 5. Agricultural Preservation. Viable, productive local agricultural lands and industry.

5.1 Prime agricultural land. Prioritize the conservation of state-designated Important Farmlands and discourage the conversion of these lands to urbanized uses until such time as the land is needed for additional growth.

5.3 Agriculture preservation. Continue to work with landowners in maintaining and extending existing Williamson Act contracts.

5.12 Market transformation. If the agri-business industry declines in Coachella, support efforts that facilitate the transition of uses, businesses and employees from agriculture to other sectors of the local economy.

Most important to note is that the City of Coachella has designated the project as Entertainment Commercial, which means that the City intends for the project site to be developed for a use that would suit this land use designation. The City's Land Use Designations provide the City's desired character for a property; the City uses the General Plan Land Use Map as a basis from which to plan future development and determine the mix of uses the City intends to support in the future. The zoning code provides developers, landowners, and builders with a set of specific rules for what is and it not acceptable to be developed on a property. This is accomplished with minimum lot sizes, height requirements, light restrictions, etc. Ultimately, the City's zoning codes exist to execute the objective of the City's land use designations; as such, given that this project requires a zone change, but does not require a change in land use designation, the goal of the developer appears to align with the City's goals for land use planning at this location. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – As stated under issue II(a) above and shown on Figure II-2, the proposed project is not located within a site that is under a Williamson Act contract. There are many lands under Williamson Act contract within the City of Coachella, as is evidenced above by the extensive General Plan policies concerning the importance of agriculture to the City. As discussed under item II(a) above, the proposed project is zoned for agricultural use (Agricultural Reserve), though this zoning classification is not compatible with the underlying land use of the project site (Entertainment Commercial). Furthermore, the zoning classification of the project site conflicts with the definition of the Agricultural Reserve use, as this classification is reserved for lands that are under Williamson Act contract, and the proposed project site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Though the proposed project is zoned for agricultural use and is designated by the Department of Conservation and the City as Farmland of Local Importance, the underlying land use of the project site (Entertainment Commercial) suggests that the City does not intend for this site to be used for agricultural use. Additionally, the City supports the developer's application for the proposed zone change. Furthermore, the defining characteristics of the underlying zoning classification are not consistent with the site as it currently exists because the project site is not under a Williamson Act Contract, and therefore does not conform to the intent and purpose of the Agricultural Reserve zoning classification. Therefore, based on the data presented above, the proposed project has a less than significant potential to conflict with the existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. No mitigation is required.

c. *No Impact* – The project site is not located within forest land, timberland or timberland zoned for Timberland Production. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production

(as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)). No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

d. *No Impact* – The project site is not located within forest land and has no trees on the property; therefore, the project will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest production use. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

e. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Please refer to the discussions under issues II(a) and II(b) above. Though the proposed project would involve a zone change from Agricultural Reserve to Commercial Entertainment on a site with an Entertainment Commercial land use designation. According to the General Plan, the project site is located within the Subarea 9 – Central Coachella Neighborhoods, which generally states that higher intensity, non-residential uses are allowed in the western portion of this Subarea—where the proposed project is located—to support the Downtown and nearby employment centers. Additionally, the City's General Plan indicates that complimentary uses—such as automobile uses (gas stations, truck stops, etc.)—should be developed along Highway 86 to support persons travelling through the City and the proposed project intends to provide amenities that would support this goal. The uses in the immediate vicinity surrounding the proposed project do not currently support agricultural activities. Ultimately, the development of this site as the Coachella Travel Centre would not involve other changes that would result in off-site agricultural land to convert to a non-agricultural use. Furthermore, there is no forest land in the City of Coachella that would be impacted by the development of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
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:

The following information utilized in this section was obtained from the technical study "Air Quality and GHG Impact Analysis Coachella Travel Centre Project, Coachella, California" prepared by Giroux & Associates dated March 16, 2019, and provided as Appendix 1 to this document.

Background

The proposed project site is located in the Coachella Valley Planning Area (CVPA) of the Salton Sea Air Basin (SSAB). The SSAB was part of the Southeast Desert Air Basin (SEDAB) until May, 1996 when the SSAB was created. The project site is in the hottest and driest parts of California. The climate is characterized by hot, dry summers and relatively mild winters. Rainfall is scant in all seasons, so differences between the seasons are characterized principally by differences in temperature. Average annual precipitation in the air basin ranges from 2 to 6 inches per year.

Seasonal temperature differences in the basin are large, confirming the absence of marine influences due to the blocking action of the mountains to the west. Average monthly maximum temperatures in the project vicinity range from 108ºF in July to 57ºF in January. The average monthly minima range from about 40ºF in January to about 80ºF in July.

During much of the year, California is covered by a moderately intense high-pressure system. In winter, the Pacific High retreats to the south, so that frontal systems from the North Pacific can move onto the California coast. On average, 20 to 30 frontal systems pass through California each winter. The first front usually arrives around the middle of October, and the average period of frontal activity is five to six months. Most of these systems are relatively weak by the time they reach the SSAB, however, and they become more diffuse as they move southeastward.

During all seasons, the prevailing wind direction is predominantly from the west to east. Banning Pass is an area where air is squeezed through a narrow opening with accelerated airflow that supports wind farms. The strong winds also occasionally lead to blowing sand that sandblasts painted surfaces and makes driving unsafe. As the west to east winds fan out into the Coachella Valley, they slow down quickly. By the time the onshore flow reaches the project site, it has again returned to its normal speed.

Air Quality Standards

In order to gauge the significance of the air quality impacts of the proposed project, those impacts, together with existing background air quality levels, must be compared to the applicable ambient air quality standards. These standards are the levels of air quality considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health and welfare. They are designed to protect those people most susceptible to further respiratory distress such as asthmatics, the elderly, very young children, people already weakened by other disease or illness, and persons engaged in strenuous work or exercise, called "sensitive receptors."

Because the State of California had established AAQS several years before the federal action and because of unique air quality problems introduced by the restrictive dispersion meteorology, there is considerable difference between state and national clean air standards. Those standards currently in effect in California are shown in Table III-1. Sources and health effects of various pollutants are shown in Table III-2.

The determination of whether a region's air quality is healthful or unhealthful is determined by comparing contaminant levels in ambient air samples to the state and federal standards presented in Table III-1. The air quality in a region is considered to be in attainment by the state if the measured ambient air pollutant levels for O3, CO (except 8-hour Lake Tahoe), SO2, NO2, PM10, PM2.5, and visible reducing particles are not to be exceeded at any time in any consecutive three-year period; all other values are not to be equaled or exceeded. The air quality in a region is considered to be in attainment by federal standards if the measured ambient air pollutant levels for O3, PM10, PM2.5, and those based on annual averages or arithmetic mean are not exceeded more than once per year. The O3 standard is attained when the fourth highest eight-hour concentration in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM10, the 24-hour standard is attained when the expected number of says per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 µg/m3 is equal to or less than one. For PM2.5, the 24-hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over three years, are equal to or less than the standard.

Baseline Air Quality

In the CVPA portion of the SSAB, air quality planning, enforcement and monitoring responsibilities are carried out by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Existing and probable future levels of air quality around the project area can be best inferred from ambient air quality measurements conducted by the SCAQMD at the Indio and Palm Springs air quality monitoring stations. In Indio, ozone and 10 microns or less in diameter, (respirable) particulates called PM-10, are monitored. These two pollutants are the main air pollution problems in the CVPA portion of the SSAB. Vehicular pollution levels such as carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) are monitored at Palm Springs. Levels of CO and NO_2 at the project site are likely lower than those monitored in Palm Springs. However, because CO and NO_2 levels in Palm Springs are well within acceptable limits, their use to characterize the project site introduces no complications.

Table III-1
AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

Pollutant	Average Time	California Standards [1]		National Standards [2]		
		Concentration [3]	Method [4]	Primary [3,5]	Secondary [3,6]	Method [7]
Ozone (O3)[8]	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Photometry	–	Same as Primary Standard	Ultraviolet Photometry
	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m^3)		0.070 ppm (137 µg/m^3)		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM10)[9]	24 Hour	50 µg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 µg/m^3	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m^3		–		
Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5)[9]	24 Hour	–	–	35 µg/m^3	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	12.0 µg/m^3	15.0 µg/m^3	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m^3)	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)	35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)	–	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)
	8 Hour	9 ppm (10 mg/m^3)		9 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	–	
	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m^3)		–	–	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2)[10]	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m^3)	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence	100 ppb (188 µg/m^3)	–	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m^3)		0.053 ppm (100 µg/m^3)	Same as Primary Standard	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO2)[11]	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	75 ppb (196 µg/m^3)	–	Ultraviolet Flourescense; Spectrophotometry (Paraosaniline Method)
	3 Hour	–		–	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m^3)	
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m^3)		0.14 ppm (for certain areas)[11]	–	
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	–		0.030 ppm (for certain areas)[11]	–	
Lead 8[12,13]	30-Day Average	1.5 µg/m^3	Atomic Absorption	–	–	–
	Calendar Quarter	–		1.5 µg/m^3 (for certain areas)[12]	Same as Primary Standard	High Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption
	Rolling 3-Month Avg	–		0.15 µg/m^3		
Visibility Reducing Particles[14]	8 Hour	See footnote 14	Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape	**No Federal Standards**		
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m^3	Ion Chromatography			
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence			
Vinyl Chloride[12]	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m^3)	Gas Chromatography			

Footnotes

1. California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (except 8-hour Lake Tahoe), sulfur dioxide (1 and 24 hour), nitrogen dioxide, and particulate matter (PM10, PM2.5, and visibility reducing particles), are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in Section 70200 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations.

2. National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest 8-hour concentration measured at each site in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM10, the 24 hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 $\mu g/m^3$ is equal to or less than one. For PM2.5, the 24 hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over three years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact the U.S. EPA for further clarification and current national policies.

3. Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.

4. Any equivalent measurement method which can be shown to the satisfaction of the ARB to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used.

5. National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.

6. National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

7. Reference method as described by the U.S. EPA. An "equivalent method" of measurement may be used but must have a "consistent relationship to the reference method" and must be approved by the U.S. EPA.

8. On October 1, 2015, the national 8-hour ozone primary and secondary standards were lowered from 0.075 to 0.070 ppm.

9. On December 14, 2012, the national annual PM2.5 primary standard was lowered from 15 $\mu g/m^3$ to 12.0 $\mu g/m^3$. The existing national 24-hour PM2.5 standards (primary and secondary) were retained at 35 $\mu g/m^3$, as was the annual secondary standard of 15 $\mu g/m^3$. The existing 24-hour PM10 standards (primary and secondary) of 150 $\mu g/m^3$ also were retained. The form of the annual primary and secondary standards is the annual mean, averaged over 3 years.

10. To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 98th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 100 ppb. Note that the national 1-hour standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the national 1-hour standard to the California standards the units can be converted from ppb to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 100 ppb is identical to 0.100 ppm.

11. On June 2, 2010, a new 1-hour SO_2 standard was established and the existing 24-hour and annual primary standards were revoked. To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 75 ppb. The 1971 SO_2 national standards (24-hour and annual) remain in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2010 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1971 standards, the 1971 standards remain in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2010 standards are approved.

    Note that the 1-hour national standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the 1-hour national standard to the California standard the units can be converted to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 75 ppb is identical to 0.075 ppm.

12. The ARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as 'toxic air contaminants' with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.

13. The national standard for lead was revised on October 15, 2008 to a rolling 3-month average. The 1978 lead standard (1.5 $\mu g/m^3$ as a quarterly average) remains in effect until one year after an area is designated for the 2008 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1978 standard, the 1978 standard remains in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2008 standard are approved.

14. In 1989, the ARB converted both the general statewide 10-mile visibility standard and the Lake Tahoe 30-mile visibility standard to instrumental equivalents, which are "extinction of 0.23 per kilometer" and "extinction of 0.07 per kilometer" for the statewide and Lake Tahoe Air Basin standards, respectively.

For more information please call ARB-PIO at (916) 322-2990 **California Air Resources Board (5/4/16)**

Table III-2
HEALTH EFFECTS OF MAJOR CRITERIA POLLUTANTS

Pollutants	Sources	Primary Effects
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	• Incomplete combustion of fuels and other carbon-containing substances, such as motor exhaust. • Natural events, such as decomposition of organic matter.	• Reduced tolerance for exercise. • Impairment of mental function. • Impairment of fetal development. • Death at high levels of exposure. • Aggravation of some heart diseases (angina).
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)	• Motor vehicle exhaust. • High temperature stationary combustion. • Atmospheric reactions.	• Aggravation of respiratory illness. • Reduced visibility. • Reduced plant growth. • Formation of acid rain.
Ozone (O_3)	• Atmospheric reaction of organic gases with nitrogen oxides in sunlight.	• Aggravation of respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. • Irritation of eyes. • Impairment of cardiopulmonary function. • Plant leaf injury.
Lead (Pb)	• Contaminated soil.	• Impairment of blood function and nerve construction. • Behavioral and hearing problems in children.
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM-10)	• Stationary combustion of solid fuels. • Construction activities. • Industrial processes. • Atmospheric chemical reactions.	• Reduced lung function. • Aggravation of the effects of gaseous pollutants. • Aggravation of respiratory and cardio respiratory diseases. • Increased cough and chest discomfort. • Soiling. • Reduced visibility.
Fine Particulate Matter (PM-2.5)	• Fuel combustion in motor vehicles, equipment, and industrial sources. • Residential and agricultural burning. • Industrial processes. • Also, formed from photochemical reactions of other pollutants, including NOx, sulfur oxides, and organics.	• Increases respiratory disease. • Lung damage. • Cancer and premature death. • Reduces visibility and results in surface soiling.
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)	• Combustion of sulfur-containing fossil fuels. • Smelting of sulfur-bearing metal ores. • Industrial processes.	• Aggravation of respiratory diseases (asthma, emphysema). • Reduced lung function. • Irritation of eyes. • Reduced visibility. • Plant injury. • Deterioration of metals, textiles, leather, finishes, coatings, etc.

Source: California Air Resources Board, 2002.

Baseline Air Quality (cont'd)

The last four years of published data from Indio and Palm Springs stations are summarized in Table III-3. The following conclusions can be drawn from this data:

1. Photochemical smog (ozone) levels periodically exceed standards. The 1-hour state standard was violated less than one percent of all days in the last four years near Indio. The 8-hour state ozone standard has been exceeded an average of eight percent of all days per year in the same time period. The Federal eight-hour ozone standard is violated on around four percent of all days per year. Ozone levels are much lower than 10 to 20 years ago. Attainment of all clean air standards in the project vicinity is not likely to occur soon, but the severity and frequency of violations is expected to continue to slowly decline during the current decade.

2. Carbon monoxide (CO) measurements near the project site have declined throughout the last decade, and 8-hour CO levels were at their lowest in 2017. Federal and state CO standards have not been exceeded in the last 10+ years. Despite continued basin-wide growth, maximum CO levels at the closest air monitoring station are less than 25 percent of their most stringent standards because of continued vehicular improvements.

3. PM-10 levels as measured at Indio, have exceeded the state 24-hour standard on 15 percent of all measurement days in the last four years, but the national 24-hour particulate standard has not been exceeded during the same period. Particulate levels have frequently exceeded the more restrictive state standard.

4. A fraction of PM-10 is comprised of ultra-small diameter particulates capable of being inhaled into deep lung tissue (PM-2.5). There have no violations of the 24-hour federal PM-2.5 standard in recent years. With dustier conditions along the I-10 Corridor, there may be occasional violations of PM-2.5 standards at the project site.

Table III-3
AIR QUALITY MONITORING SUMMARY
(DAYS STANDARDS WERE EXCEEDED AND MAXIMUM OBSERVED CONCENTRATIONS 2014-2017)

Pollutant/Standard	2014	2015	2016	2017
Ozone[a]				
1-Hour > 0.09 ppm (S)	2	0	2	8
8-Hour > 0.07 ppm (S)	30	12	27	44
8- Hour > 0.075 ppm (F)	10	4	12	27
Max. 1-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.095	0.093	0.099	0.107
Max. 8-Hour Conc. (ppm)	0.091	0.085	0.089	0.093
Carbon Monoxide[b]				
1-hour > 20. ppm (S)	0	0	0	0
8- Hour > 9. ppm (S,F)	0	0	0	0
Max 8-hour Conc. (ppm)	0.9	0.7	1.5	0.5
Nitrogen Dioxide[b]				
1-Hour > 0.18 ppm (S)	0	0	0	0
Max 1-hour Conc. (ppm)	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04
Respirable Particulates (PM-10)[a]				
24-hour > 50 $\mu g/m^3$ (S)	64/359	36/270	56/313	43/363
24-hour > 150 $\mu g/m^3$ (F)	1/359*	0/270	0/313	0/363

Pollutant/Standard	2014	2015	2016	2017
Max. 24-Hr. Conc. ($\mu g/m^3$)	152*	145.	137.	128.
Ultra-Fine Particulates (PM-2.5)[a]				
24-Hour > 35 $\mu g/m^3$ (F)	0/112	0/94	0/115	0/110
Max. 24-Hr. Conc. ($\mu g/m^3$)	26.5	24.6	25.8	18.8

*high wind event, excluded form annual statistics (S) = state standard, (F) = federal standard
[a]Data from Indio monitoring station.
[b]Data from Palm Springs air monitoring station.
Source: SCAQMD Air Monitoring Summaries.

Air Quality Planning

The Federal Clean Air Act (1977 Amendments) required that designated agencies in any area of the nation not meeting national clean air standards must prepare a plan demonstrating the steps that would bring the area into compliance with all national standards. The SCAB could not meet the deadlines for ozone, nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, or PM-10. In the SCAB, the agencies designated by the governor to develop regional air quality plans are the SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). The two agencies first adopted an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in 1979 and revised it several times as earlier attainment forecasts were shown to be overly optimistic.

The Air Quality Management District (AQMD) adopted an updated clean air "blueprint" in August 2003. The 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) was approved by the EPA in 2004. The AQMP outlined the air pollution measures needed to meet federal health-based standards for ozone by 2010 and for particulates (PM-10) by 2006. The 2003 AQMP was based upon the federal one-hour ozone standard which was revoked late in 2005 and replaced by an 8-hour federal standard. Because of the revocation of the hourly standard, a new air quality planning cycle was initiated.

With re-designation of the air basin as non-attainment for the 8-hour ozone standard, a new attainment plan was developed. This plan shifted most of the one-hour ozone standard attainment strategies to the 8-hour standard. As previously noted, the attainment date was to "slip" from 2010 to 2021. The updated attainment plan also includes strategies for ultimately meeting the federal PM-2.5 standard.

Because projected attainment by 2021 required control technologies that did not exist yet, the SCAQMD requested a voluntary "bump-up" from a "severe non-attainment" area to an "extreme non-attainment" designation for ozone. The extreme designation was to allow a longer time period for these technologies to develop. If attainment cannot be demonstrated within the specified deadline without relying on "black-box" measures, EPA would have been required to impose sanctions on the region had the bump-up request not been approved. In April 2010, the EPA approved the change in the non-attainment designation from "severe-17" to "extreme." This reclassification set a later attainment deadline (2024), but also required the air basin to adopt even more stringent emissions controls.

Table III-4
SOUTH COAST AIR BASIN EMISSIONS FORECASTS (EMISSIONS IN TONS/DAY)

Pollutant	2015[a]	2020[b]	2025[b]	2030[b]
NOx	357	289	266	257
VOC	400	393	393	391
PM-10	161	165	170	172
PM-2.5	67	68	70	71

[a]2015 Base Year.
[b]With current emissions reduction programs and adopted growth forecasts.
Source: California Air Resources Board, 2013 Almanac of Air Quality

In other air quality attainment plan reviews, EPA had disapproved part of the SCAB PM-2.5 attainment plan included in the AQMP. EPA stated that the current attainment plan relied on PM-2.5 control regulations that had not yet been approved or implemented. It was expected that a number of rules that were pending approval would remove the identified deficiencies. If these issues were not resolved within the next several years, federal funding sanctions for transportation projects could result. The 2012 AQMP included in the current California State Implementation Plan (SIP) was expected to remedy identified PM-2.5 planning deficiencies.

The federal Clean Air Act requires that non-attainment air basins have EPA approved attainment plans in place. This requirement includes the federal one-hour ozone standard even though that standard was revoked almost ten years ago. There was no approved attainment plan for the one-hour federal standard at the time of revocation. Through a legal quirk, the SCAQMD is now required to develop an AQMP for the long since revoked one-hour federal ozone standard. Because the current SIP for the basin contains a number of control measures for the 8-hour ozone standard that are equally effective for one-hour levels, the 2012 AQMP was believed to satisfy hourly attainment planning requirements.

AQMPs are required to be updated every three years. The 2012 AQMP was adopted in early 2013. An updated AQMP was required for completion in 2016. The 2016 AQMP was adopted by the SCAQMD Board in March, 2017, and has been submitted the California Air Resources Board for forwarding to the EPA. The 2016 AQMP acknowledges that motor vehicle emissions have been effectively controlled and that reductions in NOx, the continuing ozone problem pollutant, may need to come from major stationary sources (power plants, refineries, landfill flares, etc.). The current attainment deadlines for all federal non-attainment pollutants are now as follows:

8-hour ozone (70 ppb)	2032
Annual PM-2.5 (12 $\mu g/m^3$)	2025
8-hour ozone (75 ppb)	2024 (old standard)
1-hour ozone (120 ppb)	2023 (rescinded standard)
24-hour PM-2.5 (35 $\mu g/m^3$)	2019

The key challenge is that NOx emission levels, as a critical ozone precursor pollutant, are forecast to continue to exceed the levels that would allow the above deadlines to be met. Unless additional stringent NOx control measures are adopted and implemented, ozone attainment goals may not be met.

The proposed project does not directly relate to the AQMP in that there are no specific air quality programs or regulations governing general development projects. Conformity with adopted plans, forecasts and programs relative to population, housing, employment and land use is the primary yardstick by which impact significance of planned growth is determined. The SCAQMD, however, while acknowledging that the AQMP is a growth-accommodating document, does not favor designating regional impacts as less-than-significant just because the proposed development is consistent with regional growth projections. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has therefore been analyzed on a project-specific basis.

Air Quality Impact

Standards of Significance

Air quality impacts are considered “significant” if they cause clean air standards to be violated where they are currently met, or if they “substantially” contribute to an existing violation of standards. Any substantial emissions of air contaminants for which there is no safe exposure, or nuisance emissions such as dust or odors, would also be considered a significant impact.

Primary Pollutants
Air quality impacts generally occur on two scales of motion. Near an individual source of emissions or a collection of sources such as a crowded intersection or parking lot, levels of those pollutants that are emitted in their already unhealthful form will be highest. Carbon monoxide (CO) is an example of such a pollutant. Primary pollutant impacts can generally be evaluated directly in comparison to appropriate clean air standards. Violations of these standards where they are currently met, or a measurable worsening of an existing or future violation, would be considered a significant impact. Many particulates, especially fugitive dust emissions, are also primary pollutants. Because of the non-attainment status of the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) for PM-10, an aggressive dust control program is required to control fugitive dust during project construction.

Secondary Pollutants
Many pollutants, however, require time to transform from a more benign form to a more unhealthful contaminant. Their impact occurs regionally far from the source. Their incremental regional impact is minute on an individual basis and cannot be quantified except through complex photochemical computer models. Analysis of significance of such emissions is based upon a specified amount of emissions (pounds, tons, etc.) even though there is no way to translate those emissions directly into a corresponding ambient air quality impact.

Because of the chemical complexity of primary versus secondary pollutants, the SCAQMD has designated significant emissions levels as surrogates for evaluating regional air quality impact significance independent of chemical transformation processes. Projects in the Coachella Valley portion of the SCAQMD with daily emissions that exceed any of the following emission thresholds are to be considered significant under CEQA guidelines.

Table III-5
DAILY EMISSIONS THRESHOLDS

Pollutant	Construction[1]	Operations[2]
ROG	75	75
NOx	100	100
CO	550	550
PM-10	150	150
PM-2.5	55	55
SOx	150	150
Lead	3	3

[1] Construction thresholds apply to both the SCAB and the Coachella Valley (Salton Sea and Mojave Desert Air Basins.
[2] For Coachella Valley the mass daily emissions thresholds for operation are the same as the construction daily emissions thresholds.
Source: SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November, 1993 Rev.

Additional Indicators
In its CEQA Handbook, the SCAQMD also states that additional indicators should be used as screening criteria to determine the need for further analysis with respect to air quality. The additional indicators are as follows:

- Project could interfere with the attainment of the federal or state ambient air quality standards by either violating or contributing to an existing or projected air quality violation;
- Project could result in population increases within the regional statistical area which would be in excess of that projected in the AQMP and in other than planned locations for the project's build-out year; and,
- Project could generate vehicle trips that cause a CO hot spot.

Impact Analysis

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Projects such as the proposed development of a Travel Centre do not directly relate to the AQMP in that there are no specific air quality programs or regulations governing general development. Conformity with adopted plans, forecasts and programs relative to population, housing, employment and land use are the primary yardsticks by which impact significance of planned growth is determined. Based on the analysis of the City's General Plan Land Use section, the proposed project is consistent with the adopted City General Plan. Thus, the proposed project is also consistent with regional planning forecasts maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) regional plans. The SCAQMD, however, while acknowledging that the AQMP is a growth-accommodating document, does not favor designating regional impacts as less than significant only because of consistency with regional growth projections. Air quality impact significance for the proposed project has therefore been analyzed on a project-specific basis. As the analysis of project-related emissions provided below indicates, the proposed project will not cause or be exposed to significant air pollution, and is, therefore, consistent with the applicable air quality plan.

b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Air pollution emissions associated with the proposed project would occur over both a short and long-term time period. Short-term emissions include fugitive dust from construction activities (i.e., site prep, grading, and exhaust emission) at the proposed Project site. Long-term emissions generated by future operation of the proposed project primarily include energy consumption. However, there is no direct nexus between consumption and the type of power source or the air basin where the source is located. Operational air pollution emissions from electrical generation are therefore not attributable on a project-specific basis. The construction and operational emissions were estimated and compared to the SCAQMD significance thresholds using the CalEEMod model.

Construction Emissions

The proposed site will be developed with 5 buildings; a convenience store as part of a 10-pump gas station, a drive thru restaurant, a sit-down restaurant, a 116 room hotel and carwash facility. Estimated construction emissions were modeled using CalEEMod2016.3.2 to identify maximum daily emissions for each pollutant during project construction. Construction was modeled using default construction equipment and schedule for a project of this size as shown in Table III-6.

Table III-6
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY EQUIPMENT FLEET

Phase Name and Duration	Equipment
Site Prep (10)	3 Dozers
	3 Loader/Backhoes
Grading (20 days)	1 Grader
	1 Excavator
	1 Dozer
	3 Loader/Backhoes
Construction (230 days)	1 Crane
	3 Loader/Backhoes
	1 Welder
	1 Generator Set
	3 Forklifts
Paving (20 days)	2 Pavers
	2 Paving Equipment
	2 Rollers

Utilizing this indicated equipment fleet and durations shown in Table III-6 the following worst case daily construction emissions are calculated by CalEEMod and are listed in Table III-7.

Table III-7
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY EMISSIONS
MAXIMUM DAILY EMISSIONS (POUNDS/DAY)

Maximum Construction Emissions	ROG	NOx	CO	SO_2	PM-10	PM-2.5
2019						
Unmitigated	4.4	45.6	22.7	0.0	20.6	12.2
Mitigated	4.4	45.6	22.7	0.0	9.6	6.1
2020						
Unmitigated	43.4	28.9	26.1	0.1	7.9	4.6
Mitigated	43.4	28.9	26.1	0.1	7.9	2.8
SCAQMD Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55

Peak daily construction activity emissions are estimated be below SCAQMD CEQA thresholds without the need for added mitigation. The only model-based mitigation measured applied for this project was watering exposed dirt surfaces three times per day to minimize the generation of fugitive dust generation during grading.

Construction equipment exhaust contains carcinogenic compounds within the diesel exhaust particulates. The toxicity of diesel exhaust is evaluated relative to a 24-hour per day, 365 days per year, 70-year lifetime exposure. The SCAQMD does not generally require the analysis of construction-related diesel emissions relative to health risk due to the short period for which the majority of diesel exhaust would occur. Health risk analyses are typically assessed over a 9-, 30-, or 70-year timeframe and not over a relatively brief construction period due to the lack of health risk associated with such a brief exposure

Construction activities are not anticipated to cause dust emissions to exceed SCAQMD CEQA thresholds. Nevertheless, emissions minimization through enhanced dust control measures is recommended for use because of the non-attainment status of the air and proximity of residential uses. Recommended measures include:

AQ-1 ***<u>Fugitive Dust Control</u>. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:***

- ***Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas;***
- ***Water exposed surfaces as needed to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (typically 2-3 times/day);***
- ***Cover all stock piles with tarps at the end of each day or as needed;***
- ***Provide water spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials;***
- ***Minimize in-out traffic from construction zone;***
- ***Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard; and***
- ***Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.***

Similarly, ozone precursor emissions (ROG and NOx) are calculated to be below SCAQMD CEQA thresholds during construction. However, because of the non-attainment for photochemical smog,

the use of reasonably available control measures for diesel exhaust is recommended. The following mitigation measures shall be implemented:

AQ-2 Exhaust Emissions Control

- ***Utilize well-tuned off-road construction equipment.***
- ***Establish a preference for contractors using Tier 3-rated or better heavy equipment.***
- ***Enforce 5-minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.***

Localized Significance Thresholds

The SCAQMD has developed analysis parameters to evaluate ambient air quality on a local level in addition to the more regional emissions-based thresholds of significance. These analysis elements are called Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs). LSTs were developed in response to Governing Board's Environmental Justice Enhancement Initiative 1-4 and the LST methodology was provisionally adopted in October 2003 and formally approved by SCAQMD's Mobile Source Committee in February 2005.

Use of an LST analysis for a project is optional. For the proposed project, the primary source of possible LST impact would be during construction. LSTs are applicable for a sensitive receptor where it is possible that an individual could remain for 24 hours such as a residence, hospital or convalescent facility.

LSTs are only applicable to the following criteria pollutants: oxides of nitrogen (NOx), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter (PM-10 and PM-2.5). LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that are not expected to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area and distance to the nearest sensitive receptor.

LST screening tables are available for 25, 50, 100, 200 and 500 meter source-receptor distances. For this project, since there is a single residential use just south of the site the most conservative 25-meter distance was modeled. However, only paving activities will be adjacent to this receptor. The closest structure is more than 400 feet from this residence. The receptors closest to the primary construction area have more than a 600-foot setback from the site.

The SCAQMD has issued guidance on applying CalEEMod to LSTs. LST pollutant screening level concentration data is currently published for 1, 2 and 5 acre sites for varying distances. For this project, because of size, the screening thresholds for 5 acres were used.

The following thresholds and emissions in Table III-8 are therefore determined (pounds per day):

Table III-8
LST AND PROJECT EMISSIONS (POUNDS/DAY)

LST Coachella Valley	CO	NOx	PM-10	PM-2.5
LST Threshold	2292	304	14	8
Max On-Site Emissions				
Unmitigated	27	46	21	12
Mitigated	27	46	8	5

CalEEMod Output in Appendix

LSTs were compared to the maximum daily construction activities. As seen in Table III-8, with active dust suppression, mitigated emissions meet the LST for construction thresholds. LST impacts are less-than-significant.

Therefore, the following construction mitigation measure is necessary to ensure LST thresholds are maintained below significance thresholds:

AQ-3 Exposed surfaces shall be watered at least three times per day during grading activities.

Operational Emissions

The project would be expected to generate approximately 1,800 daily trips using trip generation numbers provided by the applicant which includes internal trip capture. Operational emissions were calculated using CalEEMod2016.3.2 for an assumed full occupancy year of 2020. The operational impacts are shown in Table III-9. As shown, operational emissions will not exceed applicable SCAQMD operational emissions CEQA thresholds of significance.

Table III-9
PROPOSED USES DAILY OPERATIONAL IMPACTS (2020)

Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO_2	PM-10	PM-2.5
Area	0.9	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Energy	0.1	0.8	0.7	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mobile	2.8	17.0	14.0	0.0	2.1	0.6
Total	**3.8**	**17.8**	**14.8**	**0.1**	**2.2**	**0.7**
SCAQMD Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: CalEEMod Output in Appendix

As shown in the table above, operational emissions will not exceed applicable SCAQMD operational emissions CEQA thresholds of significance. Operational impacts are considered less than significant.

c&d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The evaluation presented under issue III(b) above addresses cumulative impacts of project emissions and the findings remain the same as outlined in the preceding text. Additionally, as discussed above, implementation of the proposed project will not result in substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore will not expose sensitive receptors in the area to such impacts. As shown above, Localized Significance Thresholds were calculated for the proposed project and were below thresholds. Therefore, with the implementation of the above mitigation measures, impacts under these issues are considered less than significant.

e. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Substantial odor-generating sources include land uses such as agricultural activities, feedlots, wastewater treatment facilities, landfills or various heavy industrial uses. The Project does not propose any such uses or activities that would result in potentially significant operational source odor impacts. The proposed project includes a Travel Centre with a hotel, truck stop, gas station, car wash, fast food restaurant, and sit down restaurant. For this project, since there is a single residential use just south of the site the most conservative 25-meter distance was modeled. However, only paving activities will be adjacent to this receptor. The closest structure is more than 400 feet from this residence. The receptors closest to the primary construction area have more than a 600-foot setback from the site. As such, though there are sensitive receptors located near the proposed project, the proposed project use is not of the type

that would result in odor impacts to sensitive receptors during either construction or operation. Therefore, impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
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 Wildlife 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 Wildlife or U.S. 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: The following information is provided based on a study titled "Biological Resources Assessment & Jurisdictional Delineation, Coachella Travel Centre, APN 763-020-01, Avenue 50 And Highway 86 -Coachella, CA" prepared by Jericho Systems, Inc. dated February 14, 2019 and provided as Appendix 2. The following information is abstracted from that appendix.

General Site Conditions

The subject parcel is located in an area with an average annual precipitation of 3.69 inches. Hydrologically, the Coachella Valley area is located within the Indio Hydrologic Sub-Area (HSA 719.47) which comprises a 540057-acre drainage area within the larger Whitewater River Watershed (HUC 181002010705). The Whitewater River is the major hydrogeomorphic feature within this watershed.

The general project vicinity consists primarily of undeveloped open space, existing paved and unpaved roads, and transportation corridor to the south (SR-86). Additionally, there is a private residence adjacent the southernmost boundary of the project site. Habitat on site and within the area surrounding the project

site is best described as Four-wing saltbush scrub (*Atriplex canescens*) Shrubland Alliance (Holland: Desert saltbush bush scrub).

The site is relatively flat, and the on-site soils consist of Indio, very fine sandy loam.

Habitat within the project site consists primarily of highly disturbed Four-wing saltbush scrub (*Atriplex canescens*) Shrubland Alliance (Holland: Desert saltbush bush scrub). The site has recently been bulldozed into multiple linear brush piles. Total living vegetation cover is currently approximately 15%. Native plant species identified within the project area include four wing saltbush (*Atriplex canescens*), big saltbush (*Atriplex lentiformis*), honey mesquite (*Prosopis glandulosa*), Scalebroom (*Lepidospartum squamatum*), hairy-leaved sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*), and arrow weed (*Pluchea sericea*). Non-native, invasive plant species identified within the project area include foxtail brome (*Bromus madritensis*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), London rocket (*Sisymbrium irio*), and common Mediterranean grass (*Schismus barbatus*).

No amphibian species were observed or otherwise detected within the project area and none are expected to occur. The only reptile observed within the project area was the western side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana elegans*). Avian species observed in the project area include verdin (*Auriparus flaviceps*), white-crowned sparrow (*Zonotrichia leucophrys*), Gambel's quail (*Callipepla gambelii*), greater roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*), and Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*). No mammal species were observed during site visit; however, common species expected to occur within the project area include coyote (*Canis latrans*), Merriams' kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys merriami*), black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus* californicus), and desert cottontail (*Sylvilagus audubonii*).

No State- and/or federally-listed threatened or endangered species, or other sensitive species were observed on site during the reconnaissance-level field survey. However, there is some habitat within the proposed project footprint, as well as the project vicinity, that may be suitable for several sensitive species including Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard (CVFTL) and burrowing owl (BUOW). The findings of the Biological Resources Assessment indicate that the site is not suitable to support CVFTL and/or BUOW and no further survey is warranted or recommended. Habitat suitable for nesting birds does exist within the project site and adjacent areas, and as such mitigation is recommended to prevent impacts to nesting birds.

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the Project does not have a potential for a significant adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on 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 Wildlife (CDFW) (*formerly Department of Fish and Game)* or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). As discussed above, the proposed project does not have habitat suitable for either the CVFTL or BUOW within the project site. As such, given that no State- and/or federally-listed threatened or endangered species, or other sensitive species are anticipated to occur within the project site, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. No mitigation is required.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. The project site itself consists of highly disturbed sandy ground, with scattered vegetation. The site has recently been bulldozed into multiple linear brush piles. Habitat on site and within the area surrounding the project site is best described as Four-wing saltbush scrub (*Atriplex canescens*) Shrubland Alliance. The general project vicinity consists primarily of undeveloped open space, existing paved and unpaved roads, and transportation corridor to the south (SR-86). Based on the field survey conducted by Jericho Systems and the information contained in Appendix 2, no significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive communities are anticipated to occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.

c. *No Impact* – According to the data gathered by Jericho Systems in Appendix 2, no jurisdictional features subject to the CWA or FGC under the jurisdictions of the USACE, RWQCB, or CDFW exist within the project area. The project site is located entirely outside of any jurisdictional areas and no permanent or temporary impacts to jurisdictional features will result from the project. Therefore, no permits or authorizations from the USACE, RWQCB, or CDFW will be required. As such, given that no federally protected wetlands occur within the project footprint, implementation of the proposed project will have no potential to impact any 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. No mitigation is required.

d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Based on the field survey of the project site, the Project will not substantially interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory species or with established native or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native nursery sites. However, the State does protect all migratory and nesting native birds. Habitat suitable for nesting birds does exist within the project site and adjacent areas. As discussed, most birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). To prevent interfering with native bird nesting, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented.

BIO-1 ***The State of California prohibits the "take" of active bird nests. To avoid an illegal take of active bird nests, any grubbing, brushing or tree removal should be conducted outside of the the State identified nesting season (Raptor nesting season is February 15 through July 31; and migratory bird nesting season is March 15 through September 1). Alternatively, the site shall be evaluated by a qualified biologist prior to the initiation of ground disturbace to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds. Active bird nests MUST be avoided during the nesting season. If an active nest is located in the project construction area it will be flagged and a 300-foot avoidance buffer placed around it. No activity shall occur within the 300-foot buffer until the young have fledged the nest.***

Thus, with implementation of the above measure, any effects on wildlife movement or the use of wildlife nursery sites can be reduced to a less than significant impact.

e. *No Impact* – Based on the field survey, the Project footprint does not contain any biological resources, such as trees, that might be protected by local policies or ordinances. Past grading maintenance activities and human disturbance of the site have eliminated any trees or other biological resources that might be protected. With no potential for conflicts with local policies or ordinances, no mitigation is required.

f. *No Impact* – Please refer to the discussion under response IV(a) above. The proposed project is not located within the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP). Therefore, the Project does not have any potential to conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No mitigation is necessary.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION: A cultural resources report has been prepared to evaluate the potential for cultural resources to occur within the project area of potential effect entitled "Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Coachella Travel Centre Project, Assessor's Parcel Number 763-020-021, City of Coachella, Riverside County, California," dated March 15, 2019, prepared by CRM TECH (Appendix 3). The following summary information has been abstracted from this report. It provides an overview and findings regarding the cultural resources found within the project area.

Background

As a part of the environmental review process for the undertaking, a Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report was prepared to in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The purpose of the study is to provide the City with the necessary information and analysis to determine whether the proposed project would cause substantial adverse changes to any "historical resources," as defined by CEQA, that may exist in or around the project area.

In order to identify such resources, CRM TECH conducted a historical/archaeological resources records search, pursued historical background research, contacted Native American representatives, and carried out an intensive-level field survey of the entire project area. The results of these research procedures indicate that three historic-period sites, 33-028167 (Devers-Coachella Valley 220 kV Transmission Line), 33-028173 (Avenue 50), and 33- 028175 (domestic refuse scatter), were previously recorded as lying within or partially within the project area. The presence of these sites was confirmed during the field survey, but none of them appears to meet the definition of a "historical resource" under CEQA provisions. No other potential "historical resources" were encountered within the project area.

Based on these findings, CRM TECH recommends to the City of Coachella a conclusion of No Impact on cultural resources, pending the completion of Native American consultation process by the City of Coachella pursuant to Assembly Bill 52. No further cultural resources investigation is recommended for the proposed project unless development plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study. However, if buried cultural materials are encountered inadvertently during any earth-moving operations associated with the project, all work within 50 feet of the discovery should be halted or diverted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of the finds. Human remains discovered during the project will need to be treated in accordance with the provisions of HSC §7050.5 and PRC §5097.98.

a&b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – CEQA establishes that "a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment" (PRC §21084.1). "Substantial adverse change,"

according to PRC §5020.1(q), "means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration such that the significance of a historical resource would be impaired."

Per the above discussion and definition, no archaeological sites or isolates were recorded within the Project boundaries; thus, none of them requires further consideration during this study. In light of this information and pursuant to PRC §21084.1, the following conclusions have been reached for the Project:

- No historical resources within or adjacent to the Project area have any potential to be disturbed as they are not within the proposed area in which the facilities will be constructed and developed, and thus, the Project as it is currently proposed will not cause a substantial adverse change to any known historical resources.
- No further cultural resources investigation is necessary for the proposed project unless construction plans undergo such changes as to include areas not covered by this study.

However, if buried cultural materials are discovered during any earth-moving operations associated with the Project, the following mitigation measure shall be implemented:

CUL-1 Should any cultural resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an onsite inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the City's onsite inspector. The archaeological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.

With the above mitigation incorporation, as well as the mitigation identified under Tribal Cultural Resources below, the potential for impacts to cultural resources will be reduced to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The potential for discovering paleontological resources during development of the Project is considered not likely based on the data gathered within the Cultural Resources Report provided as Appendix 3. No unique geologic features are known or suspected to occur on or beneath the sites. However, because these resources are located beneath the surface and can only be discovered as a result of ground disturbance activities, the following measure shall be implemented:

CUL-2 Should any paleontological resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an onsite inspection should be performed immediately by a qualified paleontologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the City's onsite inspector. The paleontological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.

With incorporation of this contingency mitigation, the potential for impact to paleontological resources will be reduces to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.

d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – As noted in the discussion above, no available information suggests that human remains may occur within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and the potential for such an occurrence is considered very low. Human remains discovered during the project will need to be treated in accordance with the provisions of HSC §7050.5 and PRC §5097.98, which is mandatory. State law (Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code) as well as local laws requires

that the Police Department, County Sheriff and Coroner's Office receive notification if human remains are encountered. Compliance with these laws is considered adequate mitigation for potential impacts and no further mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
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:				
$ 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.	☐	☐	☒	☐
$ Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
$ Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☐
$ 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 onsite or offsite land-slide, 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 wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information is provided based on a study titled "Feasibility Study Preliminary Report of Soils and Foundation Evaluations, Proposed Commercial Development Planned Gas Station/Retail, Restaurant, Car Wash, and Hotel, SWC Avenue 50 & State Route 86, APN 763-0020-021-7" prepared by Soils Southwest, Inc. dated February 28, 2019 and provided as Appendix 4. The following information is abstracted that appendix.

a. i. Ground Rupture

Less Than Significant Impact – The Project site is located in the City of Coachella, which is located in an area with several active faults, including the San Andreas fault zone to the north and east, the Mecca Hills fault zone to the southeast, and the Indio Hills fault zone to the north as shown on the City of Coachella General Plan Faults and Historical (1800-2011) Seismicity Map (Figure VI-1). The

California Geologic Survey Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Indio Quadrangle map depicts the Alquist-Priolo fault zones in the City of Coachella area (Figure VI-2). According to Figure VI-2, the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo fault zone, but is located approximately 2 miles southwest from the nearest Alquist-Priolo fault zone. Based on the project site's distance from the nearest fault zone, the risk for ground rupture at the site location is low; therefore, it is not likely that future employees or visitors of the Coachella Travel Centre will be subject to seismic hazards from rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant; no mitigation is required.

ii. Strong Seismic Ground Shaking

Less Than Significant Impact – As stated in the discussion above, several faults run through the City, and as with much of southern California, the proposed structures will be subject to strong seismic ground shaking impacts should any major earthquakes occur in the future, particularly due to the site's proximity to the San Andreas Fault Zone, which is classified as an Alquist-Priolo fault zone. Additionally, several active Fault Zones as defined by the City of Coachella, shown in Figure VI-1, travel through the City and surrounding area. As a result, and like all other development projects in the City and throughout the Southern California Region, the proposed project will be required to comply with all applicable seismic design standards contained in the 2016 California Building Code (CBC), including Section 1613 Earthquake Loads. Compliance with the CBC will ensure that structural integrity will be maintained in the event of an earthquake. Therefore, impacts associated with strong ground shaking will be less than significant without mitigation.

iii. Seismic-Related Ground Failure Including Liquefaction

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated – According to the City of Coachella General Plan Update 2035 EIR Liquefaction Risk map (Figure VI-3), the project is located within an area of high liquefaction susceptibility. According to Appendix 4, the Geotechnical Study, the proposed project has a moderate susceptibility for liquefaction. The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to ensure that the structures are designed to minimize impacts from occurring as a result of seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction:

GEO-1 Based upon the geotechnical investigation (Appendix 4), all of the recommended design and construction measures identified in Appendix 4 (listed on Pages 12-25) as well as the Seismic Design Parameters (Pages 10-11) shall be implemented by the Applicant into the project design. Implementation of these specific measures will address all of the identified geotechnical constraints identified at project site.

Thus, with the above mitigation measure, the Project will not have a significant potential to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction. No further mitigation is required.

iv. Landslides

No Impact – According to the City of Coachella General Plan Update 2035 EIR Landslide Risk map (Figure VI-4), the proposed project site is not located in an area with any known earthquake induced landslide hazards. Based on a site reconnaissance the project site is essentially flat. Therefore, the Project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. No impacts under this issue are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Due to the existing graded/bladed and disturbed nature of the project site, and the type of project being proposed, a potential for soil erosion, loss of topsoil, and/or placing structures on unstable soils is generally considered less than

significant. The project site is vacant with minimal non-native vegetation coverage. City grading standards, best management practices and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) are required to control the potential significant erosion hazards. The topography is generally flat with less than a 5-foot elevation change from the highest point (to the south) and the lowest point (to the north) on the site. The project is anticipated to require minimal cut and fill with any cut being reused to balance of the site through grading. During project construction when soils are exposed, temporary soil erosion could occur, which could be exacerbated by rainfall. Project grading would be managed through the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, and will be required to implement best management practices to achieve concurrent water quality controls after construction is completed and the Coachella Travel Centre is in operation. The following mitigation measures or equivalent BMPs shall be implemented to address these issues:

GEO-2 Stored backfill material shall be covered with water resistant material during periods of heavy precipitation to reduce the potential for rainfall erosion of stored backfill material. If covering is not feasible, then measures such as the use of straw bales or sand bags shall be used to capture and hold eroded material on the Project site for future cleanup.

GEO-3 All exposed, disturbed soil (trenches, stored backfill, etc.) shall be sprayed with water or soil binders twice a day, or more frequently if fugitive dust is observed migrating from the site within which the Coachella Travel Centre is being constructed.

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, implementation of the SWPPP and associated BMPs, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – According to the City of Coachella General Plan Update 2035 EIR Liquefaction Risk map (Figure VI-3), the project is located within an area of high liquefaction susceptibility, though the Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix 4), determined that the liquefaction susceptibility is moderate and can be minimizes though the implementation of mitigation measure **GEO-1** above (implementation of recommended seismic and design measure from the Geotechnical Investigation, Appendix 4). The potential for shrinkage or subsidence at the site was determined to be very low by the data compiled in the Geotechnical Investigation. Though subsidence can occur throughout the City of Coachella, the proposed project site has been previously rough graded, which minimizes the potential for subsidence to occur at the project site. Therefore, based on the discussions under issue VI(c&d) above and the data provided in the Geotechnical Investigation, with implementation of the above mitigation measure, there is a less than significant potential for the proposed project to 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 onsite or offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The site is currently vacant and the surface of the site has been rough graded in the past due to agricultural use. The site contains non-native vegetation throughout the project site. The Geotechnical Investigation tested expansion potential in accordance with U.B.C Standard 18-2. In general soils sampled during the field investigation exhibited very low expansion potential. Given that the Project does not contain expansive soils, it is not anticipated that the project would have a significant impact that would create a substantial risk to life or property by being located on expansive soils. Impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

e. *No Impact* - This project will be connected to the regional wastewater collection system and it will not utilize any subsurface septic tank-leach system. Therefore, no impact to underlying soil from wastewater disposal can occur and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION: The following information utilized in this section was obtained from the technical study "Air Quality and GHG Impact Analysis Coachella Travel Centre Project, Coachella, California" prepared by Giroux & Associates dated March 16, 2019, and provided as Appendix 1 to this document.

a&b. *Less Than Significant Impact* –

Global Climate Change (GCC) is defined as the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, precipitation, and storms. Many scientists believe that the climate shift taking place since the industrial revolution (1900) is occurring at a quicker rate and magnitude than in the past. Scientific evidence suggests that GCC is the result of increased concentrations of greenhouse gases in the earth's atmosphere, including carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and fluorinated gases. Many scientists believe that this increased rate of climate change is the result of greenhouse gases resulting from human activity and industrialization over the past 200 years.

An individual project like the Project evaluated in the Greenhouse Gas Analysis cannot generate enough greenhouse gas emissions to effect a discernible change in global climate. However, the Project may participate in the potential for GCC by its incremental contribution of greenhouse gasses combined with the cumulative increase of all other sources of greenhouse gases, which when taken together constitute potential influences on GCC.

GCC refers to the change in average meteorological conditions on the earth with respect to temperature, wind patterns, precipitation and storms. Global temperatures are regulated by naturally occurring atmospheric gases such as water vapor, CO2 (Carbon Dioxide), N2O (Nitrous Oxide), CH4 (Methane), hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons and sulfur hexafluoride. These particular gases are important due to their residence time (duration they stay) in the atmosphere, which ranges from 10 years to more than 100 years. These gases allow solar radiation into the Earth's atmosphere, but prevent radiative heat from escaping, thus warming the Earth's atmosphere. GCC can occur naturally as it has in the past with the previous ice ages. According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the climate change since the industrial revolution differs from previous climate changes in both rate and magnitude.

CARB compiles GHG inventories for the State of California. CARB GHG inventory data indicates that in 2014 (the most recent inventory of record) California GHG emissions totaled approximately 441.5 Million Metric Tons of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (MMTCO2e). "In 2010, California accounted for 6.8 percent of all emissions in the country [United States], and ranked second highest among the states with total emissions of 453 MMTCO2e, only behind Texas with 763 MMTCO2e. From a per capita standpoint, California has the 45th lowest emissions with 12.1 MMTCO2e /person in 2010."

On December 5, 2008 the SCAQMD Governing Board adopted an Interim quantitative GHG Significance Threshold for industrial projects where the SCAQMD is the lead agency (e.g., stationary source permit projects, rules, plans, etc.) of 10,000 Metric Tons (MT) CO_2 equivalent/year. In September 2010, the SCAQMD CEQA Significance Thresholds GHG Working Group released revisions which recommended a

threshold of 3,000 MT CO_2e for all land use projects. This 3,000 MT/year recommendation has been used as a guideline for this analysis. In the absence of an adopted numerical threshold of significance, project related GHG emissions in excess of the guideline level are presumed to trigger a requirement for enhanced GHG reduction at the project level.

Construction Activity GHG Emissions

The project is assumed to require less than two years for construction. During project construction, the CalEEMod2016.3.2 computer model predicts that the construction activities will generate the annual CO_2e emissions identified in Table VII-1.

Table VII-1
CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS (METRIC TONS CO_2e)

	CO_2e
Year 2019	36.1
Year 2020	727.2
Total	763.3
Amortized	**25.4**

CalEEMod Output provided in appendix

SCAQMD GHG emissions policy from construction activities is to amortize emissions over a 30-year lifetime. The amortized level is also provided. GHG impacts from construction are considered individually less than significant.

Project Operational GHG Emissions

The input assumptions for operational GHG emissions calculations, and the GHG conversion from consumption to annual regional CO_2e emissions are summarized in the CalEEMod2016.3.2 output files found in the appendix of this report.

The total operational and annualized construction emissions for the proposed project are identified in Table VII-2. The project GHG emissions are considered less than significant.

Table VII-2
OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS (METRIC TONS CO_2e)

Consumption Source	
Area Sources	0.0
Energy Utilization	612.8
Mobile Source	756.2
Solid Waste Generation	99.8
Water Consumption	63.6
Construction	25.4
Total	**1,557.8**
Guideline Threshold	3,000

Consistency with GHG Plans, Programs and Policies

In the City of Coachella's Climate Action Plan (2014), the City proposes to set an efficiency-based greenhouse gas reduction target of 15% below 2010 per service population emissions by 2020 and an emissions reduction target of 49% per service population emissions by 2035.

The recent Coachella General Plan Update addresses GHG emissions as well. The General Plan Update proposes the significance criteria proposed but not adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District to evaluate air quality impacts. Since the project results in GHG emissions below the recommended SCAQMD 3,000 metric ton threshold, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
VIII. 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 wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

a&b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The project may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; or may 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. During construction, there is a potential for accidental release of petroleum products in sufficient

quantity to pose a significant hazard to people and the environment. The following mitigation measure will be incorporated into the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the project and implementation of this measure can reduce this potential hazard to a less than significant level.

HAZ-1 All spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities will be remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminant released. The contaminated waste will be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure will be incorporated into the SWPPP prepared for the Project development.

The Riverside County Fire Department considers gasoline a hazardous material. Therefore, during the operation phase of the project, hazardous or potentially hazardous materials will be routinely handled, stored, and dispensed on the project site. Because the Project will include a gas station and truck stop, underground storage tanks (UST) will store gasoline and diesel on the project site as shown in the site plan (Figure 3). The UST will consist of double- walled, fiberglass fuel storage tank with leak detection sensors. Due to the nature of the proposed Project, and in particular the gas station and truck stop, the project will be subject to routine inspection by federal, State, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over fuel dispensing facilities. These regulations and regulatory agencies include: provisions established by Section 2540.7, Gasoline Dispensing and Service Stations, of the California Occupational Safety and Health Regulations; Chapter 38, Liquefied Petroleum Gases, of the California Fire Code; Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA); and the Riverside County Fire Department. Under the above provisions—the routine inspection of the gas station, the permitted USTs, and all associated fuel delivery infrastructure, as well as compliance with all federal, state and local regulations—will ensure that the Project operates in a manner that poses no substantial hazards to the public or the environment. No further mitigation is required.

c. *No Impact* – The proposed project site is not located within one quarter mile of a school. The nearest school is located about 0.4 miles south of the project site is Valle Del Sol Elementary School at 51433 Education Way, Coachella, CA 92236, which is part of the Coachella Valley Unified School District. Based on this information, implementation of the Project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No adverse impacts are anticipated. No additional mitigation is required.

d. *No Impact* – The proposed project site has been vacant for several years and previously served as a site containing agricultural activities. The proposed project site would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites that are currently under remediation. According to the California State Water Board's GeoTracker website (consistent with Government Code Section 65962.5), which provides information regarding Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST), there are no active LUST sites located within the project site, the nearest open LUST Cleanup Site is located approximately one mile west of the project site at Highway 111 (Figure VIII-1 through VIII-3). This site has no potential to create a hazard that would affect the operations of the proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed construction and operation of the site as the Coachella Travel Centre will not create a significant hazard to the population or to the environment from their implementation. No impacts are anticipated. No mitigation is required.

e&f. *No Impact* – According to a review of Google Maps (11/3/2017) the Project site is not located within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. The closest airport is the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport located approximately 11 miles south of the project site at 56-850 Higgins Drive, Thermal, CA 92274. Therefore, construction and operation of the project at this location would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area as a result of proximity to a public airport or private airstrip. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

g. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project will occur entirely within the boundaries of the project site, which is located on Avenue 50 and Tyler Street. The project site is adjacent to Highway 86 to the East, which will allow traffic from Highway 86 to utilize the new site. It is not anticipated that development of the project site would impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the site activities will be confined within the proposed project site. The proposed onsite parking and circulation plans will be reviewed by the local Fire Department and Police Department to ensure that the project's ingress/egress are adequate for accommodating emergency vehicles. Finally, a construction traffic plan will be required to be submitted to the Fire Department prior to development in order to provide adequate emergency access during construction of the proposed project. Therefore, there is no potential for the development of the Project to physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plans, or evacuation plans. No impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

h. *Less Than Significant Impact* – According to the City of Coachella General Plan 2035, the area east of the Coachella Canal is mapped as having moderate fuel rank and potential fire behavior. The proposed project is located on the west side of the Coachella Canal, and is in a developed area surrounded by both development and vacant land with very little fuel load in the surrounding area that could be susceptible to wildfires. Therefore, because the proposed project is located outside of the area identified as a high fire hazard zone within the City's General Plan, the proposed project has a less than significant potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 onsite or offsite?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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 onsite or offsite?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION

a&f. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project is located within a developed area within the Whitewater River watershed, which is within the Coachella Valley Planning Area of the Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Coachella Water Authority (CWA) is responsible for the water supply to the City, though it pays a replenishment charge to Coachella Valley Water District (CVWD). CWA's existing water system consists of different pressure zones, groundwater wells, storage reservoirs, booster pumping stations, and distribution facilities. CWA has one principal source of water supply, local groundwater

pumped from CWA owned and operated wells. CWA is required to meet potable water quality requirements of the Division of Drinking Water, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

For a developed area, the only three sources of potential violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are from generation of municipal wastewater, stormwater runoff, and potential discharges of pollutants, such as accidental spills. Municipal wastewater is delivered to the Coachella Sanitation District, which meets the waste discharge requirements imposed by the RWQCB. Wastewater will be transported and processed at the wastewater treatment plant (WTP) located to the south on Avenue 54. Under the proposed project, a car wash will be constructed. The carwash will include a gray water recycling system, which will collect, treat, and filter gray water from previous car wash cycles for use with future car wash cycles. Through the use of this gray water recycling system, little or no gray water will be discharged into the municipal sewer system for wastewater treatment. Thus, the gray water will not further degrade water quality onsite. To address stormwater and accidental spills within this environment, any new project must ensure that site development implements a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) to control potential sources of water pollution that could violate any standards or discharge requirements during construction and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) to ensure that project-related after development surface runoff meets discharge requirements over the short- and long-term. The WQMP would specify stormwater runoff permit Best Management Practices (BMPs) requirements for capturing, retaining, and treating on site stormwater once the Coachella Travel Centre has been developed. Because the project site consists of pervious surfaces, the Project has identified onsite drainage that will generally be directed to the onsite retention pond that will be developed as part of the project. The SWPPP would specify the BMPs that the Project would be required to implement during construction activities to ensure that all potential water pollutants of concern are prevented, minimized, and/or otherwise appropriately treated prior to being discharged from the subject property. With implementation of these mandatory Plans and their BMPs, as well as mitigation measure HAZ-1 above, the development of Coachella Travel Centre will not cause a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the proposed Project will not deplete ground-water supplies that would substantially affect the water availability for existing or planned land uses or biological resources. The potential to directly intercept the groundwater table during development of this Project is not likely due to depths greater than the necessary excavation depths, which is approximately 20-40 feet below the ground surface according to the Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix 4). Excavation at these depths is not required to construct the proposed project. The Project will be supplied water by the CWA, which utilizes groundwater to supply its customers, though it pays water replenishment charges to CVWD. CWA produces all of its water supplies from the Coachella Valley Groundwater Basin, specifically, the East Whitewater River Subbasin, which is continuously replenished at the local and regional level pursuant to a variety of water supply projects and programs. By developing the proposed project, pervious area within this project site would decrease substantially. However, the proposed project would develop landscaping and Stormtech Subsurface Management System, that would allow much of the runoff to remain onsite and be infiltrated allowing for groundwater recharge at this location.

CWA states that Commercial uses required an average of 2.15 acre feet per acre per year (AF/A/Y) between the beginning of Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 and end of FY 2015[1]. However, CWA plans for water usage to decrease in the future as the population grows with a limited water supply due to drought and a limit on State Water Project funds. Therefore, CWA assumes that future commercial uses will consume 1.78 AF/A/Y. Using this data as the basis for the quantifying the proposed project's water demand, it is anticipated that a 14.1 acre site would require a potable water supply of 25.1 acre feet per year (AFY). According to the CWA 2015 Urban Water Management Program

[1] https://www.coachella.org/home/showdocument?id=5783

(UWMP)[2], as of 2015, commercial uses demand 905 AFY of potable water. As the Coachella Valley continues to grow and develop with urban uses, the water demand for commercial uses will increase to 1,733.9 AFY by 2020, and to 3,314.4 AFY by 2040. Based on the assumed demand for potable water that that operations of the proposed project would required, the proposed Coachella Travel Centre will increase CWA's potable water demand by about 1.45%. As previously stated, by 2020, commercial connections within CWA's service area are projected to demand a total of 1,733.9 AFY, which is greater than the 2015 demand by 829.9 AFY. Given the projected demand CWA provides in their 2015 UWMP, the potable water demand that operation of proposed Coachella Travel Centre is anticipated to require would be well within CWA's projections for future water demand and future availability of potable water. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to groundwater resources are forecast to occur from implementing the proposed Project. No mitigation is required.

c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is not anticipated to significantly change the volume of flows downstream of the project site, and would not be anticipated to change the amount of surface water in any water body in an amount that could initiate a new cycle of erosion or sedimentation downstream of the project site. The onsite drainage will capture the incremental increase in runoff from the project site associated with project development. Runoff will be managed on the project site through a Stormtech Subsurface Management System that will be installed throughout the site (see Figures 16 and 17). Therefore, the proposed Coachella Travel Centre development will not substantially increase discharges to the City of Coachella's existing storm drain system. Therefore, implementation of the Project will not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite due to the construction of onsite drainage management facilities. Any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

d *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Please refer to response IX(c) above. Impacts to the existing drainage pattern of the site or area could occur if the development of the project results in an increased amount of flooding onsite or offsite. Implementation of the proposed project will alter the existing drainage courses or patterns onsite but will maintain the existing offsite downstream drainage system through control of future discharges from the site. The proposed onsite drainage improvements include the installation of a Stormtech Subsurface Management System that will be installed throughout the site (see Figures 16 and 17) and will capture all runoff from the site. The site will be designed to direct onsite runoff to the retention pond. During construction runoff will be managed through implementation of a SWPPP, NPDEA, and WQMP, and implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-1, which will ensure that the project site is not substantially altered during construction, such that the rate or amount of surface runoff would not result in flooding onsite or offsite. Once the site has been developed as the Coachella Travel Centre, runoff will be managed based on the current requirements, which places an emphasis on infiltration. In order to prevent an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff from causing flooding onsite or offsite, the project site plan includes infiltration mechanisms that will collect runoff and allow it to infiltrate on site. As a result, the project will not substantially increase discharges to the City of Coachella's existing storm drain system. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measure HYD-1, implementation of the Project will not result in flooding onsite or offsite, and any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

e. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – As indicated under issues IX(a), IX(c) and IX(d) above, the project will not substantially create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater capacity, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water, particularly because the site plan includes infiltration mechanisms that will collect onsite runoff and ensure that polluted runoff does not leave the site. As stated under issue IX(d) above, runoff during construction will be managed through implementation of a SWPPP, NPDES, and WQMP, and implementation of mitigation measure HAZ-1 will ensure that discharge of polluted

[2] https://www.coachella.org/Home/ShowDocument?id=4678

material does not occur or is remediated in the event of an accidental spill. At present, the site is mostly pervious and runoff remains on site, thus with the proposed development of the Coachella Travel Centre, and the planned drainage systems, runoff from the site would be managed such that flooding on- or off- site is not anticipated. Therefore, with the implementation of mitigation measure HYD-1, implementation of the Project will not result in flooding onsite or offsite, and any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

g&h. *Less Than Significant Impact* – According to the Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix 4), the proposed project site is located adjacent to the Coachella Stormwater Channel/Whitewater River, which is subject to overflow during periods of inclement weather. The channel is located within a 100-year flood zone; however, the proposed project is located in Zone X according to the City of Coachella General Plan Flood Hazard map (Figure IX-1). Zone X corresponds to areas of 500-year flood, areas of 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile, and areas protected by levees from 100-year floods. The project site is adjacent to a special flood hazard area as a result of being adjacent to the Whitewater River channel. However, as shown on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 06065C2270H (Figure IX-2), the proposed project is elevated such that it is not located within an area of special flood hazard. The Project does not propose any housing as part of its implementation. Therefore, the Coachella Travel Centre would not 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, and the project would have a less than significant potential to impede or redirect flood flows as the project site is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area. No mitigation is required.

i. *Less Than Significant Impact* – As stated under issue IX(g-h), the proposed project is located adjacent to the Coachella Stormwater Channel/Whitewater River, which is subject to overflow during periods of inclement weather. According to the City of Coachella General Plan EIR, the Whitewater River levee is designed to hold double the amount of water that would flow in a 100-year flood. The levee and channelized portions of the Whitewater River are managed by the City of Coachella Engineering Department. Potential risks and planned responses associated with failures of these systems are addressed in the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. The project does not include any housing, and therefore the potential to 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 is considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

j. *No Impact* – Implementation of the Project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The proposed project is located over 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean, therefore, there is no potential for tsunami to occur within the project area. According to the City of Coachella General Plan EIR, the proposed project and the entirety of the City are outside of the area that could be affected by seiches that could occur at the Salton Sea, which is over 10 miles away. Furthermore, the General Plan EIR identifies the Mecca Hills area as susceptible to mudflow and landslides, and thus, because the project is located outside of this area on a flat parcel of land, no impacts are anticipated to occur under this issue. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☒	☐	☐
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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The project site consists of one parcel of land, which is zoned for Agricultural Reserve (A-R) use, and designated Entertainment Commercial (CE) (Figures X-1 and X-2). Much of the surrounding area consists of vacant land, though the surrounding zoning classifications are Commercial Entertainment (C-E), which is what this Project proposes to change the site to through a zone classification change. The proposed project site, much like the surrounding area, is vacant, and development of the project site would not divide an established community. In fact, the proposed project would connect people traveling through the City on SR 86 with a new travel center within the City. Consequently, the development of the project site with the proposed use will not divide any established community in any manner. Therefore, no adverse impacts under this issue are anticipated and no mitigation is necessary.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Please refer to the discussion under issue II(a) –The City of Coachella recently updated the City's General Plan, and the project site is designated for Entertainment Commercial use; however, the zoning has not been updated to reflect this change as it is the current zoning designation is Agricultural Reserve. At present, no agricultural operations occur at the project site, nor have they occurred for many years. The City's Municipal Code defines Agricultural Reserve Zoning as "*reserved for only those lands which are subject to recorded Williamson Act contracts."* Based on a review of the Riverside County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016 Map (Figure II-2), the project site is not designated as Williamson Act land, which would indicate that the proposed project site is not appropriately zoned at present, and is not considered agricultural land of value such that it would be designated as Williamson Act land. Given that the City has designated the proposed project site as Entertainment Commercial, the City's General Plan designation would indicate that the City intends for the project site to be developed for a use that would suit this land use designation. As stated under issue II(a), ultimately, the City's zoning codes exist to execute the objective of the City's land use designations; as such, given that this project requires a zone change, but does not require a change in land use designation, the goal of the developer appears to align with the City's goals for land use planning at this location. Therefore, though the proposed project is located within an A-R zoning classification, the underlying land use indicates that the proposed zone classification change to C-E would conform the City's Land Use Policies and Goals. Based on this information, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to 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.

c. *No Impact* – According to the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) Conservation Area Map (Figure X-3),

the project is not located within any mapped Conservation Area. Therefore, the proposed Project is consistent with the Coachella Valley MSHCP and NCCP. As a result, implementation of the proposed Project will not conflict with any habitat conservation or natural community conservation plan adopted to protect environmental resources. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated to occur from implementing the proposed project under this issue. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION:

a&b. *No Impact* – The proposed site for the Coachella Travel Centre is in located on a vacant site adjacent to the Whitewater River to the west and SR 86 to the east. According to the Map prepared for the City of Coachella General Plan EIR depicting Mineral Resources (Figure XI-1), the proposed project is located in Mineral Resource Zone-1, which indicates an area where available geological information indicates that little likelihood exists for the presence of significant mineral resources. The project is designated for Entertainment Commercial uses, and is not designated for mineral resource-related land uses. Therefore, the development of the Project will not cause any loss of mineral resource values to the region or residents of the state, nor would it result in the loss of any locally important mineral resources identified in the City of Coachella General Plan. No impacts would occur under this issue. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

SUBSTANTIATION

Background

Noise is generally described as unwanted sound. The Coachella Travel Centre will be developed within a 14.1-acre site that includes a 5 Story Hotel, a Restaurant, a Drive-Thru Restaurant, a Convenience Store, a Gas Station, and a Truck Stop, which includes Truck Fuel Pumps, a Truck Wash Facility, and a Car Wash Facility. The site is located adjacent to SR 86, and the general land use adjacent to the SR 86 is Entertainment Commercial, though the general area is somewhat sparsely developed. As the proposed project is located adjacent to a highway, there is intermittent heavy background noise from highway traffic.

The unit of sound pressure ratio to the faintest sound detectable to a person with normal hearing is called a decibel (dB). Sound or noise can vary in intensity by over one million times within the range of human hearing. A logarithmic loudness scale, similar to the Richter scale for earthquake magnitude, is therefore used to keep sound intensity numbers at a convenient and manageable level. The human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire spectrum. Noise levels at maximum human sensitivity from around 500 to 2,000 cycles per second are factored more heavily into sound descriptions in a process called “A-weighting,” written as “dBA.”

Leq is a time-averaged sound level; a single-number value that expresses the time-varying sound level for the specified period as though it were a constant sound level with the same total sound energy as the time-varying level. Its unit is the decibel (dB). The most common averaging period for Leq is hourly.

Because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during more sensitive evening and nighttime hours, state law requires that an artificial dBA increment be added to quiet time noise levels. The State of California has established guidelines for acceptable community noise levels that are based on the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) rating scale (a 24-hour integrated noise measurement scale). The guidelines rank noise land use compatibility in terms of "normally acceptable," "conditionally acceptable," and "clearly unacceptable" noise levels for various land use types. The State Guidelines, Land Use Compatibility for Community Noise Exposure, single-family homes are "normally acceptable" in exterior noise environments up to 60 dB CNEL and "conditionally acceptable" up to 70 dB CNEL based on this scale. Multiple family residential uses are "normally acceptable" up to 65 dB CNEL and "conditionally acceptable" up to 70 CNEL. Schools, libraries and churches are "normally acceptable" up to 70 dB CNEL, as are office buildings and business, commercial and professional uses with some structural noise attenuation.

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is located adjacent to SR-86 and is therefore in a high background noise environment. Short-term noise levels associated with project construction activates will not impact any sensitive receptors, as the noise generated from the SR-86 freeway would dominate the noise environment at the nearest sensitive receptors. The nearest sensitive receptor is located more than 600 feet from the boundary of the proposed project. As such, noise generate by the project would attenuate to a less than significant level, or an inaudible level by the time it reached the residences 600 feet southwest of the project site. The primary source of noise generated as a result of the operation of the Coachella Travel Centre will be vehicular traffic entering, exiting and accessing the site, maintenance equipment that may be required as needed, heating, ventilation and air conditioning units. The Coachella Land Use/Noise Compatibility Matrix (Figure XII-1) defines noise levels up to 80 CNEL within a Commercial Development-Regional, Village, District, Special (applicable to restaurants) and 70 CNEL within a Commercial Development-Regional, District (applicable to hotels and transient lodging) areas to be normally acceptable. The project is not anticipated to operate at a level greater than 70 CNEL. With no sensitive receptors nearby, the proposed project should not expose of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of established standards. Thus, based on the existing noise environment within this corridor, operation of the Coachella Travel Centre is forecast to be compatible with the surrounding land uses and is anticipated to be consistent with applicable noise standards.

   Section 7.04.070 of the Coachella Municipal Code (CMC) specifically exempts noise sources associated with construction, erection, demolition, alteration, repair, addition to or improvement of any building, structure, road or improvement to realty, provided that such activities take place during daytime hours, as follows: October 1st through April 30th: Monday – Friday: 6:00 AM to 5:30 PM, May 1st through September 30th Monday – Friday: 5:00 AM to 7:00 PM, all year Saturday: 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM, all year Sunday: 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM, all year Holidays: 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. The proposed project will limit construction to the hours outlined in the City Noise Ordinance, and therefore will not exceed City noise standards during the prohibited hours. The Project will comply with the City Municipal Code thereby preventing any significant impacts to nearby sensitive receptors. Thus, based on the existing noise circumstances within the vicinity of the project, impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is necessary.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Vibration is the periodic oscillation of a medium or object. The rumbling sound caused by vibration of room surfaces is called structure borne noises. Sources of groundborne vibrations include natural phenomena (e.g. earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, sea waves, landslides) or human-made causes (e.g. explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment). Vibration sources may be continuous or transient. Vibration is often described in units of velocity (inches per second), and discussed in decibel (dB) units in order to compress the range of numbers required to describe vibration. Vibration impacts related to human development are generally associated with activities such as train operations, construction, and heavy truck movements.

The Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Noise and Vibration Assessment[3] states that in contrast to airborne noise, ground-borne vibration is not a common environmental problem. Although the motion of the ground may be noticeable to people outside structures, without the effects associated with the shaking of a structure, the motion does not provoke the same adverse human reaction to people outside. Within structures, the effects of ground-borne vibration include noticeable movement of the building floors, rattling of windows, shaking of items on shelves or hanging on walls, and rumbling sounds. The FTA Assessment further states that it is unusual for vibration from sources such as buses and trucks to be perceptible, even in locations close to major roads. However, some common sources of vibration are trains, trucks on rough roads, and construction activities, such as blasting, pile driving, and heavy earth-moving equipment. The FTA guidelines identify a level of 80 VdB for sensitive land uses. This threshold provides a basis for determining the relative significance of potential Project related vibration impacts.

Due to the large size of the project site, and the lack of any sensitive receptors within a reasonable distance of the project site, the proposed project will not expose people to generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. During construction, certain construction activities have some potential to create vibration, but due to the size of the site and lack of sensitive receptors, any impacts are considered less than significant. Furthermore, the City of Coachella Municipal Code Section 7.04.070 places restrictions on hours of construction, which are outlined above under issue XII(a). The proposed project would comply with the construction hours established by the City's Municipal Code. Additionally, because the rubber tires and suspension systems of heavy trucks and other on-road vehicles provide vibration isolation and reduced noise, it is unusual for on-road vehicles to cause noticeable groundborne noise or vibration impact. Most problems with on-road vehicle-related noise and vibration can be directly related to a pothole, bump, expansion joint, or other discontinuity in the road surface. Smoothing a bump or filling a pothole will usually solve the problem. The proposed project would be constructed with smooth new pavement throughout the project and would not result in significant groundborne noise or vibration impacts from vehicular traffic. Thus, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Please refer to the discussion under issue XII(a) above. The long term of permanent change in the noise environment as a result of developing the Coachella Travel Centre is expected to be similar to or less than the existing background noise environment, which is dominated by traffic noise from SR 86. The primary source of noise generated as a result of the operation of the Coachella Travel Centre will be vehicular and truck traffic entering, exiting and accessing the site, maintenance equipment that may be required as needed, heating, ventilation and air conditioning units. As stated under section XII(a) above, the proposed project is not located in an area with any sensitive noise receptors nearby. Thus, the minor increase in noise levels relative to the background noise levels generated from nearby roadways and SR-86 is not expected to create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Therefore, based on the existing uses surrounding the project, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less than significant potential to substantially increase permanent ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project above levels existing without the project.

d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Please refer to the discussion under issue XII(a) above. The proposed project will involve construction operations that have the potential to cause short-term noise impacts. In the short term, grading and excavation, and construction of the structures that will make up the Coachella Travel Centre will result in noise generated by dozers, pavers, air compressors, welders, generators, and other noise making equipment required to complete construction. Exterior noise-generating construction activities will be restricted to the hours identified in Section 7.04.070 of the City of Coachella Municipal Code, which exempts noise sources associated with construction, erection, demolition, alteration, repair, addition to or

[3] https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

improvement of any building, structure, road or improvement to realty, provided that such activities take place during daytime hours, as follows: October 1st through April 30th: Monday – Friday: 6:00 AM to 5:30 PM, May 1st through September 30th Monday – Friday: 5:00 AM to 7:00 PM, all year Saturday: 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM, all year Sunday: 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM, all year Holidays: 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM. Construction equipment generates noise that ranges between approximately 75 and 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. Refer to Table XII-1, which shows construction equipment noise levels at 25, 50 and 100 feet from the noise source. However, there are no sensitive receptors within a distance from which noise generated at the Project site would be audible. Thus, the short-term noise impacts associated with Project construction activities are forecast to be less than significant through compliance with the City Municipal Code—as addressed above.

Table XII-1
NOISE LEVELS OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT AT
25, 50 AND 100 FEET (in dBA Leq) FROM THE SOURCE

Equipment	Noise Levels at 25 feet	Noise Levels at 50 feet	Noise Levels at 100 feet
Earthmoving			
Front Loader	85	79	73
Backhoes	86	80	74
Dozers	86	80	74
Tractors	86	80	74
Scrapers	91	85	79
Trucks	91	85	79
Material Handling			
Concrete Mixer	91	85	79
Concrete Pump	88	82	76
Crane	89	83	77
Derrick	94	88	82
Stationary Sources			
Pumps	82	79	70
Generator	84	78	72
Compressors	87	81	75
Other			
Saws	84	78	72
Vibrators	82	76	70

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency "Noise"

e&f. *No Impact* – According to a review of Google Maps (1/30/2018) the Project site is not located within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. The closest airport is the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport located approximately 11 miles south of the project site at 56-850 Higgins Drive, Thermal, CA 92274. According to the General Plan Airport Noise Compatibility Contours (Figure XII-2), the proposed project is not located within the noise contours of the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport. Based on this information, the Project site is not located within an airport land use plan or, within two miles of a public or private airport and therefore, the proposed project has no potential to expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:				
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 will employ about 100 persons. It is unknown whether the new employees will be drawn from the general area or will be new residents to the project area. Relative to the total number residents of Coachella, approximately 45,407 persons in 2016 according to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Local Profile, an increase of about 100 employees as new residents represents a minor increase in the area population. According to the City of Coachella General Plan EIR, by 2020, an estimated 70,200 persons will reside in Coachella, with the population growing to 128,700 persons by 2035. The proposed Coachella Travel Centre is not anticipated to contribute to substantial growth in the area beyond that which has been planned by the City. Thus, based on the type of project (commercial), and the small increment of potential indirect population growth the project may generate, the population generation associated with project implementation will not induce substantial population growth that exceeds either local or regional projections.

b&c. *No Impact* – No occupied residences are located on the project site; therefore, implementation of the proposed project will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or persons, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impacts will occur; therefore, no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: 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:				
a) Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The City of Coachella contracts with Riverside County Fire Department for local fire protection services. The nearest fire station is Station 79 located at 1377 Sixth Street, which is less than a mile west of the project site. Development of the project will marginally increase demand for fire and emergency services within the City. Based on the location of the nearest fire station, the project site is clearly within a distance where any future calls can be responded to within 5 minutes, which is the City's target response time. Emergency access to the project site will be provided by the site entrance on Avenue 50. The Fire Department will require the proposed project site plan to ensure that it meets applicable fire standards and regulations. The proposed Project will incrementally add to the existing demand for fire protection services. Cumulative impacts are mitigated through the payment of the Development Impact Fee (DIF), which contains a Fire Facilities component. There is no identified near term need to expand facilities in a manner that could have adverse impacts on the environment. Any impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The City of Coachella Police Department operates a substation from the Riverside County Sherriff's Department. Local headquarters for the Police area located at 82-625 Airport Boulevard, approximately 4 miles southwest of the proposed project site. At the time that the City of Coachella General Plan EIR was compiled (2012), the Department had 36 sworn officers and two non-sworn personnel for a total of 38 positions. The proposed project will result in a marginal increase in demand for police services. Access to the site for Police protection services will be provided at the entrance to the project site on Avenue 50. The proposed project will incrementally add to the existing demand for police protection services. These incremental impacts are mitigated through the payment of the DIF, which contains a Law Enforcement component. Therefore, with payment of DIF, impacts to police protection services are considered less than significant.

c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project is a commercial development that is not forecast to generate any new direct demand for the area schools. The proposed project may place additional demand on school facilities, but such demand would be indirect and speculative. The Coachella Valley Unified School District (CVUSD) requires commercial developments such as the Coachella Travel Centre facility to pay a Developer Fee to support development of future facilities due to development within the City.[4] The development impact fee mitigation program of the CVUSD

[4] https://www.cvusd.us/uploaded/pdf_files/departments/business_services/facilities/Developer_Fees.pdf.pdf

adequately provides for mitigating the impacts of the proposed project in accordance with current state law. No other mitigation is identified or needed. Since this is a mandatory requirement, no additional mitigation measures are required to reduce school impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

d. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed Project will not directly add to the existing demand on local recreational facilities. According to the City's General Plan EIR, as developments are built and constructed, developers would be subject to all provisions of the Coachella Quimby Ordinance 868 fees to set aside land or pay in-lieu fees to provide park and recreation facilities. However, at present, the City only requires residential development to pay Quimby Fees. Therefore, with no existing or planned park facilities located within the project site, and no required payment of fees, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact to parks and recreation facilities.

e. *Less Than Significant Impact* – No impacts to other public service demands have been identified in conjunction with the proposed project. Therefore, any impacts are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XV. 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 Coachella Valley Recreation and Park District (CVRPD) provides park and recreational services for the City. The nearest parks to the proposed project are Rancho De Oro Park, located about one quarter mile west of the project site at 84-600 50 Ave, and Coachella Veterans Memorial Park, located about 1000 feet west of the project site at 1500-1598 4th St, Coachella, CA 92236. Rancho Del Oro Park is 4 acres and contains the following amenities: baseball/softball, restrooms, playground, tables, open grass, soccer/football, and splash pad. Veterans Memorial Park is about 1.5 acres, and contains the following amenities: swimming pool, restrooms, playground, tables, benches, bleachers, open grass, drinking fountain, and a stage. As stated under issue XIV(d), the City of Coachella does not require commercial projects to pay Quimby Act fees dedicated to development of City parks. Additionally, the proposed project will be developed on land that is designated by the City's General Plan for Entertainment Commercial use, and is not listed in any planning documents as desirable land for future park development. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant potential to physically deteriorate park or recreational facilities through increased use. No mitigation is required.

b. *No Impact* – The proposed project consists of developing the Coachella Travel Centre, which will contain a 5 Story Hotel, a Restaurant, a Drive-Thru Restaurant, a Convenience Store, a Gas Station, and a Truck Stop, which includes Truck Fuel Pumps, a Truck Wash Facility, and a Car Wash Facility within the City of Coachella. The project will include a pool for hotel guest use only (it will not be a public pool); the impacts of developing this pool are not anticipated to be significant.

No public recreational facilities are part of the proposed project. The site is currently vacant, with no existing recreational facilities on or near the project site, and the Project site is in an area of the City that is designated for Entertainment Commercial. As a result, no other recreational facilities—existing or new—are required to serve the Project, thus any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards 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) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

a&b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the proposed CoachellaGro project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The proposed project is located off of Harrison Street just south of Avenue 48. According to the City of Coachella General Plan, Avenue 50 is considered a Primary Arterial with Bicycle Facility at the entrance to the project site. The project site is also adjacent to Highway 86, which is a regional highway that extends north-south in the City of Coachella. The General Plan identifies existing traffic on Avenue 50 east of Harrison as being capable of handling about 35,714 trips per day, while the current volume on this roadway is only 7,500 and operates at a Level of Service (LOS) of C or better at present.

The proposed project is anticipated to employ about 100 persons, which would generate an average daily trip rate of 2 trips per day, which would result in about 200 trip ends per week day.

The proposed project would also generate customer trips to the various uses that make up the Coachella Travel Centre as follows:

1. Convenience Store/Gas Station/Car Wash: 1,800
2. Drive-Thru Restaurant: 300
3. Sit Down Restaurant: 500
4. Hotel: 90
5. Truck Stop: 150

Total Customer Trips = 2,840 trips.

Based on this information, the proposed project would contribute an average of 3,040 trips per day, the volume to capacity ratio would increase from 0.21 to 0.29, which would still allow this segment of roadway to operate at an LOS C or better for the foreseeable future, which is better than the City's standard of a minimum LOS D or better. It is also assumed that the traffic generated from this project site is comparable to the traffic projections outlined in the General Plan because the project will be consistent with the underlying land use of the project. The City of Coachella General Plan EIR indicates that—for the segment of roadway along Avenue 50 adjacent to the Project site—the 2035 roadway segment LOS, as forecast in the General Plan, at Avenue 50 east of SR-111 would be capable of handling 37,400 trips per day with a volume forecasted at 34,920 trips operating at an LOS E, which an unacceptable LOS. Mitigation identified in the General Plan EIR indicates that widening Avenue 50, east of SR-111, from 4 lanes to 6 lanes, would improve the roadway segment LOS from E to LOS C or better. Additionally, by 2035, the City intends to construct a signalized intersection at SR-86 and Avenue 50, which is forecast to operate at an LOS B or better for both south- and north-bound directions, which would benefit traffic flow in the area surrounding the proposed project. As such, the City of Coachella General Plan EIR states that it implements a DIF program that provides for the implementation of all of the roadway improvements identified in the Mobility Element, and thus, the proposed project will pay any applicable fees to improve the roadways that experience greater use as a result of the project. Therefore, the proposed project has a less than significant potential to conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or conflict with an applicable congestion management program. No mitigation is required.

c. *No Impact* – According to a review of Google Maps (1/31/2018) the Project site is not located within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. The closest airport is the Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport located approximately 11 miles south of the project site at 56-850 Higgins Drive, Thermal, CA 92274. According to the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Map of Jacqueline Cochran Regional Airport (Figure XVI-1), the proposed project is not located within the airport land use compatibility planning area. Therefore, no adverse impact to airport operations or from pattern overflights can result from implementing the proposed project.

d&e. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The proposed project will occur entirely within the project site boundaries. However, construction activities will include curb improvements as well as installation of a driveway to provide access to the site. Large trucks delivering equipment or removing small quantities of excavated dirt or debris can enter the site without major conflicts with the flow of traffic on the roadways used to access the site. Primary access to the site will be provided by a new entrance on Avenue 50. Access to the site must comply with all City design standards, and would be reviewed by the City to ensure that inadequate design features or incompatible uses do not occur. The entrance to the site on Avenue 50 allows access to each of the entirety of the project site allowing any emergency vehicles to access any of the proposed uses that will make up the Coachella Travel Centre. Additionally, the proposed Project would be required to comply with all applicable fire code and ordinance requirements for construction and access to the site. Emergency response and evacuation procedures would be coordinated with the City, as well as the police and fire departments, resulting in less than significant impacts. However, mitigation to

ensure that access to the site does not interfere with the flow of traffic along Avenue 50 during construction shall be implemented as follows:

TRAF-1 ***The construction contractor will provide adequate traffic management resources, as determined by the City of Coachella. The City shall require a construction traffic management plan for work in public roads that complies with the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook, or other applicable standard, to provide adequate traffic control and safety during excavation activities. At a minimum this plan shall include how to minimize the amount of time spent on construction activities; how to minimize disruption of vehicle and alternative modes of transport traffic at all times, but particularly during periods of high traffic volumes; how to maintain safe traffic flow on local streets affected by construction at all times, including through the use of adequate signage, protective devices, flag persons or police assistance to ensure that traffic can flow adequately during construction; the identification of alternative routes that can meet the traffic flow requirements of a specific area, including communication (signs, webpages, etc.) with drivers and neighborhoods where construction activities will occur; and at the end of each construction day roadways shall be prepared for continued utilization without any significant roadway hazards remaining.***

With implementation of the above mitigation measure, the project is not anticipated to either substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses or result in inadequate emergency access. No further mitigation is required.

f. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with policies or programs for alternative transportation requirements. The proposed project will not interfere with the nearby bus stop along Avenue 50. There is a Bus Line (#95) that travels along Avenue 50, with nearby stops along Harrison Street and Tyler Street. There is another Bus Line (#96) that stops at Harrison Street and Avenue 50, which is about one half mile west of the project. These stops would allow local access to the site, though generally the purpose of this project is to provide a stop for persons travelling along either the I-10 or SR-86; however, employees working at the Coachella Travel Centre would have alternative transit access to the site through the above bus stops, and through sidewalks and bike lanes along Avenue 50. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to these alternative modes of transportation will occur and overall bus and bicycle access should be enhanced by the proposed intersection improvements. The proposed project's impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project cause a substantial change in the significance of tribal cultural resources, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographic-ally defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to the California Native American tribe, and that is:				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in sub-division (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

A Tribal Resource is defined in the Public Resources Code section 21074 and includes the following:

- Sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that are either of the following: included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of Section 5020.1;
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 5024.1 for the purpose of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resources to a California American tribe;
- A cultural landscape that meets the criteria of subdivision (a) is a tribal cultural resource to the extent that the landscape is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape;
- A historical resource described in Section 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource as defined in subdivision (g) of Section 21083.2, or a "non-unique archaeological resource" as defined in subdivision (h) of Section 21083.2 may also be a tribal resource if it conforms with the criteria of subdivision (a).

a&b. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation* – The project site is located within the City of Coachella, which has been contacted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 by the following California Native American tribes traditionally and cultural affiliated with the City of Coachella: Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians, Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians, Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, and Cabazon Band of Mission Indians. The AB 52 consultation letters were sent out to the above tribes on February 7, 2019. The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians responded on February 26, 2019 and defers to the Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, concluding consultation efforts. The Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians responded on February 25, 2019, requesting a copy of the cultural report,

and also noting that they elect to be a consulting party under CEQA. No other Tribes responded during the 30-day consultation period. The 29 Palms Band of Indians responded with a request for government–to-government consultation with the City of Coachella requesting a visual assessment of cultural resources that may be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places or the CA Resister of Historical Resources be included in the environmental assessment. This consultation process was concluded in April 2019 after the Tribe had an opportunity to review the Cultural Resources Study and found adequacy with the standard mitigation measures included herein.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XVIII. 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(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

a. *Less Than Significant Impact* – There are two sources of wastewater that the proposed project will generate that could exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Colorado River Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The surface runoff from the site, nonpoint source storm water runoff, will be managed in accordance with the project's WQMP, once developed. By providing treatment of the storm water before discharge (during both construction and operation), the proposed project will not violate any requirements imposed by the Regional Board through its MS4 permit.

Municipal wastewater is delivered to the Coachella Sanitation District, which meets the waste discharge requirements imposed by the RWQCB. Wastewater will be transported and processed at the wastewater treatment plant (WTP) located in to the south on Avenue 54. The carwash will include a gray water recycling system, which will collect, treat, and filter gray water from previous

car wash cycles for use with future car wash cycles. Though the use of this gray water recycling system, little or no gray water will be discharged into the municipal sewer system for wastewater treatment. No other sources of wastewater will be produced by the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project has a less than significant potential to exceed or violate any wastewater treatment requirements.

b,d &e. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – Implementation of the proposed project will result in a need for additional utilities and service systems that could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service levels or other performance objectives for any of the utilities and service systems including but not limited to those discussed below.

As stated under Hydrology and Water Quality above, CWA is responsible for the water supply for the City, though it pays a replenishment charge to CVWD. CWA is required to meet water quality requirements of the RWQCB. CWA assumes that future commercial uses will consume 1.78 AF/A/Y. Using this data as the basis for the quantifying the proposed project's water demand, it is anticipated that a 14.1 acre site would require a potable water supply of 25.1 acre feet per year (AFY). According to the CWA 2015 UWMP, as of 2015, commercial uses demand 905 AFY of potable water. Water demand for commercial uses is projected to increase to 1,733.9 AFY by 2020, and to 3,314.4 AFY by 2040. Additionally, approximately 80 percent of the water used for each car wash cycle will be recycled for reuse for future car wash cycles. Based on the assumed demand for potable water that that operations of the proposed project would require, the proposed Coachella Travel Centre will increase CWA's potable water demand by about 1.45%. Given the projected demand CWA provides in their 2015 UWMP, the potable water demand that operation of proposed Coachella Travel Centre is anticipated to require would be well within CWA's projections for future water demand and future availability of potable water. Through the payment of water standby charges, hookup and connection fees, the impact of implementing the proposed Project on water systems are forecast to be less than significant. A review of the CWA 2015 UWMP documents the water availability for this project and the whole of the CWA service area, when the water shortage contingency plan and demand management measures are taken into account. Based on these substantiating data, provision of domestic water supply can be accomplished without causing significant impacts on the existing water system or existing entitlements.

The Project is not subject to Senate Bill 221 requirements because it is not a commercial development of more than 500,000 square feet, and it will not increase the number of water service connections by 10 percent or more in a district with fewer than 5,000 service connections. This Project is not subject to Senate Bill 610 because it is not a large-scale development. Other than mandatory fees and installation of onsite utility infrastructure, specific mitigation is proposed below to address water demand by the project.

The Coachella Sanitary Division WTP has a capacity of 4.9 MGD. The WTP treats approximately 2.9 MGD of wastewater at present, which leaves approximately 2 MGD of capacity remaining. Based on the City of Coachella 2015 Sewer System Master Plan, Entertainment Commercial uses are estimated to have a wastewater flow rate of 600 gallons per day per acre.[5] Therefore, the 14.1 acre site is anticipated to generate about 8,460 gallons of wastewater per day per acre. Based on this information, the proposed project is expected to require 0.17% of the WTP's 4.9 MGD capacity, which is minimal when compared to the 2 MGD of capacity remaining during daily operations. The Coachella WWTP implements all requirements of the RWQCB, State Water Resource Control Board and City of Coachella 2015 Sewer System Master Plan that protect water quality and monitor wastewater discharge. This consumption of capacity will not cause the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities. Thus, the proposed project will consume some capacity of the existing Water Reclamation Facility, but the level of adverse impact is considered less than significant.

[5] https://www.coachella.org/Home/ShowDocument?id=5678

The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce any impacts under the above issues to a level of less than significant:

UTL-1 If recycled water becomes available at the project site, the Applicant shall connect to this system and utilize recycled water for landscape irrigation, and any other feasible uses of recycled water on the project site.

With implementation of the above mitigation measures, any impacts under the above issues are considered less than significant.

c. *Less Than Significant Impact* – Please refer to the discussion under Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this Initial Study. The project design incorporates a Stormtech Subsurface Management System that will be installed throughout the site to capture the additional increment of stormwater runoff generated by the proposed project development (see Figures 16 and 17). The main stormwater drainage infrastructure facility within the Coachella Valley is the WWRSC/CVSC, a portion of the Whitewater River that has been channelized to handle flood flows of up to 80,000 cubic feet per second and drains water into the Salton Sea. The proposed project will grade the site and direct drainage to the Stormtech Subsurface Management System that will catch onsite drainage. This system has been designed to intercept the peak 100-year flow rate from the project site. As a result, no offsite drainage system facilities will need to be expanded that could cause indirect significant adverse impacts.

f&g. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project will generate demand for solid waste service system capacity and has a potential to contribute to potentially significant cumulative demand impacts on the solid waste system. Solid waste generation rates outlined on the CalRecycle[6] website indicate the following solid waste generation rates for specific uses, also below are the solid waste generation rates calculated for the proposed project.

- Convenience Store (gas station): 0.9 lbs / 100 SF / day = **34.2 lbs / day**
- Sit Down Restaurant: 0.005 lbs / SF / day = **27.77 lbs / day**
- Drive Thru Restaurant: 17 lbs / employee / day = **340 lbs / day**
- Hotel: 2 lbs / room / day = **232 lbs / day**
- Truck Stop: 0.9 lbs / 100 SF / day = **42.79 lbs / day**
- Car Wash: 0.9 lbs / 100 SF / day = **24.09 lbs / day**
- TOTAL: = **700.85 lbs / day**

The total solid waste generated per year would equal about 127.91 tons, or after an assumed 50% diversion to be recycled per the state's solid waste diversion requirements under AB 939, the project solid waste generation will be about 63.95 tons per year. With the City's mandatory source reduction and recycling program, the proposed Project is not forecast to cause a significant adverse impact to the waste disposal system.

The City of Coachella General Plan identifies landfills that serve the planning area. The Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill and Badlands Landfill serve the project area. The Lamb Canyon Sanitary Landfill has a maximum permitted daily capacity of 5,500 tons per day, with a permitted capacity of 38,935,653 cubic yards (CY), with 19,242,950 CY of capacity remaining. The Badlands landfill has a maximum permitted daily capacity of 4,800 tons per day, with a permitted capacity of 34,400,000 CY, with 15,748,799 CY of capacity remaining. According to Jurisdiction Landfill Tonnage Reports from Riverside County Waste Management Department, 2,037,163 total tons of solid waste was hauled to County landfills in 2015. Therefore, the proposed project would consist of 0.0031% of solid waste generation within the County of Riverside. The City of Coachella contracts with Burrtec Waste and Recycling Services to provide regular trash, recycling, and green waste pickup. It is not anticipated that the project will generate a significant amount of construction waste, as the project

[6] https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates

aims to use any excavated material on site, with a neutral amount of cut and fill. However, should the proposed project need to remove any excess soils, the soil removal will be accomplished using trucks during normal working hours, with a maximum of 50 round trips per day. Furthermore, any hazardous materials collected on the project site during either construction of the Project will be transported and disposed of by a permitted and licensed hazardous materials service provider. Therefore, the Project is expected to comply with all regulations related to solid waste under federal, state, and local statutes. The Project is expected to comply with all regulations related to solid waste under federal, state, and local statutes and be served by a landfill(s) with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. No further mitigation is necessary.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact or Does Not Apply
XIV. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
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 the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) 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)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

SUBSTANTIATION

The analysis in this Initial Study and the findings reached indicate that the proposed project can be implemented without causing any new project specific or cumulatively considerable unavoidable significant adverse environmental impacts. Mitigation is required to control potential environmental impacts of the proposed project to a less than significant impact level. The following findings are based on the detailed analysis of the Initial Study of all environmental topics and the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the previous text and summarized following this section.

a. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The Project has no potential to cause a significant impact any biological or cultural resources. The project has been identified as having minimal potential to degrade the quality of the natural environment, substantially reduce 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, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. Based on the historic disturbance of the project area, and its

current condition, the potential for impacting biological resources is low; however, mitigation has been identified in order to protect nesting birds. The cultural resources evaluation concluded that the Project footprint does not contain any known important cultural resources, but to ensure that any accidentally exposed subsurface cultural resources are properly handled, contingency mitigation measures will be implemented. With incorporation of Project mitigation measure all biology and cultural resource impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level.

b. *Less Than Significant Impact* – The proposed project will not cause a significant impact on the environment once implemented or during construction with proper site design and mitigation. The nature of the Project as a Travel Center are such that without proper site design and mitigation, leaks and spills could occur. However, with the construction of Underground Storage Tanks for the gasoline and diesel storage that include leak detection, and a site design that ensures that no runoff from either minor fuel leaks or remnants of car wash solution, no significant long-term impacts to the environment would occur from Project operations. Based on the analysis in this Initial Study, any impacts under this issue are considered less than significant.

c. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The Project has 10 potential impacts that are individually limited, but may be cumulatively considerable. These are: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology/Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems. The Project is not considered growth-inducing, as defined by *State CEQA Guidelines.* These issues require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and ensure that cumulative effects are not cumulatively considerable. All other environmental issues were found to have no significant impacts without implementation of mitigation. The potential cumulative environmental effects of implementing the proposed project have been determined to be less than considerable and thus, less than significant impacts.

d. *Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated* – The Project will achieve long-term community goals through the provision of growth in tax dollars generated within the City. The short-term impacts associated with the Project, which are mainly construction-related impacts, are less than significant with mitigation, and the proposed Project is compatible with long-term environmental protection. The issues of Air Quality, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, and Noise require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce human impacts to a less than significant level. All other environmental issues were found to have no significant impacts on humans without implementation of mitigation. The potential for direct human effects from implementing the proposed project have been determined to be less than significant.

Conclusion

This document evaluated all CEQA issues contained in the latest Initial Study Checklist form. The evaluation determined that either no impact or less than significant impacts would be associated with the issues of Agricultural and Forestry Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population/Housing, Public Services, and Recreation. The issues of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation and Traffic, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems require the implementation of mitigation measures to reduce Project specific and cumulative impacts to a less than significant level. The required mitigation has been proposed in this Initial Study to reduce impacts for these issues to a less than significant impact level.

Based on the findings in this Initial Study, the City of Coachella proposes to adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Coachella Travel Centre Project. A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration (NOI) will be issued for this Project by the City. The Initial Study and NOI will be circulated for 30 days of public comment. At the end of the 30-day review period, a final MND package will be prepared and it will be reviewed by the City for possible adoption at a future City Council meeting, the date for which has yet to be determined. If you or your agency comments on the MND/NOI for this

Project, you will be notified about the meeting date in accordance with the requirements in Section 21092.5 of CEQA (statute).

_____

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*,(1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; San *Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Revised 2016
Authority: Public Resources Code sections 21083 and 21083.09
Reference: Public Resources Code sections 21073, 21074, 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, 21082.3/ 21084.2 and 21084.3

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

Aesthetics

AES-1 The proposed structures shall be painted in colors that closely match the surrounding desert landscape, so as to create continuity in the potentially obscured views. The colors chosen shall be approved by the City of Coachella's architectural review process.

AES-2 Prior to approval of the Final Design, an analysis of potential glare from sunlight or exterior lighting to impact vehicles traveling on adjacent roadways shall be submitted to the City for review and approval. This analysis shall demonstrate that due to building orientation or exterior treatment, no significant glare may be caused that could negatively impact drivers on the local roadways or impact adjacent land uses. If potential glare impacts are identified, the building orientation, use of non-glare reflective materials or other design solutions acceptable to the City of Coachella shall be implemented to eliminate glare impacts.

Air Quality

AQ-1 Fugitive Dust Control. The following measures shall be incorporated into Project plans and specifications for implementation:

- Apply soil stabilizers or moisten inactive areas;
- Water exposed surfaces as needed to avoid visible dust leaving the construction site (typically 2-3 times/day);
- Cover all stock piles with tarps at the end of each day or as needed;
- Provide water spray during loading and unloading of earthen materials;
- Minimize in-out traffic from construction zone;
- Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, or loose material and require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard; and
- Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried out from the construction site.

AQ-2 Exhaust Emissions Control

- Utilize well-tuned off-road construction equipment.
- Establish a preference for contractors using Tier 3-rated or better heavy equipment.
- Enforce 5-minute idling limits for both on-road trucks and off-road equipment.

AQ-3 Exposed surfaces shall be watered at least three times per day during grading activities.

Biological Resources

BIO-1 The State of California prohibits the "take" of active bird nests. To avoid an illegal take of active bird nests, any grubbing, brushing or tree removal should be conducted outside of the the State identified nesting season (Raptor nesting season is February 15 through July 31; and migratory bird nesting season is March 15 through September 1). Alternatively, the site shall be evaluated by a qualified biologist prior to the initiation of ground disturbace to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds. Active bird nests MUST be avoided during the nesting season. If an active nest is located in the project construction area it will be flagged and a 300-foot avoidance buffer placed around it. No activity shall occur within the 300-foot buffer until the young have fledged the nest.

Cultural Resources

CUL-1 Should any cultural resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an

onsite inspection shall be performed immediately by a qualified archaeologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the City's onsite inspector. The archaeological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.

CUL-2 Should any paleontological resources be encountered during construction of these facilities, earthmoving or grading activities in the immediate area of the finds shall be halted and an onsite inspection should be performed immediately by a qualified paleontologist. Responsibility for making this determination shall be with the City's onsite inspector. The paleontological professional shall assess the find, determine its significance, and make recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures within the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Geology and Soils

GEO-1 Based upon the geotechnical investigation (Appendix 4), all of the recommended design and construction measures identified in Appendix 4 (listed on Pages 12-25) as well as the Seismic Design Parameters (Pages 10-11) shall be implemented by the Applicant into the project design. Implementation of these specific measures will address all of the identified geotechnical constraints identified at project site.

GEO-2 Stored backfill material shall be covered with water resistant material during periods of heavy precipitation to reduce the potential for rainfall erosion of stored backfill material. If covering is not feasible, then measures such as the use of straw bales or sand bags shall be used to capture and hold eroded material on the Project site for future cleanup.

GEO-3 All exposed, disturbed soil (trenches, stored backfill, etc.) shall be sprayed with water or soil binders twice a day, or more frequently if fugitive dust is observed migrating from the site within which the Coachella Travel Centre is being constructed.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1 All spills or leakage of petroleum products during construction activities will be remediated in compliance with applicable state and local regulations regarding cleanup and disposal of the contaminant released. The contaminated waste will be collected and disposed of at an appropriately licensed disposal or treatment facility. This measure will be incorporated into the SWPPP prepared for the Project development.

Transportation / Traffic

TRAF-1 The construction contractor will provide adequate traffic management resources, as determined by the City of Coachella. The City shall require a construction traffic management plan for work in public roads that complies with the Work Area Traffic Control Handbook, or other applicable standard, to provide adequate traffic control and safety during excavation activities. At a minimum this plan shall include how to minimize the amount of time spent on construction activities; how to minimize disruption of vehicle and alternative modes of transport traffic at all times, but particularly during periods of high traffic volumes; how to maintain safe traffic flow on local streets affected by construction at all times, including through the use of adequate signage, protective devices, flag persons or police assistance to ensure that traffic can flow adequately during construction; the identification of alternative routes that can meet the traffic flow requirements of a specific area, including communication (signs, webpages, etc.) with drivers and neighborhoods where construction activities will occur; and at the end of each construction day roadways shall be prepared for continued utilization without any significant roadway hazards remaining.

Utilities and Service Systems

UTL-1 If recycled water becomes available at the project site, the Applicant shall connect to this system and utilize recycled water for landscape irrigation, and any other feasible uses of recycled water on the project site.

REFERENCES

City of Coachella, General Plan Update, Adopted April 22, 2015

CRM TECH, *"Historical/Archaeological Resources Survey Report: Coachella Travel Centre Project, Assessor's Parcel Number 763-020-021, City of Coachella, Riverside County, California"* dated March 15, 2019

Giroux & Associates, "Air Quality and GHG Impact Analysis Coachella Travel Centre Project, Coachella, California" dated March 16, 2019

Goodman & Associates, Inc., "Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Coachella Travel Center, Avenue 50 & State Route 86" dated January 2019

Jericho Systems, Inc., "Biological Resources Assessment & Jurisdictional Delineation, Coachella Travel Centre, APN 763-020-01, Avenue 50 and Highway 86, -Coachella, CA" dated February 14, 2019

Soils Southwest, Inc., "Feasibility Study Preliminary Report of Soils and Foundation Evaluations, Proposed Commercial Development Planned Gas Station/Retail, Restaurant, Car Wash, and Hotel, SWC Avenue 50 & State Route 86, APN 763-0020-021-7" dated February 28, 2019

"State Route 86/Avenue 50 New Interchange Project, Initial Study with (Proposed) Mitigation Negative Declaration/Environmental Assessment" prepared by the State of California, Department of Transportation and the City of Coachella dated November 2018

https://www.coachella.org/home/showdocument?id=5783

https://www.coachella.org/Home/ShowDocument?id=4678

https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/FTA_Noise_and_Vibration_Manual.pdf

https://www.cvusd.us/uploaded/pdf_files/departments/business_services/facilities/Developer_Fees.pdf.pdf

https://www.coachella.org/Home/ShowDocument?id=5678

https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates

FIGURES

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX 4