

**FINAL  
INITIAL STUDY  
AND  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
LAKE PERRIS STATE RECREATION AREA  
LIFEGUARD HEADQUARTERS REPLACEMENT**

**PUBLIC USE IMPROVEMENTS**

**December 2003**

Prepared for the California Department of Parks and Recreation  
Inland Empire District



## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**PROJECT: LAKE-PERRIS STATE RECREATION AREA LIFEGUARD HEADQUARTERS  
REPLACEMENT  
PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS**

**LEAD AGENCY:** California Department of Parks and Recreation

**AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS:** The Initial Study for this Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for review at:

Southern Service Center  
California Department of Parks &  
Recreation  
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, # 270  
San Diego, California 92108

Inland Empire District  
California Department of Parks &  
Recreation  
17801 Lake Perris Drive,  
Perris, CA 92571

Cesar E. Chavez Library  
163 East San Jacinto Avenue  
Perris, CA 92570

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The project proposes to partially demolish/remove all interior walls and finishes within the existing 900 square foot lifeguard headquarters and tower building. An addition of new construction will provide a new facility of approximately 3,000 square feet in total. The new facility will provide storage and garage space, a suitable living situation for the parks canine, as well as lifeguard office space, first aid storage and treatment area, locker rooms and a training room. The existing building has complete utility services and the intent is to reuse the existing utilities, however some amount of trenching will be required to make necessary connections with new lines from the building. The existing facility has a two story tower which will remain. The new construction will utilize the existing one story structure and add a slightly taller one story structure. The design of the new facility will be structured around the guidelines for sustainable design. The LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) checklist will be used to provide guidance in design decisions regarding site design, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere design, reuse of materials and resources, indoor environmental quality, and for innovation and design processes. As part of preliminary design, a soils engineer will need to take several soil borings of approximately 20'-0" deep to determine the soil type.

A copy of the Initial Study is attached. Questions or comments regarding this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration may be addressed to:

Ronald A. Saenz, Environmental Coordinator  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
Southern Service Center  
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, Suite 270

San Diego, California 92108  
Phone: (619) 688-3354  
[rsaenz@parks.ca.gov](mailto:rsaenz@parks.ca.gov)

Pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has independently reviewed and analyzed the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the proposed project and finds that these documents reflect the independent judgment of DPR. DPR, as lead agency, also confirms that the project mitigation measures detailed in these documents are feasible and will be implemented as stated in the Negative Declaration.

# TABLE of CONTENTS

<b><u>Chapter/Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>1</b> INTRODUCTION.....	1
<b>2</b> PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	4
<b>3</b> ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING.....	8
I. Aesthetics.....	8
II. Agricultural Resources.....	8
III. Air Quality.....	8
IV. Biological Resources.....	8
V. Cultural Resources.....	12
VI. Geology and Soils.....	15
VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	15
VIII. Hydrology and Water Quality.....	15
IX. Land Use and Planning.....	15
X. Mineral Resources.....	16
XI. Noise.....	16
XII. Population and Housing.....	16
XIII. Public Services.....	16
XIV. Recreation.....	16
XV. Transportation/Traffic.....	16
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems.....	17
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST.....	18
<b>4</b> MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.....	44
<b>5</b> PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....	46
<b>6</b> SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES.....	47
<b>7</b> REFERENCES/DOCUMENT PREPARATION.....	50

## **Appendices**

- A** MAPS/FIGURES
- B** PROJECT DESIGN GRAPHICS

# CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed “Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement” project at Lake Perris State Recreation Area (LPSRA) in Riverside County, California. This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code §21000 *et seq.*, and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §15000 *et seq.* The project is funded in its entirety through the State of California’s Minor Capital Outlay Program.

An Initial Study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment [CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)]. If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines that revisions in the project plans or proposals (made by or agreed to) mitigate the potentially significant effects to a less-than-significant level, a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared instead of an EIR [CEQA Guidelines §15070(b)]. The lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons a proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why an EIR need not be prepared. The IS/MND conforms to the content requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15071.

## 1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b)(1), “the lead agency will normally be an agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose.” The lead agency for the proposed project is DPR. The contact person for the lead agency is:

Ronald A. Saenz, Environmental Coordinator  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
Southern Service Center  
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, Suite 270  
San Diego, California 92108  
Phone: (619) 688-3354  
Fax: (619) 220-5400  
E-mail: [rsaenz@parks.ca.gov](mailto:rsaenz@parks.ca.gov)

### **1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION**

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement project at Lake Perris State Recreation Area. Mitigation measures have also been incorporated into the project to eliminate any potentially significant impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level.

This document is organized as follows:

#### **Chapter 1 - Introduction.**

This chapter provides an introduction to the project and describes the purpose and organization of this document.

#### **Chapter 2 - Project Description.**

This chapter describes the reasons for the project, scope of the project, and project objectives.

#### **Chapter 3 - Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.**

This chapter identifies the significance of potential environmental impacts, explains the environmental setting for each environmental issue, and evaluates the potential impacts identified in the CEQA Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist. Mitigation measures are incorporated, where appropriate, to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

#### **Chapter 4 - Mandatory Findings of Significance**

This chapter identifies and summarizes the overall significance of any potential impacts to natural and cultural resources, cumulative impacts, and impact to humans, as identified in the Initial Study.

#### **Chapter 5 – Project Alternatives**

This chapter summarizes the alternatives considered for the Lake Perris State Recreation Area Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement Project.

#### **Chapter 6 - Summary of Mitigation Measures.**

This chapter summarizes the mitigation measures incorporated into the project as a result of the Initial Study.

#### **Chapter 7 – References/Document Preparation.**

This chapter identifies the references and sources used in the preparation of this IS/MND. It also provides a list of those involved in the preparation of this document.

## 1.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of this document contains the Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist that identifies the potential environmental impacts (by environmental issue) and a brief discussion of each impact resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

Based on the IS and supporting environmental analysis provided in this document, the proposed Lake Perris Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement project will result in less-than-significant impacts for the following issues: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

In accordance with §15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a MND shall be prepared if the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment after the inclusion of mitigation measures in the project. Based on the available project information and the environmental analysis presented in this document, there is no substantial evidence that, after the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment. It is proposed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

## **CHAPTER 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

This IS/MND evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed Lake Perris Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement project. The project proposes to partially replace the existing 900 square foot lifeguard headquarters and tower building with a new approximately 3,000 square foot facility. The new facility will provide storage and garage space, a suitable living situation for the parks canine, as well as lifeguard office space, first aid storage and treatment area, locker rooms and a training room. The existing facility has a two story tower which will remain.

### **2.2 PROJECT LOCATION**

Lake Perris State Recreation Area is a designated unit of the State Park system. With approximately 8,200 acres, the park serves as an important water storage facility and provides excellent recreation opportunities such as: swimming, fishing (shore, pier and boat), boating, sailing, waterskiing, and a special area for scuba diving. The Park is located 18 miles southeast of the City of Riverside.

### **2.3 EXISTING FACILITIES AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT**

The existing lifeguard headquarters building is aging, outdated and has a constricted floor plan of less than 900 square feet, including the lifeguard tower. There is only one locker room with showers because at the time the building was constructed, women lifeguards were uncommon. The building has one small office and storage space. Currently the lifeguards must maintain offices and use the conference room in the main park headquarters office complex on the far side of the park.

In addition, lifeguard vehicles and equipment are currently stored in the maintenance facilities behind the District Headquarter offices, a distance from the lake. A secure environment is needed for storing lifeguard vehicles and equipment near their point of use while providing protection from the sun and wind exposure.

Since the existing lifeguard headquarters building was constructed approximately 25 years ago, the volume of recreational water users has increased dramatically. The lifeguard staff has at least tripled since the park originally opened and has become more gender diversified. Male and female lifeguards currently must share the existing shower and locker room facilities. The existing building has one small office space and does not have room for additional office space or a training room.

Lake Perris is also home to the statewide reservoir lifeguard training program. Training at this location has many advantages, including a warmer year-round climate, high

visitation during training season, a variety of water-based recreational facilities, and good layout. However, due to the condition of the existing buildings, the training program has been temporarily relocated to Folsom Lake where training conditions are less than optimal. With the anticipated increase in visitation, it has become even more important to provide appropriate and adequate facilities for the reservoir lifeguard training program.

The purpose of this project is to provide appropriate facilities for the current LPSRA lifeguard operations as well as the statewide reservoir lifeguard training program.

## **2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this project is to make improvements to the lifeguard headquarter's day-to-day operations and improved training facilities for reservoir lifeguards. The objectives related to this proposed project center primarily on the improvement of the lifeguard headquarters. Project features would provide:

- Improved meeting facility
- Improved office and work stations
- A first aid storage area
- Separate female and male restrooms
- A garage and storage area

The proposed project, as outlined above, will further the Department's mission by:

- Improving the quality of life in California by increasing the diversity and availability of high quality recreational experiences and opportunities.
- Providing and maintaining a supportive infrastructure for continued park use and maintenance, and the protection of park resources.
- Providing education, interpretation, and leadership to assist the public in understanding the significance and value of the state's natural and cultural resources.
- Providing a safe environment within State Parks.

## **2.5 Project Description**

DPR proposes to make several improvements to the lifeguard headquarters at LPSRA. The following is a summary of the planned improvements:

### **2.5.1 Construct A Training Conference Room At The Lifeguard Headquarters**

This room will accommodate a maximum of 40 persons seated comfortably. This area will also be used for defensive tactics training and lifeguard training. A central dividing partition will allow for separate instructional uses at the same time. Multi media capability will allow for other benefits like video conferencing. This room will also be used as a training room and a briefing room.

### **2.5.2 Construct Office and Work Stations**

The new area will allow for heavy operational use during business hours. These spaces will accommodate lifeguards, a lifeguard supervisor and seasonal lifeguards. All workstations will allow for computer stations and phones. An area will be designated, as the Kitchenette will be adjacent to the office areas.

### **2.5.3 Construct First Aid Storage**

This area will be used to store medications and other consumables.

### **2.5.4 Construct Restrooms**

Separate female and male ADA restrooms shall be provided with accessibility to the office area and conference room.

### **2.5.5 Construct Garage and storage**

The garage will accommodate, at different time periods, up to two vehicles, ventilated storage areas for dive gear, paddle board trailer, personal water craft, seized vehicles and other multi-purpose uses. It is also desired that one bay of the garage accommodate space for locking evidence, such as a seized personal watercraft or vehicle. Space for cliff rescue equipment and other lifeguard training equipment will also need to be allocated. The garage will have 12 feet of overhead clearance in the bays. The area above the garage will be used for long-term storage.

### **2.5.6 Construct A Locker Room**

The restroom will be a female and male locker room facility. There will be full size lockers in the room. Private single user female and male showers and changing rooms will be provided.

## **2.6 Project Construction**

The construction window for this project will be from October 26, 2004 to April 11, 2005. Improvements will be limited to those areas that were disturbed in the past or are otherwise devoid of sensitive natural, cultural and historical resources. All work will occur during daylight hours.

## **2.7 ATTENDANCE HISTORY**

The general plan indicates that the beaches can accommodate 15,000 visitors per day. Additionally, there are 450 boats (including jet-skis, sailboats, speedboats, etc.) per day allowed in the park. On a typical summer weekend, all 426 campsites will be full, with approximately 2,000 people camping overnight.

## **2.8 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND POLICIES**

The project provides for improved service and safety for the LPSRA. This project is consistent with local plans and policies because it is replacing an existing lifeguard facility. It is also consistent with the Western Riverside County Stephens' Kangaroo Rat HCP, as the facility is located in a previously developed area which is not included in lands designated in that plan to be managed for preservation of SKR.

## **2.9 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS**

DPR has approval authority for the proposed "Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement" project at LPSRA.

## **2.10 RELATED PROJECTS**

DPR often has other projects and/or maintenance programs planned for a park unit. Currently, there are plans to construct an amphitheater located in the campground approximately one mile from the site. In addition, miscellaneous improvements to upgrade facilities are planned in order to comply with the American Disabilities Act. No other additional work, other than regular maintenance, is currently in progress or planned for this area.

## CHAPTER 3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

### 3.1 GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL DESCRIPTION

LPSRA is a designated unit of the State Parks system and consists of approximately 8,200 acres, 2,000 of which is reservoir. The LPSRA is located in Riverside County (Figure 1, Appendix A).

#### 3.1.1 Aesthetics

The principal aesthetic resource at LPSRA is the scenic quality of the lake and natural surroundings. Factors that contribute to this scenic beauty include the diversity of topography and surrounding mountains.

#### 3.1.2 Agricultural Resources

Currently there are no agricultural resources within the boundaries of the LPSRA.

#### 3.1.3 Air Quality

The closest air pollution monitoring station to the project site is located in the City of Perris. Measurements taken at the Perris station exceeded the 1-hour federal standards for ozone four times and state standards fifty four times for the year 2000. The 8-hour state standards for ozone was exceeded thirty nine times that same year. The County of Riverside where Lake Perris is located is considered an extreme non attainment area for ozone.

#### 3.1.4 Biological Resources

##### Environmental Setting

The project site is located in a disturbed, man-made environment that is adjacent to the reservoir and does not represent any plant community. The project site's surrounding wildlife habitat types can be classified as barren and urban. Barren habitats are typically absent of vegetation, and they include open sandy beaches, rocky outcrops, and urban settings that are covered with pavement and buildings. Urban habitats include shade trees, lawns, and street strips. The lake itself represents a lacustrine habitat type. The LPSRA that surrounds these habitat types contains additional habitat types and plant communities.

The two main plant communities within the LPSRA are the Riversidean sage scrub and the non-native grassland communities. Remnant patches of native perennial grasses

can be found among the non-native grassland community. Riparian areas also occur within the LPSRA, and they can be found along the edges of the lake as well as along springs and seeps that are further from the lake's edge.

### **SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES**

To determine the sensitive plant and animal species that have the potential to occur at or near the project site, park species lists were reviewed, and a query of the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was conducted for sensitive species within the Perris and Sunnymead 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle maps. Forty special status species, 10 plant species and 30 wildlife species, were considered to have the potential to occur at or near the project site (see Table 1).

Due to the highly disturbed and developed nature of the project site, none of the potential special status plant or wildlife species are expected to occur at the project site. However, several special status wildlife species are known to occur at LPSRA.

Rocky outcroppings within the LPSRA's sage scrub and grasslands and the scrub and grasslands themselves provide habitat for reptile species like the rosy boa (*Charina trivirgata*), the northern red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus exsul*), the coastal western whiptail (*Cnemidophorus tigris multiscutatus*), and the orange-throated whiptail (*Cnemidophorus hyperythrus*). These and other special status reptile species are not expected at the project site due to the absence of suitable habitat.

The lake provides forage for ospreys (*Pandion haliaetus*) and on rare occasions, bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*). Upland areas provide foraging grounds for northern harriers (*Circus cyaneus*) and loggerhead shrikes (*Lanius ludovicianus*). The LPSRA's grasslands are home to the California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris actia*) and the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*). The California thrasher (*Toxostoma redivivum*) can be found in the SRA's sage scrub. These and other special status bird species are not expected at the project site due to the absence of suitable habitat.

Table 1. Special Status Species with the potential to occur at LPSRA

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS
San Jacinto Valley crownscale	<i>Atriplex coronata</i> var. <i>notatior</i>	CNPS List 1B
South coast saltscale	<i>Atriplex pacifica</i>	CNPS List 1B
Parish's brittlescale	<i>Atriplex parishii</i>	CNPS List 1B
Thread-leaved brodiaea	<i>Brodiaea filifolia</i>	FT, SE, CNPS List 1B
Smooth tarplant	<i>Centromadia pungens</i> ssp. <i>laevis</i>	CNPS List 1B
Long-spined spineflower	<i>Chorizanthe polygonoides</i> var. <i>longispina</i>	CNPS List 1B
Slender-horned spineflower	<i>Dodecahema leptoceras</i>	FE, SE, CNPS List 1B
Coulter's goldfields	<i>Lasthenia glabrata</i> ssp. <i>coulteri</i>	CNPS List 1B
Spreading navarretia	<i>Navarretia fossalis</i>	FT, CNPS List 1B
Wright's trichocoronis	<i>Trichocoronis wrightii</i> var. <i>wrightii</i>	CNPS List 2
Southwestern pond turtle	<i>Clemmys marmorata pallida</i>	FSC, CSC
Rosy boa	<i>Charina trivirgata</i>	FSC
Orange-throated whiptail	<i>Cnemidophorus hyperythrus</i>	CSC
Coastal western whiptail	<i>Cnemidophorus tigris multiscutatus</i>	FC
Northern red-diamond rattlesnake	<i>Crotalus exsul</i>	CSC
San Diego horned lizard	<i>Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei</i>	CSC
Western spadefoot toad	<i>Scaphiopus hammondi</i>	FSC, CSC
Sandstone night lizard	<i>Xantusia henshawi gracilis</i>	CSC
Cooper's hawk	<i>Accipiter cooperii</i>	CSC
Tricolored blackbird	<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	FSC, CSC
Golden eagle	<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>	CSC
Short-eared owl	<i>Asio flammeus</i>	CSC
Burrowing owl	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	FSC, CSC
American bittern	<i>Botaurus lentiginosus</i>	FSC
Costa's hummingbird	<i>Calypte costae</i>	FSC
Lawrence's goldfinch	<i>Carduelis lawrencei</i>	FSC
Northern harrier	<i>Circus cyaneus</i>	CSC
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	SE
White-tailed kite	<i>Elanus leucurus</i>	FSC
California horned lark	<i>Eremophila alpestris actia</i>	CSC
Prairie falcon	<i>Falco mexicanus</i>	CSC
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	SE
Loggerhead shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	FSC, CSC
Osprey	<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>	CSC
Coastal California gnatcatcher	<i>Polioptila californica</i>	FT, CSC
Black-chinned sparrow	<i>Spizella atrogularis</i>	FSC
California thrasher	<i>Toxostoma redivivum</i>	FSC
Northwestern San Diego pocket mouse	<i>Chaetodipus fallux fallux</i>	CSC
Stephen's kangaroo rat	<i>Dipodomys stephensi</i>	FE, ST
Los Angeles pocket mouse	<i>Perognathus longimembris brevinasus</i>	CSC

Status Codes: FE=Federally Endangered; FT=Federally Threatened; FC=Federal Candidate Species; FSC=Federal Species of Concern; SE=State Endangered; ST=State Threatened; CSC=California Species of Concern; CNPS=California Native Plant Society; List 1B=Plants Rare, Threatened, or Endangered in California and Elsewhere; List 2=Plants Rare, Threatened or Endangered in California, but More Common Elsewhere.

The Stephen's kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*) occurs in the park's grasslands. This nocturnal rodent prefers sparse perennial vegetation and nests in burrows. Urbanization and cultivation have resulted in the habitat loss that has led to the decline of this species. This and other special status mammal species are not expected at the project site due to the absence of suitable habitat.

Lake Perris SRA is included in two separate conservation plans, the Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat in Western Riverside County (SKRHCP) that was adopted in March 1996 and the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (MSHCP) that was adopted in June 2003. Much of LPSRA is within the San Jacinto-Lake Perris Core Reserve that is identified in the SKRHCP. This core reserve does not include existing facilities at LPSRA or the proposed project area. The entire LPSRA is also included in an identified a core area (Existing Core H) within the MSHCP Conservation Area, which is an area that is designated to provide for the conservation of the species that are covered by the MSHCP. The MSHCP is focused on the conservation of 146 species of plants and animals, including both listed special-status species and unlisted species. Forty-nine planning species are identified for the Existing Core H area.

The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of these conservation plans.

#### **SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES**

Sensitive natural communities are those that are regionally uncommon, unusually diverse, or of special concern to local, state, and federal agencies. Elimination or substantial degradation of these communities would constitute a significant impact under CEQA. According to the CNDDDB, the Southern Sycamore Alder Riparian Woodland is a sensitive natural community that exists within the Sunnymead quadrangle. However, no sensitive natural communities are found at the project site.

#### **WETLANDS AND WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES**

The US Army Corps of Engineers defines wetlands as lands that are inundated or saturated by surface or ground water at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and under normal conditions do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. There are no wetlands present at or adjacent to the project site.

Waters of the United States are defined to include intrastate lakes like Lake Perris. For the purposes of this project, if construction (including but not limited to, grading, dredging, discharge, or fill) will occur within the banks of the lake, permit approval may be required from the US Army Corps of Engineers, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the Department of Fish and Game. It is not anticipated that construction will occur within the banks of the lake.

### 3.1.5 Cultural Resources

#### Precontact & Ethnographic Information

The Lake Perris area falls within the territory of four known prehistoric groups: including Cahuilla (east), Luiseño (south), Gabrielino (west), and Serrano (north). These groups were four distinct tribes that spoke different languages, though they employed a relatively similar lifestyle. The project area is closer to the known boundaries of the Luiseño and Cahuilla people in prehistoric times (that is prior to settlement by Europeans in 1769). Early contacts found them hostile to the Spanish. Bean has described the lifestyle and adaptation of the Cahuilla in detail (Bean 1978; 1972:). It is likely that the Cahuilla inhabited this area late in prehistoric times. It is thought the inhabitants of the Lake Perris area were displaced from the Salton Sea basin: when the Colorado River was diverted. The Luiseño in contrast were thought to have occupied an area approximately bounded by Lake Elsinore, Temecula, and Palomar Mountain to the east.

The Cahuilla belong to the Cupan subgroup of the Takic family of the Uto-Aztekan language stock.. Luiseño, Cupeño, Cahuilla, and Gabrielino all belong to the same Takic subfamily. This group was probably a somewhat late entrant into California, coming from the Great Basin area with a few exceptions. Cahuilla people learned to adapt to a variety of climatic and geographical zones in which they lived. This included areas of desert, foothills, mountains, and inland valleys.

The Luiseño were similar in lifestyle to the Cahuilla, however they were less adapted to the desert preferring coastal, valley, and foothill environments. They fished and hunted both inland and on the coast. They probably emphasized fishing more than the Cahuilla. They utilized throwing sticks to kill rabbits. Their population could have reached 10,000 people prior to Spanish contact in 1769. This would be equivalent to the Chumash. Many descendants still live on the Pechanga reservation in Temecula. They probably also inhabited portions of Lake Perris.

The Cahuilla were similar to the Gabrielino, Serrano, and Luiseño. However, they mostly interacted with the Gabrielino and Serrano (Bean 1978; 1972). Villages were located in canyons or on flood plains near permanent water sources (Bean 1978:575). A series or network of trails connected villages, following natural features of the topography.

The Cahuilla were generally hunter/gatherers relying on hunting deer and small game as well as collecting a variety of seeds, acorns, cacti, and other plants for food. Hunting was generally the duty of men. Late in prehistoric times some agriculture was practiced with the most common crops being corn, beans, squash, and melons similar to practices in the Southwest. Houses were generally domed shaped. In the desert areas, often brush shelters sufficed. A men's sweathouse and granaries were common in the villages (Bean 1978).

Baskets and pottery were made and utilized for a variety of tasks including seed collecting, food storage, water storage, bowls, dishes, and cooking pots. Pottery was often painted and incised. They also used a carrying net.

Little is known about the early inhabitants to California in this area. It is thought they hunted Big Game, but newer data indicates that they hunted smaller game, & waterfowl. They were highly mobile foragers. They were occupying the shores of Lake Elsinore by 8,500 years ago (Grenda 1997:278-279). By the Middle Period, inhabitants were using acorns as a staple food source as well as other available plants, roots, and seeds in the areas inhabited. Villages were situated around lakeshores and near floodplains of rivers. Village sizes had increased and the inhabitants were more sedentary. The archeological data at sites like Lake Elsinore show that the newer data is not always consistent with the existing theories.

Sites in Lake Perris date from 380 B.C. to about A.D. 1680 (O'Connell and Wilke et al. 1974). This time period of occupation is based on radiocarbon dates and relative dates from artifacts recovered from sites at Lake Perris. One early time marker, includes an Elko-Eared projectile point which, dates from 1000 B.C. to A.D. 600. Other archeological data might indicate that the actual date is closer to the middle to late portion of that time-period.

### **Previous Archaeological Work**

Previous archaeological work in the Lake Perris vicinity is spotty. More recent work is generally more comprehensive. The most comprehensive was a large survey and excavation carried out in 1960's and 1970's at Lake Perris. This survey was conducted by members of the Archaeological Research unit at UC Riverside. There are a significant number of sites in the Lake Perris region, most of them fairly Late in the cultural sequence

Surveys have been conducted in the general area of Lake Perris since the 1930's: by G.A. Smith, C.E. Smith, E. W. Shepard, and others (O'Connell, Wilke et al. 1974). In the early 1960's, the area of the Bernasconi Hills-Mt. Russell complex was surveyed by Eugene Shepard and Paul Chace. Shepard excavated sites such as the Charles Mott (Riv-464) and Dead Dog (RIV-202) site around the reservoir, but it is unknown whether the results were ever completed and reported on.

Archeological excavations have occurred at several sites in the Lake Perris basin. These include RIV-395, RIV-265, RIV-202 to name a few sites tested (O'Connell, Wilke et al. 1974). Other excavations occurred at the Dead Dog site, Charles Mott site, Oleander Tank site, Pepper tree site, and others. This study was important because it employed modern techniques and applied specific research questions to the study that are important to the region.

The most important aspect of the Lake Perris Archaeology project was the fact that it was a systematic approach to the region as a whole. It followed professional guidelines

by surveying and identifying sites and then testing specific sites that were threatened or would answer specific research questions about the occupants of the area and their lifestyle. It even identified a settlement pattern for the Lake Perris area by identifying types of sites and proposing a network affiliation for each site.

Another important excavation occurred at a site in nearby Lake Elsinore (Grenda 1997). Unfortunately, it could not resolve the question of a Late Shoshonean intrusion into the area, saying that the migration may have occurred about 3000 years ago (Grenda 1997:241-242) at the end of the La-Jollan complex.

Vandalism to archeological sites has been pretty rampant in the Lake Perris area. This extends from simple collecting of artifacts at sites, to massive dislocation of rock art, graffiti on rock art, grading, to almost complete destruction of sites. It seems to have been common for people to remove bedrock mortars from archeological sites at Lake Perris: no easy feat.

A variety of surviving Cahuilla people live on several reservations today including the Morongo, Ramona, Soboba, Agua Caliente, and Cahuilla. Some surviving Luiseño also live on the Pechanga, Pala, La Jolla, Pauma, Rincon, and Soboba reservations.

### **Project Work**

The proposed project of replacing the existing lifeguard tower, will have no impact on cultural resources at Lake Perris. The park unit has been thoroughly surveyed in the early 1970's. No archeological sites were found in the vicinity of the current lifeguard station. The site has been completely disturbed from previous development. There are also no historic resources in the project area. The immediate site area was examined for cultural resources and no artifacts were noted in the project APE.

### **HISTORIC INFORMATION**

The Lake Perris area has been used as grazing and as ranch land since the mid-1850's. Sheep roamed the valley. Perris the town gets its name from Fred T. Perris former chief engineer of the California Southern railroad. He was also one of the founders of the town. San Jacinto was a cattle ranch of Mission San Luis Rey. San Jacinto is one of four land grants named after the Saint. One of the rivers nearby Lake Perris is San Jacinto. Another prominent feature nearby is the Bernasconi Hills flanking the lake was named for Bernardo Bernasconi who developed the nearby springs in 1880's.

Lake Perris was named "Perris Reservoir State Recreation Area" in 1966. In 1968 it was officially named "Lake Perris". The Lake Perris lifeguard tower is not a historic building having been built in the 1970's.

### **3.1.6 Geology/Soils**

#### **Topography**

The LPSRA is located in the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province of Southern California. Lake Perris is located in the northern part of the Peninsular Ranges Province. At LPSRA the elevation ranges from about sea level to about 1700 feet. Features of the general area include gently sloping pediments and up steep, brushy hillsides to the ridgecrests (DPR 1976). These state lands surrounding Lake Perris are also part of a watershed.

#### **Geology/Soils**

The project location lies within a seismically active region subject to the effects of moderate to large earthquake events along two major faults: the San Jacinto fault (M6.4 to 7.3) and the Elsinore fault (6.5 to 7.3), as defined by the State of California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey (formerly known as the Division of Mines and Geology) (T. Deméré, PhD, San Diego Natural History Museum). The topography in the project areas consists of gently sloped land. Onsite elevations range between sea level and 1,700 feet above mean sea level. Soils in the area are mostly Ramona Sandy Loam. Soils of the LPSRA are quite absorptive and have relatively low content of organic matter.

### **3.1.7 Hazards**

There is no known hazardous contamination at the project site and the project site is not suspected of containing any hazardous wastes, debris, or soil contamination.

### **3.1.8 Hydrology**

The LPSRA lies in the San Jacinto Watershed of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board. The central hydrologic feature is the Lake Perris Reservoir. The lake has a “high pool” elevation of 1,588 feet, holds some 131,450 acre-feet of water and is rimmed by 10 miles of shoreline (DPR 2003).

Hydrologic characteristics for the area are closely tied to seasonal and cyclic weather patterns. Precipitation from rain and snow are the source of runoff and groundwater. Most of the stream flows in the area are intermittent, fed by seasonal precipitation (DPR 1976).

### **3.1.9 Land Use & Planning**

Existing land use in the LPSRA includes recreation, interpretation, and maintenance use. Lake Perris itself is a public water supply managed by the Department of Water Resources.

### **3.1.10 Minerals**

Granitic rock is the predominant rock in the vicinity of LPSRA. Mineral resources in the area include sand, gravel, stone and clay (CGS 2000).

### **3.1.11 Noise**

Vehicles arriving and leaving the LPSRA parking lot and watercraft on the lake generate the primary source of noise in the project area.

### **3.1.12 Population and Housing**

The closest community to the project site, the City of Perris, has a total population of 38,200, consisting of 56.1% Hispanic, 22.8% white, 15.4% African American, .4% American Indian, 2.6% Asian, 2.2% mixed race, and .2% other, with a median age of 25.4. However the project area lies in close proximity to the Greater Riverside Metropolitan Area, which has a population base of 1,545,387, consisting of 51% white, 36.3 Hispanic, 6% African American, .7% American Indian, 3.6% Asian, 2.2% mixed race, and .2% other, with a median age of 32.8. The area surrounding the project site has a low population density residing in primarily single-family households. Total housing units in the Perris area number 10,553 out of the 584,674 housing units within Riverside County (US Census–2000).

### **3.1.13 Public Services**

The City of Perris' Police Department and DPR rangers provide law enforcement for the LPSRA. The City of Perris Fire Department provides fire protection and ambulance services.

### **3.1.14 Recreation**

Current recreational use of the LPSRA include: swimming, fishing (shore, pier and boat), boating, sailing, water skiing, and a special area for scuba diving. Wildlife includes ducks and Canada Geese. Anglers can find rainbow trout, catfish and Alabama spotted bass. The area also offers opportunities for hikers, bikers and equestrians. Rock climbing is featured in an area south of the dam. In addition, the lake offers small game and wildlife hunting.

### **3.1.15 Transportation/Traffic**

The Lake Perris Lifeguard Headquarters is accessible via County Highway 60 or I-215.

### **3.1.16 UTILITIES**

#### **Sewer**

There is currently a sewer system that serves the current Lifeguard Headquarters.

#### **Water**

A gravity-feed distribution system supplies water to the park area.

#### **Electric**

There is electrical power supplied to the current Lifeguard Headquarters.

#### **Telephone**

There is currently telephone service provided to the Lifeguard Headquarters.

#### **Gas**

There is currently a gas supply that serves the Lifeguard Headquarters.

### 3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION	
1. Project Title:	Lake Perris SRA Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement
2. Lead Agency Name & Address:	California Department of Parks and Recreation
3. Contact Person & Phone Number:	Ron A. Saenz, Environmental Coordinator (619) 688-3354
4. Project Location:	Lake Perris State Recreation Area <sup>(LPSRA)</sup>
5. Project Sponsor Name & Address:	Inland Empire District California Department of Parks & Recreation 17801 Lake Perris Drive, Perris, CA 92571
6. General Plan Designation:	State Recreation Area
7. Zoning:	Park Land/Open Space
8. Description of Project:	Replace lifeguard headquarters at the Lake Perris State Recreation Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Construct a conference room which will accommodate a maximum of 40 persons.</li><li>• Construct new office and workstations.</li><li>• Provide a new first aid storage area.</li><li>• A uni-sex ADA restroom and standard unisex restrooms shall be provided.</li><li>• A garage and storage area will be constructed.</li><li>• Construct a unisex locker room which will include private single user unisex showers and changing rooms.</li></ul>
9. Surrounding Land Uses & Setting:	Refer to Section IX, Land Use Planning in this chapter.
10. Approval Required from Other Public Agencies	None

## 1. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below will 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.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems     | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None        |

## DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

I find that, although the original scope of the proposed project **COULD** have had a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect because revisions/mitigations to the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL** be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or its functional equivalent will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment. However, at least one impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described in the report's attachments. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the impacts not sufficiently addressed in previous documents.

I find that, although the proposed project could have had a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to applicable standards, and have been avoided or mitigated, pursuant to an earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, all impacts have been avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level and no further action is required.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald A. Saenz  
Environmental Coordinator - Southern Service Center

\_\_\_\_\_  
November 6, 2003  
Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
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 (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:
  - a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.
  - b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.
  - c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. A source list should be appended to this document. Sources used or individuals contacted should be listed in the source list and cited in the discussion.
8. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:
  - a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question **and**
  - b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

### 3.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The Environmental Analysis (Initial Study) Checklist was prepared to assess the impact of the proposed project's impact on the environment. The environmental setting for each topic is described in Section 3.1 above. Potential environmental impacts, identified by checklist point, are addressed in the discussion section. For each impact identified as "less than significant with mitigation," mitigation measures have been specified to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

#### I. AESTHETICS

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION

- a) The proposed project at LPSRA will not hinder accessibility to or block visibility of scenic areas. The benefit to the recreational experience far outweighs the effect of the visual impact. Construction activities may have a limited temporary impact on the viewshed, but obstructions will be extremely limited and brief in duration. There will be no long-term or permanent impact to the existing scenic vista. Therefore, the impact from this project will be less than significant.
- b) No scenic resources, natural or historical, will be damaged with implementation of the proposed project. No impact.
- c) The proposed improvements will be designed to blend in with the existing landscape as much as possible. As with any construction project, there will be some temporary decrease in the visual appeal of the area immediately affected by the work being performed. However, the duration of the work in any one area will be limited and overshadowed by the improvements to recreational use that will result from the proposed project. Therefore, the impact from this project will be less than significant.
- d) Lighting is not a major element of this project and will not substantially exceed what is currently in place. No impact.

## II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT*:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

\*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 Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland.

### DISCUSSION

a-c) The LPSRA is not zoned for agriculture. None of the land within the parks, or areas impacted by the proposed projects is included in any of the Important Farmland categories, as delineated by the California Department of Conservation, under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). This project contains no component that will have an effect on any category of California Farmland, conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract, or interfere with the use or result in the conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. No impact.

### III. AIR QUALITY

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT*:</b>				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

\*Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make these determinations.

#### DISCUSSION

- a) Work proposed with this project is not in conflict with and will not obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan for Riverside County Air Basin. No impact.
- b,c) Grading activities associated with construction of the proposed facilities will result in limited surface disruption and operation of diesel-powered construction equipment will emit ozone precursor emissions. Except for project access roads, which will remain unimproved, construction vehicle trips for all of the facility improvements will occur via paved roads, minimizing dust generation during truck trips.

The proposed project consists of constructing a new lifeguard headquarters, however, the project provides for limited capacity and it is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in visitors to the area, therefore, the project will not introduce any new air emissions associated with fossil fuel combustion or particulate matter.

The operation of the new facilities will not result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing, projected, or cumulative air quality violation. The proposed project will not emit air contaminants at a level that, by themselves, will violate any air quality standard, or contribute to a permanent or long-term increase in any air contaminant. However, project construction will generate short-term emissions of fugitive dust (PM<sub>10</sub>) and involve the use of equipment and materials that will emit ozone precursors (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROG] and nitrogen oxides(NO<sub>x</sub>)). Increased emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, ROG, and NO<sub>x</sub> could contribute to existing non-attainment conditions and interfere with achieving the projected attainment standards. Consequently, construction emissions will be considered a potentially significant short-term adverse impact. Implementation of

the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURE AQ-1**

- All active construction areas will be watered at least twice daily during dry, dusty conditions. On windy days or when fugitive dust can be observed leaving the project site, additional applications of water will be applied to maintain a minimum 12 percent moisture content (as required by SCAQMD Rule 403).
- All trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials on public roads will be covered or required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Traffic speed on unpaved roads will be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- Intersections of public and private roads will be swept daily, with water sweepers, if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- Exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) subject to wind erosion will be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily, or stabilized with (non-toxic) soil binders.
- All equipment engines will be maintained in good condition, in proper tune (according to manufacturer's specifications), and in compliance with all State and federal requirements.
- Grading activities will be suspended when sustained winds exceed 25 mph, instantaneous gusts exceed 35 mph, or dust from construction might obscure driver visibility on public roads.
- Soil stabilization and revegetation will be used in those areas where vegetation was damaged or destroyed within project boundaries during grading activities, immediately after completion of work. The project manager/contractor will consult with a DPR-qualified resource ecologist to determine the appropriate type and level of revegetation necessary for each area.

- d) As noted in the discussion above (III b,c), project construction will generate dust and equipment exhaust emissions for the duration of the project. No residences are located on or near the project site. These circumstances, in conjunction with Mitigation Measures AQ-1 above, will reduce the potential adverse impact to a less than significant level.
- e) The proposed work will not result in the long-term generation of odors. Construction-related emissions might result in a short-term generation of odors, including diesel exhaust, fuel vapors, and evaporative emissions from asphalt paving materials. Some visitors to the general area might consider these odors objectionable. However, because construction activities will be short-term and odorous emissions will dissipate rapidly in the air with increased distance from the source, area visitor exposure to these odors will be extremely limited [see (d) above]. Potential odor impacts will be considered less than significant.

#### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION

- a) Although LPSRA is home to several special status species, due to the highly disturbed and developed nature of the site, no sensitive, candidate, or special status species are expected to occur at the project site. No impact.
- b) Neither riparian habitat nor sensitive natural communities are present within the project site. No impact.
- c) No wetlands occur within the project site. No impact.
- d) Proposed project activities would not interfere with the movement of any other native resident or migratory fish, wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. No impact.

- e) The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies, plans, or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impact.
- f) Lake Perris SRA is within the boundaries of the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan. The plan covers several species including the Stephen's kangaroo rat. The proposed project does not conflict with the provisions of this plan. No impact.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO IMPACT</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

The proposed project of replacing the existing lifeguard tower, will have no impact on cultural resources at Lake Perris. The park unit has been thoroughly surveyed in the early 1970's. No archeological sites were found in the vicinity of the current lifeguard station. The site has been completely disturbed from previous development. There are also no historic resources in the project area. The immediate site area was examined for cultural resources and no artifacts were noted in the project APE.

## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<u>IMPACT</u> <b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable, as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or properties?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION

- A As noted in the Environmental Setting in Section 3.1, the project locations lie within a seismically active region subject to the effects of moderate to large earthquake events along major faults, as defined by the State of California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey (formerly known as the Division of Mines and Geology). Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels.

#### MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-1

- The design and construction of all structures and facilities included in the proposed project will comply with the 1997 UBC Zone 4 seismic requirements, Riverside County Planning Department regulations, and all other applicable local, state, and federal

guidelines and permitting requirements.

- b) Potential exists for loss of soil during the planned grading and/or excavation. However, any grading that will take place would be minimal because the sites are mostly level. The following mitigation measures, combined with **AIR-1**, will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-2 EROSION**

- Best Management Practices will be used in all areas to control soil and surface water runoff, such as recontouring, placement of geotextiles or biodegradable reinforcement, and drainage and slope erosion control methods, as appropriate. Soil disturbance will be minimized during the rainy season by the use of temporary BMPs, including such things as covering of any stockpiled soils, silt fences, straw bales, straw or rice wattles, and sediment detention basins to prevent soil loss and siltation into streams.

- c) The site is flat and lies on granitic alluvium. The site is generally considered to be stable and there are no areas immediately adjacent to the project with the potential for lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. However, since the project location is immediately adjacent to the lake it may have a higher potential for liquefaction. The level of liquefaction hazards at the proposed facility locations would be low to moderate. Impacts will be less than significant.
- d) The soils are not considered to be expansive in the vicinity of the project as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997). No impact.
- e) The lifeguard headquarters is hooked up to the sewer system. No impact.
- f) There are no known unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features within the proposed project areas. Implementation of **CULT-1** will reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level. No impact.

## VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION

- a) Construction activities will require the use of certain potentially hazardous materials, such as fuels, oils, and solvents. These materials are generally used for excavation equipment, generators, and other construction equipment and will be contained within vessels engineered for safe storage. Large quantities of these materials will not be stored at the construction site. Spills, upsets, or other construction-related accidents could result in a release of fuel or other hazardous substances into the environment. The following

mitigation measures will reduce the potential for adverse impacts from these incidents to a less than significant level.

**MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT-1 SPILLS**

- All construction equipment will be inspected for leaks immediately prior to the start of construction, and regularly inspected thereafter until equipment is removed from park premises.
- The contractor(s) will prepare an emergency spill response plan prior to the start of construction and maintain a spill kit on site throughout the life of the project. This plan will include a map that delineates construction staging areas, where refueling, lubrication, and maintenance of equipment may occur. In the event of any spill or release of any chemical during construction, in any physical form on or immediately adjacent to park property, the contractor will immediately notify the appropriate DPR staff (e.g., project manager or supervisor). Emergency containment procedures will be immediately initiated to prevent contamination of the area.
- Equipment will be cleaned and repaired (other than emergency repairs) outside the park boundaries. All contaminated water, sludge, spill residue, or other hazardous compounds will be disposed of outside park boundaries, at a lawfully permitted or authorized location.

- b) See the VII (a) discussion above. Mitigation Measure **HAZMAT-1** will reduce the potential for adverse impacts to a less than significant level.
- c) There are no schools or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, this section does not apply to this project. No impact.
- d) The LPSRA is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. Therefore, no impact will occur with project development. However, the contamination hazards addressed above are addressed here:
- e,f) LPSRA is not located within a private airport land-use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public-use airport. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.
- g) All construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of LPSRA and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. Therefore, the impact of this project on an emergency response or evacuation plan will be less than significant.
- h) The project will not add any new uses that could create additional long-term or permanent increased fire risks. The man-made environment within the APE does not represent any plant community because it is barren. The vegetation in the surrounding area consists of Riversidean sage scrub and non-native grasslands. Grasslands can become highly flammable during the dry season (June-October). Heavy equipment can get very hot during the warmer part of the work season; this equipment will not be in close proximity to this vegetation. No impact.

## VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there will 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 will drop to a level that will not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which will result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which will result in on- or off-site flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place structures that will impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION

- a) The LPSRA is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control District (SARWQCD). The project will be in compliance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. (See Mitigation Measure HAZMAT 1 regarding potential impacts from accidents, spills, or upset.) Project-related grading will not create changes that would significantly alter existing drainage patterns. Grading will

be conducted in such a way as to maintain or improve drainage and will not increase flow or result in increased sedimentation in existing drainages. Ground disturbance will be minimal, further lessening the chance of any impact to surface water quality. The project scope does not include waste discharge work of any kind and will not increase or alter existing conditions. Project location, design, in combination with the mitigation measures indicated above for accidental hazardous material exposure and use of BMPs, will control soil erosion and surface water runoff and insure no water quality standards are violated. This will result in a less than significant impact to water quality and waste discharge.

- b) There will be no impact to water supplies.
- c) See VIII (a) discussion above. This project will not significantly alter drainage patterns in the area. The project is small with minimal grading. Grading will be designed to complement the natural drainage patterns in the area and reduce erosion from stormwater. No impact.
- d) See VIII (a,c) discussions above. This project will not alter drainage patterns in a manner that could result in on- or off-site flooding.
- e) See VIII (c) discussion above. This project will not exceed the capacity of the existing drainage system and will not introduce polluted runoff into the existing system. No impact.
- f) Project design features have resulted no impact.
- g) This project does not include the construction of housing. No impact.
- h) See VIII (g) discussion above. No structures will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact.
- i) See VIII (g,h) discussion above. The project area does not lie within a 100-year floodplain but is located directly behind Lake Perris dam. Since, its proximity is behind the dam it does not expose people or structures to flooding. No impact
- j) The project is located far from the coast and would not likely be affected by seiche or tsunamis. The project will not change the likelihood of either of these events. No impact.

## IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION

- a) The project will not divide an established community because there are none existing within the boundaries of LPSRA. No impact.
- b) This project is consistent with all applicable state and local land use plans, policies, and regulations. With certification of this Mitigated Negative Declaration, the project will be in compliance with CEQA. No impact.
- c) The project area is including in the planning area for the Western Riverside County Stephens' Kangaroo Rat HCP, as well as the Western Riverside Multiple Species Conservation Plan. The project is located in a previously developed area, and does not conflict with either of the plans. No impact.

## X. MINERAL RESOURCES

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION

- a) No easily retrieved mineral resources of local or regional importance have been identified within project boundaries by the Mineral Land Classification Program (administered by the California Department of Mines and Geology). (Refer to Section 3.1.10). Therefore, no loss of mineral resources will occur as a result of the proposed project. No impact.
- b) The project site has not been classified or nominated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact.

**XI. NOISE.**

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Be 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? If so, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- a) Construction noise levels at and near the project area will fluctuate, depending on the type and number of construction vehicles operating at any given time. There are no noise-sensitive land uses located in the vicinity of the project site that will be substantially affected by the proposed construction-related activities. However, short-term increases in ambient noise levels could result in a potential increase in annoyance to passers by and those who may be recreating in the general vicinity of the project. As a result, construction-generated noise will be considered to have a potentially significant short-term impact to nearby noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., passers by). Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce those potential impacts to a less than significant level.

<p><b>Mitigation Measure Noise 1</b></p> <p>Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours; alterations in this schedule will be made to address overriding construction considerations or worker safety. No work will take place on weekends or holidays.</p> <p>Internal combustion engines used for any purpose at the job site will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. Equipment and trucks used for construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., engine enclosures, acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, intake silencers, ducts, etc.) whenever feasible and necessary.</p>
---

Stationary noise sources and staging areas will be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. If they must be located near sensitive receptors, stationary noise sources will be muffled to the extent feasible and/or, where practicable, enclosed within temporary sheds.

- b) Construction activity will not involve the use of explosives, pile driving, or other intensive construction techniques that could generate significant ground vibration or noise. Minor vibration immediately adjacent to grading equipment will only be generated on a short-term basis. Therefore, groundborne vibration or noise generated by the project will have a less than significant impact.
- c) Once the proposed project is completed, all related construction noise will disappear. Nothing within the scope of the proposed project will result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.
- d) See XI (a) discussion above. Mitigated to a less than significant impact.
- e,f) The project area is not located within an private airport land-use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public-use airport. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.

## XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION

- a) Work proposed by this project is designed primarily to meet the needs of State Park employees to provide public services. The project will not have a housing component and all work will take place within the confines of the park boundaries, with no additions or changes to the existing local infrastructure. Therefore, it will have no impact on population growth in the area.
- b) As noted in the XII (a) discussion above, the project will have no housing component and will neither modify nor displace any existing housing. No impact.
- c) As noted in the XII (a) discussion above, the project will have no housing component and will displace no one, either temporarily or permanently. No impact.

### XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION

a) There will be no need to create or alter any government facilities with implementation of this project. Alterations to the area as a result of the proposed project will be minor, designed to provide improved lifeguard headquarters facilities. As the project is designed to meet the needs of the current user population, the level of required services is expected to remain relatively static. Any impact on services will be temporary and nothing in the project scope will contribute to the need for an increase in the level of public services.

#### XIV. RECREATION

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### DISCUSSION

a,b) No project component will substantially increase visitation or demands to this or any other park or recreational facility in the area. No impact.

## XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that will substantially increase hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### DISCUSSION

- a) A significant increase in visitation to the area of LPSRA is not anticipated as a result of the proposed project. All construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of the park and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. The addition of several vehicles entering and leaving during daylight hours will not constitute a substantial increase in traffic volume or result in congestion at the park entrances, or restrict the public's access to adjacent areas. Additionally, most heavy equipment will be stored on park property for the duration of the project, further reducing the traffic impacts. Therefore, the project will result in a less than significant impact.
- b) Per the XV (a) discussion above, the impact on congestion resulting from the additional construction vehicles to normal traffic, which is typically light, will be minimal and have no impact on the acceptable Level Of Service for this area.
- c) The LPSRA is not located within a private airport land-use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public-use airport. Nothing in the proposed project will in any way affect or change existing air traffic patterns in the area. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.

- d) As noted in the XV (a) discussion above, all construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of the LPSRA, and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. There are no incompatible uses related to this proposed project. No impact.
- e) All construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of the LPSRA and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. Therefore, the impact of this project on emergency access or response will be less than significant.
- f) Project construction will generate a temporary demand for construction worker vehicle parking. This parking demand will not be substantial and will likely be accommodated in the construction staging areas. No impact.
- g) There are no policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation that apply to the project or project area. The project will have no impact.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) The project is within the jurisdiction of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control District. The project will be in compliance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. (See Mitigation Measure **HAZMAT-1** regarding potential impacts from accidents, spills, or upset.) No impact.
- b) The proposed project will add two restrooms, however, the addition of these restrooms will have less than a significant impact. It contains no elements that will have an impact on public water or wastewater treatment facilities. No impact.
- c) Project grading is designed to maintain or enhance existing natural drainage patterns to avoid stormwater erosion. And alteration to overall drainage patterns will be minimal. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on existing stormwater drainage facilities or require the construction of new facilities.

- d) Current water supplies will adequately serve the proposed facilities even with minimal additional demands associated with the proposed construction, and projected future use. Therefore, this project will have a less than significant impact on water supplies.
- e) The proposed facilities would have the ability to handle future demands as the capacity of the facilities is limited and restricted to seasonal use. Installation of vault toilets will not increase wastewater treatment demands. Less than significant impact.
- e) The proposed work will increase the Park's solid waste disposal needs very little over current park uses and will be in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations, therefore, this project will have no impact.
- f) This project will comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste. No impact would result from this project.

**CHAPTER 4**  
**MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.**

<u>IMPACT</u>	<u>POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION</u>	<u>LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT</u>	<u>NO</u>
<b>WILL THE PROJECT:</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) The proposed project was evaluated for potential significant adverse impacts to the natural environment. Because the project area serves as the current lifeguard headquarters, there is a high degree of disturbance of the natural environment in the area. Project-related impacts are focused in disturbed areas and would not affect any native plant community. Impacts to sensitive plant or animal species are not anticipated as none were observed on the project sites.
  
- b) The proposed project will not eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory by disturbing potential archaeological features and resources. No archeological sites were found in the vicinity of the current lifeguard station. The site has been completely disturbed from previous development. There are also no historic resources in the project area.
  
- c) DPR often has other smaller maintenance programs and rehabilitation projects planned for a park unit. Because the mission of LPSRA is to protect and preserve the natural and cultural resources of the area, while making them available for public enjoyment, there may be numerous maintenance and restoration projects on-going at any time. Ongoing maintenance/rehabilitation activities are designed to protect and enhance areas of public

use within Parks and typically do not have a negative effect on the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Currently ongoing or other proposed projects include a amphitheater project with an interpretive element. However, no other additional projects, other than routine maintenance, are planned for the proposed project area in the foreseeable future. Moreover, impacts from other environmental issues addressed in this evaluation do not overlap in such a way as to result in cumulative impacts that are greater than the sum of the parts. Less than significant impact.

- d) Most project-related environmental effects have been determined to pose a less than significant impact on humans. However, possible impacts from construction accidents (Hazards and Hazardous Waste), as well as noise, though temporary in nature, have the potential to result in significant adverse effects on humans. These potentially significant adverse impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level when all mitigation measures incorporated into this project are fully implemented.

## CHAPTER 5 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives were considered for this project:

**Alternative 1** Demolition of the existing lifeguard headquarters and construction of new, multi-purpose lifeguard facility.

This alternative would provide for the demolition of the existing lifeguard headquarters and the construction of a new, multi-purpose 3,000 square foot lifeguard facility. The new building will include a lifeguard tower, a garage with vehicle and equipment storage, a training/conference room, offices for lifeguards/lifeguard supervisors, separate female and male restrooms, a first aid room, and separate female and male locker rooms with showers. This larger facility will allow for the consolidation of all lifeguard activities in one location and will enhance safety by keeping the lifeguard staff and equipment on-site and adjacent to the areas used by recreational water users. It will also provide the optimal location for the statewide reservoir lifeguard training program.

**Alternative 2** (Rehabilitate Existing Lifeguard Tower and Building)

The existing 900 square foot structure is small, outdated, and dilapidated and has a constrained floor plan that does not provide the needed space for a training room, an additional locker room with showers, lifeguard offices, or a garage bay. This building could be rehabilitated at a cost savings compared to the proposed project. However, due to its deteriorated condition and constricted floor plan it is not worth rehabilitating. Much of the existing building's floor plan can not be remodeled to allow for more efficient use of space.

**Alternative 3** (Construct an Auxiliary Building to be used in conjunction with the Existing Building)

This alternative would allow for the construction of a new 1,800 to 2,400 square foot lifeguard facility to supplement existing space. The new structure would include a garage with vehicle and equipment storage, a training room, offices for lifeguards/lifeguard supervisors, a uni-sex restroom, and one locker room with showers. This new building would be used in conjunction with the existing building which provides the necessary lifeguard tower, one locker room with showers, a small office and storage rooms. The existing building would still need to be rehabilitated and brought up to current standards. Much of the existing building's floor plan can not be remodeled to allow for more efficient use of space. The two separate buildings would not function as well operationally as would the single building proposed in this project.

**Alternative 4** (No project)

This would not provide the safety enhancements, training facility or improved operational efficiencies that the new lifeguard multi-purpose building would provide.

## CHAPTER 6 SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures will be implemented by DPR as part of the LPSRA Lifeguard Headquarters Replacement project.

### **AIR QUALITY**

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES AIR-1**

- All active construction areas will be watered at least twice daily during dry, dusty conditions. On windy days or when fugitive dust can be observed leaving the project site, additional applications of water will be applied to maintain a minimum 12 percent moisture content (as required by SCAQMD Rule 403).
- All trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials on public roads will be covered or required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Traffic speed on unpaved roads will be limited to 15 miles per hour (mph).
- Intersections of public and private roads will be swept daily, with water sweepers, if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- Exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) subject to wind erosion will be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily, or stabilized with (non-toxic) soil binders.
- All equipment engines will be maintained in good condition, in proper tune (according to manufacturer's specifications), and in compliance with all state and federal requirements.
- Excavation and grading activities will be suspended when sustained winds exceed 25 mph, instantaneous gusts exceed 35 mph, or dust from construction might obscure driver visibility on public roads.
- Soil stabilization and revegetation will be used in those areas where vegetation was damaged or destroyed during grading, immediately after completion of work. The project manager/contractor will consult with a DPR-qualified resource ecologist to determine the appropriate type and level of revegetation necessary for each area.

### **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES BIO-1**

- Not applicable.

### **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES CULT-1**

Not applicable.

### **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES GEO-1**

- The design and construction of all structures and facilities included in the proposed project will comply with the 1997 UBC Zone 4 seismic requirements, Riverside County Planning Department regulations, and all other applicable local, state, and federal guidelines and permitting requirements.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES GEO-2**

- If any grading will occur, appropriate measures will be taken to control soil and surface water runoff, including recontouring, placement of geotextiles or biodegradable reinforcement, and drainage and slope erosion control methods, as appropriate. If storms are anticipated during construction, “winterizing” will occur, including the covering of any stockpiled soils and the use of temporary erosion control methods to protect disturbed soil. Other temporary erosion control measures will be used as needed and may include the use of silt fences, straw bales, weed-free straw or rice wattles, and sediment detention basins to prevent soil loss and siltation into the lake.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

### **MITIGATION MEASURES HAZMAT-1**

- All equipment will be inspected for leaks immediately prior to the start of construction, and regularly inspected thereafter until equipment is removed from park premises.
- The contractor(s) will prepare an emergency spill response plan prior to the start of construction and maintain a spill kit on site throughout the life of the project. This plan will include a map that delineates construction staging areas, where refueling, lubrication, and maintenance of equipment may occur. In the event of any spill or release of any chemical during construction, in any physical form on or immediately adjacent to park wetlands, or on park property, the contractor will immediately notify the appropriate DPR staff (e.g., project manager or supervisor). Emergency containment procedures will be immediately initiated to prevent contamination of wetlands.
- Equipment will be cleaned and repaired (other than emergency repairs) outside the park boundaries. All contaminated water, sludge, spill residue, or other hazardous compounds will be disposed of outside park boundaries, at a lawfully permitted or authorized location.
- A safety plan will be developed and reviewed by all project staff prior to the start of any work. Job site characteristics to reduce the potential for fire will be included.
- Spark arrestors or turbo-charging (which eliminates sparks in exhaust) and fire extinguishers will be required for all heavy equipment.
- Construction crews will be required to park vehicles away from flammable material, such as dry grass and brush. At the end of each workday, heavy equipment will be parked over mineral soil, asphalt, or concrete to reduce the chance of fire.
- Park staff will be required to have a State Park radio on site, which allows direct contact to City of Perris Fire Department and centralized dispatch center, to facilitate the rapid dispatch of control crews and equipment in case of a fire. Fire suppression equipment will also be available on park grounds.

## **NOISE**

### **MITIGATION MEASURES NOISE-1**

- Construction activities will be generally limited to daylight hours; alterations in this schedule will be made to address overriding construction considerations or worker safety. No work will take place on weekends or holidays.

- Internal combustion engines used for any purpose at the job site will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. Equipment and trucks used for construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., engine enclosures, acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, intake silencers, ducts, etc.) whenever feasible and necessary.
- Stationary noise sources and staging areas will be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. If they must be located near sensitive receptors, stationary noise sources will be muffled to the extent feasible and/or, where practicable, enclosed within temporary sheds.

## CHAPTER 7 REFERENCES / DOCUMENT PREPARATION

### MATERIALS REFERENCED

California Air Resources Board (CARB). Area Designations Maps/State and National (updated May 13, 2002). <http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm>

Bean, Lowell John, 1978, "Cahuilla" in California, Vol. 8 in Handbook of North American Indians. Smithsonian Institution. Washington. Pages 575-587.

DPR Archeological Report #14. February 20 , 1973.

DPR A Survey of the Natural History of Lake Perris State Recreation Area, December 1976.

DPR Lake Perris General Development Plan, January 1972.

DPR Lake Perris General Development Plan, October 2003.

Dudek & Associates, Inc. 2002. Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan. Prepared for the County of Riverside Transportation and Land Management Agency.

Grenda, Donn, 1997, Continuity & Change. 8,500 Years of Lacustrine Adaptation on the Shores of Lake Elsinore. Statistical Research Technical Series #59. Tucson Arizona.

Mukat's People, 1972, : The Cahuilla Indians of Southern California. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

O'Connell, James F. and Phillip Wilke et al., 1974, Perris Reservoir Archeology: Late Prehistoric Demographic Change in Southeastern California. Prepared by the Archaeological Research Unit, University of California, Riverside.

Riverside County Habitat Conservation Agency. 1996. Habitat Conservation Plan for the Stephens' Kangaroo Rat in Western Riverside County, California.

U.S. Census Bureau, <http://factfinder.census.gov>

## **REPORT PREPARATION**

Nicholas Loisos  
Landscape Architect  
Design Manager  
Southern Service Center

Anthony Brown  
Project Manager  
Southern Service Center

Patricia K. Autrey  
Staff Services Manager I  
Environmental Coordinator  
Southern Service Center

Karen L. Miner  
Senior Resource Ecologist  
Natural Resources Supervisor  
Southern Service Center

Herb Dallas  
Associate Archaeologist  
Southern Service Center

Christina L. Robinson  
Associate Park and Recreation Specialist  
Environmental Coordinator  
Southern Service Center

Amy Palkovic  
Associate Resource Ecologist  
Natural Resources Coordinator  
Central Service Center

Ron Saenz  
Associate Park and Recreation Specialist  
Environmental Coordinator  
Southern Service Center

Robert Shanaberger  
Research Analyst I (GIS)  
Southern Service Center



