

**SKYBORNE SPECIFIC PLAN  
ADDENDUM NO. 1  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

**StoneRidge Specific Plan  
Environmental Impact Report  
(State Clearinghouse No. 2004061026)**

**DESERT HOT SPRINGS, CALIFORNIA**



*Prepared for:*

**CITY OF DESERT HOT SPRINGS**  
65-950 Pierson Blvd  
Desert Hot Springs, California 92240

*Prepared by:*



**MSA CONSULTING, INC.**  
34200 Bob Hope Drive  
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

**AUGUST 2015**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAFT FOCUSED EIR

1.1	Previous Environmental Documentation.....	1
1.2	Purpose and Description of this Addendum.....	3
1.3	Basis for Addendum to EIR .....	5

### 2.0 SUPPLEMENTAL REVIEW

2.1	Air Quality .....	9
2.2	Biological Resources .....	10
2.3	Noise .....	11
2.4	Transportation and Traffic .....	12
2.5	Summary of Findings .....	13

### APPENDIX

A.	Urban Crossroads Updated Traffic Assessment	
----	---	--

## **1.0 Introduction**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires public agencies to analyze and consider the environmental consequences of their decisions to approve development projects over which they exercise discretion. CEQA achieves this objective by requiring agencies to prepare Environmental Impact Reports (EIR's) for projects with the potential to cause significant impacts on the physical environment. EIR's are public documents that assess environmental effects related to the planning, construction, and operation of a project, and indicate ways mitigate possible environmental damage. An EIR also discloses growth inducing impacts, effects found not to be significant, significant cumulative impacts, and significant impacts that cannot be avoided, if any. The purpose of an EIR is to inform. EIR's are not policy documents and they do not make recommendations on project approval or denial.

The lead agency is required to prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary, but such changes are deemed not to warrant the preparation of a subsequent EIR based on the conditions described in Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines states.

### **1.1 Previous Environmental Documentation**

In accordance with CEQA, the City of Desert Hot Springs (Lead Agency) originally approved the Stoneridge Specific Plan project and certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) with State Clearinghouse No. 2004061026, on December 7, 2004. The project EIR was certified in conjunction with a Development Agreement and permits issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The Stoneridge Specific Plan originally was approved as a gated community of 2,140 detached single-family units. Project entitlements included the StoneRidge Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment 02-04 (GPA), Change of Zone 02-04 (CZ), Development Agreement 01-04 (DA) and Tract Maps 32029 & 32030. Build-out of the project was intended to occur in response to market demands. The project name was subsequently changed to "Skyborne" in 2006 and has been used since.

Construction of the project began in 2006, but subsequently ceased in 2008 primarily due to the housing market collapse and recession. As a result, much of the project property remains undeveloped. Home construction is 90% complete in Village I and 25% complete in Village II. Both Villages are currently occupied by residents. Proposed Amendment No. 1 to the Skyborne Specific Plan intends to refocus the project to accommodate an active adult housing

component in Villages IV-VII and allowing this as an option to traditional single-family residential development in Village IX in the western portions of the project.

During the cessation of construction, a series of permitted activities took place on the property pursuant to an approved grading permit (No. 2013-102) and supporting agreements. The chronological order of those activities occurred as follows:

On May 15, 2013, Skyborne LLC entered into an agreement with Tri-Star Contracting II, Inc (“Tri-Star”) to export earth material from approximately 4 acres at the northwest corner of the Specific Plan area. The export quantity was estimated at 54,500 cubic yards, resulting in approximately 700-end dump loads (21 tons each). Tri-Star was required to obtain the appropriate permits through the City, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and other applicable regulatory agencies. The activities also involved the implementation of temporary measures to control soil erosion and fugitive dust.

On May 23, 2013, the original agreement was amended via “Addendum 1” to include the import of soil, concrete, asphalt, and steel with an estimated total quantity of 30,000 cubic yards. The import would result in approximately 3,000 truckloads based on 12 cubic yards of compacted material per truck. As part of these activities, Tri-Star was required to provide on-site treatment of the material by screening it into compliance before the material could be transported to the appropriate landfill or concrete recycling facility. The clean fill material would be compacted in place and become property for on-site use or marketing. Addendum 1 maintained that all fugitive dust control measures would be followed in accordance with the City and SCAQMD standards.

On July 31, 2013, a mass grading permit (No. 2013-102) was issued by the City in favor of Skyborne Ventures LLC, as the owner, and Tri-Star, as the contractor. The permit applied to 103 acres generally occupying the northwest corner of the Specific Plan area. The corresponding grading agreements and bonds were established and accepted. In addition, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) was prepared and approved for the mass grading activities in order to comply with California’s General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (General Permit). The approved SWPPP and permit registration documents (WDID 733C367233) included a site analysis and an assessment of the planned land disturbance activities to identify opportunities for incorporating best practices (BMPs) and compliance measures. The SWPPP identified BMPs for implementation during and after construction in order to prevent potential pollution impacts to the soils, storm water runoff and receiving waters. The BMPs designed to eliminate or minimize the discharge of pollutants from land disturbance activities can be summarized as follows:

1. Good housekeeping practices for waste management, vehicle and equipment cleaning, and material handling and storage.
2. Procedures such as stabilized construction access points, scheduling/phasing to minimize areas of soil disturbance, soil stabilization and erosion/sediment control.
3. Measures to control debris disposal, releases of sediment laden liquids, spills, leakage, and dumping, and to prevent illicit connections during construction must be addressed through structural as well as non-structural BMPs.
4. Proper identification of individuals, their roles and responsibilities, including the Legally Responsible Person (LRP) or Assigned Signatory (AS), Qualified SWPPP Developer (QSD), Qualified SWPPP Practitioner (QSP), contractors, and subcontractors.
5. Proper management of permit registration documents

Prior to approval of subsequent actions that constitute a “project” under CEQA, the City is required to determine whether the environmental effects of such actions are within the scope covered by prior environmental analysis, and whether additional environmental analysis is required. If the agency finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 and Sections 15162, of the State CEQA Guidelines the project would not (1) result in new effects and would not substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant effects occur, then no supplemental or subsequent EIR is required.

Moreover, according to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, a project that is consistent with a development density in existing zoning, community plan, or general plan for which an EIR was certified, shall not require additional environmental review, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. According to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, the lead agency shall prepare an Addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions in State CEQA Guidelines 15162 have occurred.

## **1.2 Purpose and Description of this Addendum**

The current proposed Project (“Project”) that is the subject of this EIR Addendum consists of the Skyborne Specific Plan Amendment No. 1, Amendment to Development Agreement No. 01-04, and Tentative Parcel Map No. 36904. The collective purpose of the requested entitlements would guide the remaining Specific Plan development in a manner that includes housing for senior residents as an option to traditional single family residential development and reflects an updated buildout schedule. The environmental analysis also covers existing and future implementing tentative and final tract maps for a total of 2,140 residential housing units within the Skyborne project.

The proposed Amendment to Development Agreement No. 01-04 would modify certain aspects of the existing Development Agreement (No. 01-04) to reflect the current schedule of development. The Amendment acknowledges that a force majeure condition occurred due to the global economic crises of 2008, which resulted in a delay of the development schedule. The proposed Amendment includes an extension to the established Development Agreement Term and therefore an extension to the duration of phased construction activities, which will continue to occur according to the market demands.

The proposed Skyborne Specific Plan Amendment No. 1 (City of Desert Hot Springs Specific Plan No. 01-04 Amendment No. 1) identifies changes to the proposed development along with updated site and contextual information. The Skyborne Specific Plan consists of ten (10) family-oriented residential villages encompassing approximately 604 acres. The Specific Plan provides regulations, guidelines and standards that are consistent with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan.

The Skyborne Specific Plan Amendment No. 1 proposes to allow an alternative design of Villages IV, V, VI, VII and IX in the western portion of the Specific Plan with an Active Adult Community. As proposed, these villages could be developed for a senior household market of ages 55 years and above. This Amendment would maintain the overall total of 2,140 single-family homes as approved under the original Specific Plan, but would allow for adjusted parcel sizes, product mix, and subarea densities as well as residential floor plans to appeal to the needs of senior market households. In addition, a second clubhouse would be added to serve these senior neighborhoods. The updated project would not require any changes to the backbone infrastructure master plans (streets, sewer, water, etc.) as proposed in the original Specific Plan. Adopted by ordinance, the Stoneridge Specific Plan is the zoning regulation for the project site and consequently the Skyborne Specific Plan Amendment No.1 will revise the project zoning accordingly to support the inclusion of active adult housing products. .

Upon approval, construction of the project would resume in phases starting in 2016, and occur over a 13-to-18 year period in response to market demands and according to a logical and orderly extension of roadways, public utilities, and infrastructure. Completion of the proposed buildout would involve the resumption of grading activities and some export of soil, consistent with approved grading permits. This constitutes a minor variation from the certified EIR, which assumed an earthwork balance for air quality analysis.

The proposed phasing plan of improvements can be summarized as follows:

Phase I – Villages I, II and III; the Pierson Boulevard frontage excluding frontage of the out parcel; Karen Avenue frontage to the southernmost point of the out-parcel; the east-west spine road from Karen Avenue to and including the southernmost roundabout; the north/south

section of the spine road to the southernmost roundabout; and the drainage channel. As of 2015, Phase I is partially complete with paved and graded roads, graded lots, finished building pads and occupied homes as well as a completed community clubhouse.

Phase II – Villages IV, V, VI and VII; the Worsley Road frontage; the spine road section between the two roundabouts; the northernmost roundabout; the westerly spine roads from each roundabout to Worsley Road. As of 2015, Phase II exhibits rough graded backbone streets but no residential development.

Phase III – Villages VIII, IX and X; frontage on Mission Lakes Boulevard; Karen Avenue from Mission Lakes Boulevard to the northernmost point of the out-parcel; the spine road from the northernmost roundabout to Mission Lakes Boulevard. As of 2015, Phase III exhibits rough graded backbone streets and rough graded lots in the western third of the phase.

All areas left vacant during construction will be stabilized. Public Street improvements shall be installed according to the project phasing; so too will the perimeter walls and landscape treatments. As of 2015, Phase I is partially complete with graded lots, finished building pads and occupied homes.

### **1.3 Basis for an Addendum to an EIR**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 states that: *“The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of an subsequent EIR have occurred.”* Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

*(a) When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*

*Finding: The proposed entitlements in support of this EIR Addendum, including the proposed Skyborne Specific Plan Amendment No. 1, Amendment to Development Agreement No. 01-04, and Parcel Map No. 36904, as well as implementing tentative tract maps would largely be consistent with all elements of the adopted Stoneridge Specific Plan project, including the relevant land use classifications, density and overall total number of residential units (2,140), circulation system, utilities and*

*amenities. The proposed adjustments to incorporate senior housing designations are expected to result in reduced impacts related to traffic, air quality and noise while impacts pertaining to biological resources would remain unchanged.*

*Therefore, no major revisions are proposed in the project that would result in new or expanded impacts beyond those identified in the previously Specific Plan EIR.*

- (2) *Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*

*Finding: As previously described, construction of the project began pursuant to the development standards of the adopted Specific Plan, but subsequently ceased due to the economic recession. No substantial changes occurred in the planning areas that differ from the envisioned development conditions. No substantial changes have occurred in the community or region that would lead to new or expanded significant impacts, or substantially increase the severity of previously identified environmental effects.*

*The Stoneridge Specific Plan Area (Skyborne Specific Plan) of approximately 604 acres is situated within the City of Desert Hot Springs jurisdiction; bordered to the north by the future extension of Mission Lakes Boulevard; to the east by Karen Avenue; to the south by Pierson Boulevard; and to the west by Worsley Road. The project is located approximately 0.25 miles east of State Route 62 and 3 miles north of Interstate-10.*

*Per the approved Specific Plan, Villages I and II contain a mixture of finished pads, interior streets, onsite utilities and constructed homes. Approximately 90% of the planned residential development has occurred in Village I and 25% for Village II. Currently, both Villages are occupied by residents. Skyborne Drive, south of Promenade Drive, is currently paved. Also paved is the segment of Promenade Drive between Skyborne Drive and Karen Avenue. Villages III and X have been disturbed by grading activities, but remain undeveloped. Villages IV thru IX have had minimal grading and no development.*

*Per the approved Specific Plan, various street improvements have taken place in the immediate project surroundings. The ultimate half-section*



*width (major arterial) improvements along Pierson Boulevard, between Worsley Road and Karen Avenue are complete. The ultimate half-section width (collector) improvements along Karen Avenue, between Promenade Drive and Pierson Boulevard, are also complete. Karen Avenue, between Promenade Drive and Mission Lakes Boulevard is now largely paved with some pending half-section improvements (i.e. curb, sidewalk, etc). Worsley Road is also paved. Moreover, the recommended improvements from the approved project are currently built at the intersections of Skyborne Drive / Pierson Boulevard and Karen Avenue / Pierson Boulevard. Both intersections are now signalized and both provide separate eastbound left turn lanes. A stop sign control has been installed at the intersection of Karen Venue/Promenade Drive.*

*Implementation of the Specific Plan Amendment No. 1 will resume within the adopted planning area and be consistent with the existing and amended development standards.*

- (3) *New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*

- (A) *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;*

*Finding: The proposed Specific Plan Amendment does not present any new potentially significant effects that were not evaluated in the previous EIR.*

- (B) *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;*

*Finding: The analysis provided in this Addendum shows that the previously identified significant impacts of the adopted Specific Plan would not increase in severity through implementation of the proposed Amendment.*

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

*Finding: No changes in the feasibility of Specific Plan mitigation measures have been identified.*

- (D) *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative."*

*Finding: No new significant impacts on the environment have been identified in the Specific Plan Amendment. No additional or different mitigation measures or alternatives are deemed necessary to substantially reduce the significant impacts associated with the project. An adopted Statement of Overriding Considerations remains part of the certified EIR and applicable to Specific Plan project.*

Through the analysis described this Addendum, the City of Desert Hot Springs has determined that changes associated with the Skyborne Specific Plan (Amendment No. 1) are not substantial. There are no new significant impacts resulting from these changes, nor is there any substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental impacts. In addition, the changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken would not result in new or more severe environmental impacts.

## **2.0 Supplemental Review**

The following qualitative review on Air Quality, Biological Resources, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic provides supporting information demonstrating that no additional impacts or mitigation measures are required for the proposed Skyborne Specific Plan Amendment No. 1. The Stoneridge Final EIR identified potential adverse impacts to air quality and biological resources. In order to approve the project, the City Council adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations, stating that benefits from implementing the project outweighed the remaining post-mitigation environmental impacts identified in the Final EIR. The Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (Section 2.0 of the Adopted Final EIR) specifies a set of mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen the effects of implementing the project. The proposed project is required to comply with each applicable measure.

The supplemental review further demonstrates that the Project does not meet any of the criteria of Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines warranting for preparation of a subsequent EIR and meets the criteria of Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines for the preparation of an EIR addendum.

## 2.1 Air Quality

The topic of air quality was revisited for supplemental review in order to assess the potential changes in air quality impacts, as these can be substantially linked to land use, transportation, and traffic. Existing setting defined in the 2004 EIR was characterized as relatively undeveloped. Section 2.0 of the 2004 Stoneridge Specific Plan Final EIR found that during construction, the project would result in an exceedance of the SQAMD daily emissions significance thresholds criteria for CO, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. This impact to air quality was reduced below a level of significance through implementation of construction management practices (MM 2-1 and MM 2-2). This form of mitigation was implemented during the initial construction activities for the project's street improvements, and Villages I and II. The proposed Amendment would not preclude the project's ability to continue implementing the adopted construction mitigation measures necessary to maintain the impacts below a level of significance.

As indicated in the Transportation and Traffic Section of this addendum, an updated traffic study concluded that the current noise settings have not increased significantly in comparison to the 2003 baseline conditions. The updated analysis also determined that implementation of the Specific Plan Amendment would result in a reduced total number of trips per day in comparison to the approved Specific Plan. As a result, the factor of transportation and traffic is not expected to result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects on air quality than previously analyzed in the FEIR.

Furthermore, the 2004 EIR forecasted that project operations would exceed the SQAMD daily emissions significance thresholds criteria for CO, ROC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub>. The adopted mitigation measure to address this impact involved the requirement of project design actions to reduce operational emissions, including the required use of low-emission water heaters, use of central heating system and use of fireplaces or fire pits that rely on natural gas only and sufficient electrical outlets to promote the use of electric landscape equipment (MM 2-3). The proposed Amendment would not preclude the project's ability to continue implementing the adopted mitigation measures pertaining to operational emissions.

The amended project does not propose substantial changes to the project which would require major revisions to the FEIR due to new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects on air quality than previously analyzed in the FEIR. As described previously, changes have occurred in the project area in the form of grading and construction improvements pursuant to the development standards of the adopted Specific Plan their cessation in 2008.

During the pause in construction, temporary land disturbance activities took place in portions of the Specific Plan area pursuant to an approved grading permit (No. 2013-102) and

supporting permits. These past activities allowed for the temporary import and export of material to and from the property and the import, screening and export of miscellaneous concrete, asphalt and steel materials. Implementation of these activities was subject to the municipal and SCAQMD regulations on fugitive dust (PM10) control, thereby reducing air quality impacts. These activities were also regulated under the Construction General Permit with an approved SWPPP, which established waste management measures to reduce potential contamination of on-site soils and stormwater runoff. The remaining conditions of those activities include multiple temporary stockpiles, which have been subject to stabilization and which would be incorporated into the future grading operations upon project resumption.

Therefore, these changes will not require major revisions to the FEIR and would not result in substantially more severe environmental effects than the previously analyzed in the FEIR. Moreover, no new information of substantial importance, as described in subsection (a)(3) of Section 15164, has been revealed that would require major revisions to the FEIR or its conclusions.

## **2.2 Biological Resources**

Section 2.0 of the 2004 Stoneridge Specific Plan Final EIR found that the project would result in indirect effects on the surrounding biota due to invasion of exotic species, human intrusion, domestic pets, and lighting. As a result, Mitigation Measures 3-1 through 3-4 were adopted to reduce the impacts to the native biota. The remaining impacts were found to remain significant, as these were determined to be intrinsic to the nature of the project, making further reductions less feasible without relocating the project outside of the Coachella Valley or placing infeasible limitations on the development. The project was also found to result in potential impacts to waters of the United States and California, but MM 3-5 was found to reduce the potential impacts to below a level of significance.

At the time of Final EIR preparation and certification, the City of Desert Hot Springs was not a Permittee of the Coachella Valley Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (CVMSHCP). Anticipating a potential policy change, the adopted mitigation (MM 3-6) specified that if the CVMSHCP was approved by the City of Desert Hot Springs, the project would be required to pay the applicable mitigation fees on future building permits. Currently, the City of Desert Hot Springs and Mission Springs Water District are undergoing the final steps to become Permittees through a Major Amendment of the CVMSHCP.

The proposed Amendment would not preclude the project's ability to continue implementing the adopted mitigation measures pertaining to operational emissions. The amended project does not propose substantial changes to the project which would require major revisions to the FEIR due to new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects on biological

resources than previously analyzed in the FEIR. A regulatory change that has occurred since the 2004 EIR preparation is a Major Amendment to the CVMSHCP, which upon completion, will incorporate the City of Desert Hot Springs as a Permittee. As a result, the project will be required to pay the adopted mitigation fees. Physical improvements have occurred in the project area in the form of construction improvements consistent with the development standards of the adopted Specific Plan. Therefore, these changes will not require major revisions to the FEIR and would not result in substantially more severe environmental effects than the previously analyzed in the FEIR. Moreover, no new information of substantial importance, as described in subsection (a)(3) of Section 15164, has been revealed that would require major revisions to the FEIR or its conclusions

### **2.3 Noise**

The topic of noise was revisited to assess potential changes in noise impacts, particularly on noise sources that are closely associated with vehicular traffic. The existing setting defined in the 2004 EIR was characterized as relatively undeveloped with no significant traffic noise. The FEIR determined that project implementation would result in exterior noise levels modeled to exceed 65 dBA adjacent to Pierson Boulevard and Karen Avenue; interior noise levels with “window open” were modeled to exceed 45 dBA adjacent to Pierson Boulevard, Karen Avenue and Worsley Road. These noise impacts were largely attributed to the vehicular traffic. Temporary, short-term noise and groundborne vibration increases were also anticipated during construction. To reduce these impacts below a level of significance, the recommended and adopted mitigation measures consisted of physical barriers, such as walls, to attenuate exterior noise levels (MM 9-1). Best management practices in construction were recommended to reduce the anticipated short-term construction noise impacts (MM 9-1).

As indicated in the Transportation and Traffic Section of this amendment, an updated traffic study concluded that the existing 2015 noise settings have not increased significantly in comparison to the 2003 baseline conditions. The updated analysis also determined that implementation of the Specific Plan Amendment would result in a reduced total number of trips per day in comparison to the approved Specific Plan. As a result, the factor of traffic is not expected to result in new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects on noise than previously analyzed in the FEIR.

The Specific Plan amendment will continue implementing the permanent and temporary mitigation program to maintain the levels of significance. Perimeter improvements will be installed in conformance with the project phasing plan to ensure consistency in the construction of the project’s perimeter walls. The side and rear yards of the single family lots will be enclosed with block walls or plastic/vinyl fencing. Maximum height of perimeter and interior walls will be six

(6) feet, exclusive of retaining walls. With exception of rear yards facing public open space and park areas, decorative walls with view fencing will be installed. Residences that have been constructed as of 2015 exhibit plastic/vinyl fencing along their rear and side property lines. These improvements on future phases will attenuate long -term impacts.

The amended project does not propose substantial changes to the project which would require major revisions to the FEIR due to new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects on noise than previously analyzed in the FEIR. Changes have occurred in the project area in the form of construction improvements pursuant to the development standards of the adopted Specific Plan. Therefore, these changes will not require major revisions to the FEIR and would not result in substantially more severe environmental effects than the previously analyzed in the FEIR. Moreover, no new information of substantial importance, as described in subsection (a)(3) of Section 15164, has been revealed that would require major revisions to the FEIR or its conclusion.

## **2.4 Transportation and Traffic**

Implementation of the amended project would result in an unchanged scale and nature of development, as assessed in the 2004 EIR. Pertaining to transportation and traffic, the amended project would be substantially consistent with the existing and pending circulation conditions adopted in the Specific Plan. The 2004 EIR concluded that buildout of the project would generate an increase of vehicular trips per day, which would impact the local roadways. Mitigation measures to reduce the levels of significance included street improvements, some of which have been built.

In February of 2015, the firm of Urban Crossroads, Inc prepared an updated traffic assessment of the previously approved Stoneridge traffic impact analysis (prepared in June of 2004) in order to include the planned adjustments for Skyborne Specific Plan Amendment 1.

The 2004 traffic study included an analysis of the Existing 2003 conditions and an evaluation of cumulative conditions without and with the project from 2004 to 2008 based on an assumption that the development would be built in five phases during a five-year span. The approved project of 2,140 single-family detached residential units was anticipated to generate a total of approximately 20,481 trips per day with 1,604 AM peak hour trips and 2,163 PM peak hour external trips. Based on those findings, a series of street improvements were recommended to mitigate potential impacts (MM 13-1 through MM 13-10). The traffic study indicates that some of the recommended street improvements to serve as mitigation are complete along Pierson Boulevard, Karen Avenue and Worsley Road.

In comparison with the previously approved project's baseline (2003) conditions (specifically at the intersection of SR-62 / Pierson Boulevard), the Existing 2015 counts have not increased in comparison to the 2003 baseline conditions. The updated traffic analysis concluded that the proposed amendment is anticipated to decrease the total number of trips from the project. Specifically, the project with Amendment 1 is anticipated to generate a total of approximately 11,795 trip-ends per day with 850 vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 1,109 vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour. The proposed Project is anticipated to generate 6,801 fewer trip-ends per day with 606 fewer vehicles per hour during the AM peak hour and 856 fewer vehicles per hour during the PM peak hour in comparison with the previously approved project. The improvement recommendations in the 2004 traffic study for the approved development are still applicable to the overall project. The reduced impacts can in part be explained by an expected condition wherein future senior residents are less likely to commute to work and therefore trips generated by the project would be expected to decrease in comparison to the approved project. The reduction in trips would translate to reduced traffic impacts in comparison with the approved development and would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts.

The amended project does not propose substantial changes to the project which would require major revisions to the FEIR due to new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects on transportation and traffic than previously analyzed in the FEIR. Changes have occurred in the project area in the form of construction improvements pursuant to the development standards of the adopted Specific Plan. Therefore, these changes will not require major revisions to the FEIR and would not result in substantially more severe environmental effects than the previously analyzed in the FEIR. Moreover, no new information of substantial importance, as described in subsection (a)(3) of Section 15164, has been revealed that would require major revisions to the FEIR or its conclusions.

## **2.5 Summary of Findings**

Based on the supplemental review, the project and supporting environmental analysis (Section 2.0) and pursuant to Section 15162, 15164 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Desert Hot Springs has determined that:

- (a) The amended project does not propose substantial changes to the project which would require major revisions to the FEIR due to new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than previously analyzed in the FEIR;

- (b) There have been no substantial changes in circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the FEIR due to new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than previously analyzed in the FEIR; and
- (c) No new information of substantial importance as described in subsection (a)(3) of Section 15164 has been revealed that would require major revisions to the FEIR or its conclusions.

Although there are no significant changes to the project, an addendum was deemed appropriate due to the land use adjustment of Villages IV through VII from Single Family Residential to Active Adult Community residential, while maintaining the overall total number of homes, as approved under the original Specific Plan. To accommodate the senior-oriented nature of the neighborhoods, adjustments to the parcel sizes and floor plans are a necessary component of the Amendment. Moreover, an additional clubhouse will be constructed to serve the senior residents of this community. The Amendment will not expand the current Specific Plan boundary or result in off-site disturbances.

These occurrences do not constitute substantial changes to the project or the circumstances due to the involvement of significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Similarly, subsequent consideration does not constitute new information that would show new effects or substantially more severe effects. Likewise, there is no known mitigation measures that would in fact be feasible or that would substantially reduce significant effects, that the project proponent has declined to adopt. Furthermore, there have been no other changes, evidence or new information which would require revisions to the previous certified EIR. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15164, this Addendum to the previously certified EIR is the appropriate environmental documentation for the proposed project.

As lead agency, the City of Desert Hot Springs prepared an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Stoneridge Specific Plan (now known as the Skyborne Specific Plan), in compliance with the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, section 21000 *et seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 *et seq.*, as amended).