

---

---

## ERRATA TO THE FINAL EIR

---

---

### RECIRCULATED DRAFT EIR

#### Section III (Project Description)

##### *Figure III-11 (Preferred Land Plan) on page III-29*

Although the overall development scheme (i.e., land uses, acreages, number of dwelling units, and square footage) depicted on Figure III-11 is correct, a slight error in the graphical representation of the “Preferred Plan” has been noted. Figure III-11 has been corrected (attached to this Errata) to depict the acreages and illustrative land use locations of the Specific Plan’s “Preferred Plan.”

The correction to this figure clarifies the graphical representation of the “Preferred Plan” but does not affect the development assumptions used in the impact analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR and does not change the conclusions of the EIR. Thus, no other revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR are needed.

#### Section IV.I (Transportation/Traffic)

##### *Second paragraph on Page IV.I-69*

In addition, the intersection of Sherman Road/La Piedra Road also would operate at unsatisfactory conditions with the addition of the proposed project. The Traffic Impact Analysis (LSA 2010) identifies recommended improvements that would maintain an acceptable LOS at the aforementioned intersections for Year 2035. The recommended improvements are listed below under Recommended Circulation Improvements. As discussed below, ~~because the funding and ultimate implementation of some of the recommended improvements is uncertain at this time~~ with implementation of the improvements, project impacts under the Year 2035 with project condition related to intersection LOS would be *less than significant and unavoidable*.

##### *Second paragraph on Page IV.I-99*

For purposes of clarification, the following edit to the Recirculated Draft EIR has been made:

Under cumulative without and with project conditions, eighteen intersections operate at unsatisfactory LOS. This scenario, includes trips from 73 cumulative projects, but does not take into account any circulation improvements that could be associated with the construction of the cumulative projects. Therefore, this scenario does not include the intersection improvements that may be attributable as mitigation measures that could be considered necessary for growth in traffic in the Menifee region. The TIA identifies recommended improvements that would maintain an acceptable LOS at the aforementioned intersections for Year 2035. The recommended improvements are listed below under Recommended Circulation Improvements. As discussed below, because the funding and ultimate implementation of some of the

recommended regional improvements is uncertain at this time, cumulative impacts under the cumulative (2013) with project condition related to intersection LOS would be ***significant and unavoidable***.

***Bulleted list of intersections under the Cumulative (2013) Circulation Improvements***

This list identifies the Haun Road/Holland Road intersection instead of the Haun Road/Newport Road intersection. Thus, the following edit to the Recirculated Draft EIR has been made:

- **Haun Road/~~Holland~~Newport Road**

Additionally, the study intersections listed below were inadvertently omitted from the list. Thus, the following text has been added to the bulleted list of intersections under Cumulative (2013) Circulation Improvements:

- **I-215 Northbound Ramps/Newport Road**
- **I-215 Southbound Ramps/Newport Road**
- **I-215 Southbound Ramps/Scott Road**
- **I-215 Northbound Ramps/Scott Road**

These edits to Section IV.I (Transportation/Traffic) of Recirculated Draft EIR clarifies the summary of the traffic analysis but does not affect any of the assumptions used in the traffic analysis and does not identify any new significant impacts beyond those impacts already identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR. Thus, no other revisions to the Recirculated Draft EIR are needed.

**FINAL EIR**

**Mitigation Monitoring Plan**

***Page IV-11***

A comment received on the Recirculated Draft EIR (refer to Comment Johnson-44) suggested paving the roadway segments that would experience significant traffic-related noise impacts associated with the project with rubberized asphalt. Preliminary information gathered in preparing a response to this comment showed that rubberized asphalt could be effective in reducing the project's significant traffic noise impact, and a mitigation measure requiring paving the roadway segments that would experience significant traffic-related noise impacts associated with the project with rubberized asphalt was drafted

and added to the Mitigation Monitoring Plan. However, additional research revealed that studies conducted to assess the effectiveness of rubberized asphalt at reducing traffic noise on roadways show that the noise reductions on roadways with traffic speeds lower than 40 miles per hour (mph) vary between approximately 1 to 3 dBA, which is a range between not a perceptible lowering in the noise level to a barely perceptible lowering in the noise level.<sup>1</sup> Thus, based on these studies, paving the referenced roadway segments that would be affected by the project might not reduce the project's traffic noise impact along these roadway segments by any perceptible level. Also, a cost analysis conducted by Caltrans regarding the cost effectiveness of using rubberized asphalt in lieu of conventional asphalt shows that, "The cost of asphalt-rubber binder is about two and one-half times the cost of conventional asphalt," and the use of rubberized asphalt increases the cost of per ton by approximately 30 to 40 percent over the cost of using conventional asphalt.<sup>2</sup> At this time, it is unknown if the Project Applicant and/or the City could absorb the increased road maintenance costs associated with the initial paving of the affected roadways with rubberized asphalt and the on-going maintenance of the asphalt. Therefore, because the effectiveness of paving the affected roadways with rubberized asphalt at reducing the project's significant traffic noise impact cannot be determined, and the feasibility of absorbing the increased road building and maintenance costs by the Project Applicant and/or the City is unknown, the commenter's suggested mitigation measure will not be incorporated into the EIR. Nonetheless, the mitigation measure was inadvertently left in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan. Thus, the text on page IV-11 of the Mitigation Monitoring Plan has been edited as follows:

~~IV.H-15: Prior to the issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy for development under the Specific Plan south of La Piedra Road, the Project Applicant shall pave the following roadway sections with rubberized asphalt, subject to the availability of rubberized asphalt and to the extent that on-going maintenance and replacement costs do not prohibit the long term use of rubberized asphalt along the referenced roadway segments, as determined by the City:~~

- ~~1. La Piedra Road between Sherman Road and Bradley Road~~
- ~~2. La Piedra Road between Sherman Road and Haun Road~~

---

<sup>1</sup> *Report on the Status of Rubberized Asphalt, Traffic Noise Reduction in Sacramento County, Sacramento County Public Works Agency Transportation Division, November 1999; and Asphalt Rubber Overlay Noise Study Update, Acoustical Analysis Associates, Incorporated, December 2002. Both reports are included in Appendix B to this document.*

<sup>2</sup> *Caltrans, Caltrans Pavement Rehabilitation Using Rubberized Asphalt Concrete* [http://www.rubberpavements.org/RPA\\_News/May97/caltrans.html](http://www.rubberpavements.org/RPA_News/May97/caltrans.html), hit on October 21, 2010.

3. ~~Sherman Road between La Piedra Road and Holland Road~~

~~**Monitoring Phase:** Permitting/Occupancy  
**Enforcement Agency:** City Traffic Engineer  
**Monitoring Agency:** City Traffic Engineer~~

Because Mitigation Measure IV.H-15 was not a mitigation measure identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR for the purposes of reducing or avoiding a significant impact of the Project, and because the measure was determined to be infeasible for the reasons discussed above, and because the measure's inclusion in the Final EIR was due to clerical error, removal of the measure from the Mitigation Monitoring Plan does not change the impact conclusions of the Recirculated Draft EIR and or Final EIR and does not result in any new significant impact beyond those already identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR.

**This page left blank intentionally.**



Source: Planning Center, 8/21/10



Not to Scale



CHRISTOPHER A. JOSEPH & ASSOCIATES  
Environmental Planning and Research

Figure III-11  
Preferred Land Plan