



1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 Project Location

The City of Murrieta is located in southeastern Riverside County. The City's Planning Area is comprised of 26,852 acres (41.96 square miles) of which 21,511 acres (33.61 square miles) is located within the City limits and 5,341 acres (8.34 square miles) is located within the City's Sphere of Influence. Surrounding cities include Menifee to the north, Temecula to the south and east, Wildomar to the west, and unincorporated Riverside County to the north, south, and east. The San Diego County border is just south of Temecula, and Orange County lies on the other side of the Santa Ana Mountains to the west. Regional access to the City is provided by the Interstates 15 and 215.

1.2 Project Summary

In 2009, the City of Murrieta initiated a comprehensive update of the General Plan which was adopted on July 19, 2011 and included a Climate Action Plan (CAP). The City's 2011 General Plan consists of the following elements: Land Use, Economic Development, Circulation, Infrastructure, Healthy Community, Conservation, Recreation and Open Space, Air Quality, Noise, Safety and Housing. In 2018, the City issued a request for proposals (RFP) to prepare a focused General Plan Update (GPU) of the City's 2011 General Plan, a CAP Update, and the preparation of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). In 2019, the City augmented the scope of work to include a focused Zone Change and Zone Code Amendment. The "proposed Project" in this SEIR includes a GPU, CAP Update, and Zone Code Amendment.

Growth Assumptions

Table 3-1 as shown in Section 3, Project Description, depicts the growth assumptions for the 2011 General Plan based on existing 2018 land use designation acreages. In total, the existing General Plan based on existing 2018 land use designation acres, anticipates 44,351 residential dwelling units and 48,764,774 square feet of non-residential uses.

Table 3-2, as shown in Section 3, Project Description, depicts the proposed Project's revised growth assumptions. In total, the proposed Project anticipates 45,923 residential dwelling units and 46,359,173 square feet of non-residential uses. As depicted in Table 3-2, a new land use designation (Innovation) is being incorporated into the proposed Project.



The proposed Project's anticipated change in dwelling units and non-residential square feet over the 2035 estimated buildout from the 2011 General Plan is:

- Addition of 1,572 dwelling units
- Reduction of 2,405,601 square feet of non-residential uses

1.3 Statement of Objectives

The City of Murrieta's objectives for the proposed Project are as follows:

- Provide a focused update to the 2011 General Plan and the Zoning Code.
- Address changes in State law enacted since the adoption of the 2011 General Plan.
- Evaluate the Office Research Park designation and recommend any revisions and/or provide a new land use designation.
- Modify the organization and location of land use designations in key areas of the City.
- Update General Plan development projections to the year 2035.
- Provide a basis for informative decisions when considering development associated with implementation of the General Plan 2035 in the City of Murrieta.
- Update the City's CAP to address new State and regional goals since the adoption of the 2011 CAP and the proposed changes to land use designations in certain areas within the City as part of the GPU.
- Provide a legally defensible environmental foundation upon which discretionary actions may be evaluated.
- Provide an analysis in the SEIR related to the possible future annexation of an area into the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD) which is currently not served by a water district. No annexation into the EMWD is proposed as part of the proposed Project; however, the SEIR will include a facilities assessment that the Riverside Local Agency Formation Commission would require as part of the information needed for a future annexation request by the City.

1.4 Project Characteristics

The City of Murrieta's major components for the proposed Project are as follows:

- Additions, deletions, or modifications to the 2011 General Plan goals, policies, exhibits and implementation to address changes in State law enacted since the adoption of the 2011 General Plan.
- Update of General Plan development projections to the year 2035.



- Update of the existing General Plan 2035 Land Use Policy Map (Exhibit 3-2, refer to Section 3.0 Project Description) in six key areas.
- Update of the Land Use Element with a new land use designation (Innovation) and a revised mix and location of land use designations in six key areas as shown on the proposed General Plan 2035 Land Use Policy Map (Exhibit 3-3, refer to Section 3.0 Project Description).
- Revisions to the 2011 General Plan Focus Areas exhibits, text and policies.
- Creation of one new zoning district (Innovation) with a zone change and revisions to the City's Development Code to address the new zone with a Zone Code Amendment.
- Update of the existing Zoning Map (Exhibit 3-4, refer to Section 3.0 Project Description) so that it is consistent with the proposed General Plan 2035 Land Use Policy Map as shown on the proposed Zoning Map (Exhibit 3-5, refer to Section 3.0 Project Description).
- Update of emissions inventory, projections, targets, and GHG reduction strategies and measures for the CAP Update.

1.5 Project Impacts

The City of Murrieta determined that a SEIR should be prepared pursuant to the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)* and the *CEQA Guidelines*. This SEIR assesses changes in the proposed Project, changes in circumstances, and new information that was not evaluated in the 2011 Certified EIR. Potential new impacts are determined through the process mandated by CEQA, in which the Certified EIR is used as the baseline for comparative analysis, except in the case of changed circumstances or new information, where existing conditions are used as the baseline. Section 4.0, *Environmental Analysis*, analyzes those subject areas for which changes in the proposed Project, changes in circumstances, or new information result in potentially greater impacts than those identified in the 2011 Certified EIR. Subject areas addressed in this Section include:

- Land Use and Planning
- Transportation
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Wildfire

Subject areas that were determined to produce no new impacts are discussed in Section 5.0, *Subject Areas Not Discussed in Detail, and include the following:*

- Aesthetics, Light and Glare
- Agricultural Resources



- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazardous Materials
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population, Housing, and Employment
- Public Resources
- Recreational Facilities
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Water Supply
- Wastewater
- Solid Waste
- Electricity and Natural Gas
- Hydrology, Drainage, and Water Quality
- Energy

Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis, of this Program EIR provides a description of potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project and recommends mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less than significant level, where feasible. After implementation of the proposed Project’s goals and policies and the recommended mitigation measures, most of the significant or potentially significant impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project would be reduced to a less than significant level. However, the impacts listed below could not be feasibly mitigated and would result in a significant unavoidable impacts associated with implementation of the proposed Project.

**Table 1-1
Summary of Significant Unavoidable Impacts and Associated Mitigation Measures**

Impacts	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Goals and Policies in the Proposed General Plan Update	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION				
Implementation of the proposed Project could conflict with a program plan ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Potentially Significant Impact	Goals and policies identified in the 2011 General Plan (CIR-1.1 – CIR-1.14, CIR-2.1 – 2.14, CIR-3.1 – CIR-3.5, CIR-4.1 – CIR-4.3, CIR-5.1 – CIR-5.14, CIR-6.1 – CIR-6.14, CIR-7.1 – CIR-7.8, CIR-8.1 – CIR-8.15, LU-3.2, LU-23.1, LU-23.2, AQ-5.1 – AQ-5.7, N-3.4, SAF-11.1) New or revised policies of	For recommended improvements/mitigation measures see section 4.2	Significant Unavoidable Impact for the seven (7) roadway segments identified in Section 4.2. Less Than Significant Impact for all other studied roadway segments. Significant Unavoidable Impacts for the five (5) Intersections identified in Section 4.2. Less Than



Impacts	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Goals and Policies in the Proposed General Plan Update	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		the proposed Project (CIR-3.5, CIR-3.6, CIR-6.15 and CIR-7.9, INF-3.4)		Significant Impact for all other studied intersections.
AIR QUALITY				
Implementation of the proposed Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the proposed project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.	Potentially Significant Impact	Goals and policies identified in the 2011 General Plan (AQ-1.1 – AQ-1.5, AQ-2.1 – AQ-2.5, AQ-3.1 – AQ-3.4, AQ-4.1 – AQ-4.4, AQ-5.1 – AQ-5.7, AQ-6.1, AQ-6.3 – AQ-6.7, AQ-7.1 – AQ-7.4, LU-8.1, LU-8.2, CIR-1.4, CIR-5.9 – CIR-5.12, and CIR-6.1 – CIR-6.12) New or revised policies of the proposed Project (LU-7.9, LU-7.10, LU-17.3, LU-17.6 and CIR-6.15)	Mitigation measures AQ-1 – AQ-24, as described in section 4.3	Significant Unavoidable Impact.
Regional Air Quality emissions resulting from operational buildout of the proposed project could impact regional air quality levels on a cumulatively considerable basis.	Potentially Significant Impact	Goals and policies identified in the 2011 General Plan (AQ-1.1 – AQ-1.5, AQ-2.1 – AQ-2.5, AQ-3.1 – AQ-3.4, AQ-4.1 – AQ-4.4, AQ-5.1 – AQ-5.7, AQ-6.1, AQ-6.3 – AQ-6.7, AQ-7.1 – AQ-7.4, LU-8.1, LU-8.2, CIR-1.4, CIR-5.9 – CIR-5.12, and CIR-6.1 – CIR-6.12) New or revised policies of the proposed Project (LU-7.9, LU-7.10, LU-17.3, LU-17.6 and CIR-6.15)	Mitigation measures AQ-1 – AQ-24, as described in section 4.3	Significant Unavoidable Impacts for construction and regional air quality, Less than Significant for localized air quality and cumulative odor impacts.



1.6 Summary of Project Alternatives

Section 6.0, Alternatives, analyzes three reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project, and evaluates the comparative merits of each alternative. Potential environmental impacts associated with the alternatives are compared to the impacts of the proposed Project. The alternatives include: No Project; Alternative 2, and Alternative 3.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in similar environmental impacts as the proposed Project except in terms of air quality, energy, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, population, housing and employment, traffic and circulation, and wildfire, which would be considered inferior. The No Project Alternative would be considered environmentally superior in regard to public services and utilities; however, the No Project Alternative does not reduce the significant unavoidable impacts to the environment to the extent that the proposed Project does. Additionally, the No Project Alternative would not address changes in State law enacted since the adoption of the 2011 General Plan nor include the CAP Update. Therefore, the No Project Alternative is not selected as the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed Project.

ALTERNATIVES 2 AND 3 AND THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Alternatives 2 and 3 allow for greater residential development and less non-residential development than the proposed Project overall. This increase in residential development could result in additional impacts to population, housing and employment, and public services and utilities beyond those identified by the proposed Project. However, the land use components of Alternatives 2 and 3 are very similar overall to the proposed Project and the differences in impacts would be minimal. As such, the Environmentally Superior Alternative is the proposed Project; however, as discussed, Alternatives 2 and 3 would be very similar overall to the proposed Project.