2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE PROJECT

The project analyzed in this Program EIR is the adoption and implementation of a comprehensively updated Moreno Valley General Plan. The EIR provides a program-level assessment of the general environmental impacts resulting from the development of land and implementation of policies in accordance with the General Plan. Moreno Valley is considering three potential land use map alternatives for the General Plan. This Program EIR analyzes these three land use alternatives at an equal level of detail.

Alternative 1, also known as the "no project alternative," is the existing General Plan. Alternative 2 would allow more multiple-family housing, less commercial and office development to better match the demand for such uses and more business park/industrial development than Alternative 1. Alternative 2 also includes changes to the circulation plan. Alternative 3 is similar to Alternative 2, except in the northeastern portion of the City. Alternative 3 would allow more low-density (2 or fewer dwellings/acre) single-family housing, less office development, less business park development, and less conventional (5 dwellings/acre) single-family housing than Alternative 2.

PROJECT LOCATION

Moreno Valley is located in northwestern Riverside County, approximately 66 miles east of Los Angeles, 42 miles west of Palm Springs and 100 miles north of San Diego. The community is situated in a crescent of land bounded by the Box Springs Mountains to the north, the steep hills of the Badlands to the east and the mountains of the Lake Perris Recreation Area to the south. The surrounding jurisdictions include the City of Riverside, the City of Perris and the County of Riverside. A joint civilian and military airport under the jurisdiction of the March Air Reserve Base and the March Joint Powers Authority is located at the southwestern boundary. The State of California owns and operates regional recreation and open space areas south of the City limits: the San Jacinto Wildlife Area and Lake Perris State Recreation Area. The City is located in proximity to regional transportation routes including Interstate 60, which traverses the City and Interstate 215, which is located near the western boundary. Figure 3-1 in the Project Description depicts the planning area.

The City contains approximately 29,754 acres of land. The planning area consists of the incorporated City, as well as 9,966 acres of unincorporated land immediately north and east of the City within the City's sphere of influence (SOI). The planning area represents the probable near-term physical boundaries and service area of the City.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Moreno Valley determined that an EIR is required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The environmental issue areas identified in the environmental Initial Study for assessment in the EIR include:

- Land Use and Planning
- Traffic/Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Geology and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Agricultural Resources
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Aesthetics
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Mineral Resources

Based on the data and conclusions of this Program EIR, Moreno Valley finds that the project will result in significant project-level and cumulative impacts to traffic/circulation, air quality, and agricultural resources which cannot be fully mitigated. If Moreno Valley chooses to approve the project, it must adopt a "Statement of Overriding Considerations" pursuant to Sections 15093 and 15126 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Table 2-1 provides an impact comparison of the three project alternatives. As shown, Alternative 1 is the environmentally inferior alternative; Alternative 2 is superior to Alternative 1; and Alternative 3 is the environmentally superior alternative, although it is not superior to Alternative 2 in all respects. Alternative 3 would result in less traffic congestion and less total air emissions than Alternative 2, but it would also allow residential development along State Route 60, thereby exposing future residents to higher levels of air pollution that exist along freeway corridors.

Table 2-2 summarizes the project impacts, mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation for all environmental issue areas.

TABLE 2-1
IMPACT COMPARISON OF THE THREE PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Impact	Alternative 1 Existing General Plan*	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Land Use and Planning	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
Traffic/Circulation	Significant and unavoidable and greater than Alternatives 2 and 3	Significant and unavoidable, less than Alternative 1 and more than Alternative 3	Significant and unavoidable, and less than Alternatives 1 and 2
Air Quality	Significant and unavoidable, and greater than Alternatives 2 and 3	Significant and unavoidable, less than Alternative 1 and more than Alternative 3	Significant and unavoidable, and less than Alternatives 1 and 2
Noise	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
Geology and Soils	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Agricultural Resources	Significant and unavoidable, and similar to Alternatives 2 and 3	Significant and unavoidable, and similar to Alternatives 1 and 3	Significant and unavoidable, and similar to Alternatives 1and 2
Biological Resources	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Cultural Resources	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Aesthetics	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Population and Housing	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
Public Services and Utilities	Less than Significant	Less than Significant	Less than Significant
Mineral Resources	Not significant	Not significant	Not significant
Conclusion	**Environmentally Inferior**	**Environmentally Superior to Alternative 1; Inferior to Alternative 3**	**Environmentally Superior to Alternatives 1 and 2**

*The no project alternative

POTENTIAL AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

The CEQA Guidelines require potential areas of controversy to be identified in the Executive Summary. Responses to the NOP indicate potential areas of controversy including:

- Noise and safety impacts associated with the aircraft operations at the March Air Reserve Base
- Potential land use changes adjacent to the San Jacinto/Lake Perris Core Reserve
- Potential impacts to the proposed Master Drainage Plan facilities, including increased runoff or changes in the existing drainage patterns within the planning area
- Potential impacts to Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District facilities
- Impacts associated with earthquake fault zones including the Farm Road Fault
- Impacts on transportation corridors and emergency response networks for a major earthquake
- Noise impacts
- Air quality impacts
- Impacts of new development on school districts
- Growth impacts
- Availability of water
- Circulation impacts

OTHER ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

In addition to the three General Plan land use alternatives examined in detail throughout this EIR, Section 6.0 of this EIR includes evaluation of the following alternatives in less detail:

- Increased Preservation of Agricultural Land
- Reduced Density

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
PROJECT LEVEL IMPACTS		
5.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING		
No significant impact to land use and planning has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.
5.2 TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION		
A significant traffic impact associated with roadway segments could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**TR-1.** Conduct studies of specified arterial segments to determine if any additional improvements will be needed to maintain an acceptable LOS at General Plan build-out. Generally, these segments will be studied as new developments are proposed in their vicinity. Measures will be identified that are consistent with the Circulation Element designation of these roadway segments, such as additional turn lanes at intersections, signal optimization by coordination and enhanced phasing, and travel demand management measures. (Arterial segments that require further study are listed in Table 5.2-6 for Alternative 1, Table 5.2-8 for Alternative 2 and Table 5.2-10 for Alternative 3 of the EIR for the General Plan Update). The study of specified arterial segments will be required to identify measures to maintain an acceptable LOS at General Plan build-out for at least one of the reasons discussed below: (a) Segments will need improvement, but their ultimate volumes slightly exceed design capabilities. (b) Segments will need improvements but require inter-jurisdictional coordination. (c) Segments would require significant encroachment on existing adjacent development if built-out to their Circulation Element designations.	Significant and unavoidable

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
5.3 AIR QUALITY		
A significant air quality impact associated with short-term construction could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**AQ1.** Grading activities shall comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403 regarding the control of fugitive dust **(Policy 6.7.4)**. **AQ2.** Building construction shall comply with the energy conservation requirements of Title 24 of the California Administrative Code **(Policy 6.7.5)**. **AQ3.** The City shall cooperate with regional efforts to establish and implement regional air quality strategies and tactics **(Policy 6.7.1)**.	Significant and unavoidable.
A significant long-term air quality impact could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	Mitigation Measures AQ1 through AQ3 (above) and AQ4 through AQ10 below: **AQ4.** The City shall encourage the financing and construction of park-and-ride facilities **(Policy 6.7.2)**. **AQ5.** The City shall encourage express transit service from Moreno Valley to the greater metropolitan areas of Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange and Los Angeles Counties **(Policy 6.7.3)**. **AQ6.** The City shall coordinate with Caltrans and RCTC regarding the integration of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) consistent with the principles and recommendations referenced in the Inland Empire ITS Strategic Plan **(Policy 5.4.1)**. **AQ7.** The City shall ensure that all new developments make adequate provision for bus stops and turnout areas for both public transit and school bus service **(Policy 5.7.2)**. **AQ8.** The City shall integrate bikeways, consistent with the Bikeway Plan, with the circulation system and maintain Class II and III bikeways as part of the City's street system **(Policy 5.9.1)**.	Significant and unavoidable.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	AQ9. The City shall implement Transportation demand management (TDM) strategies that reduce congestion in the peak travel hours. Examples include carpooling, telecommuting, and flexible work hours **(Program 5-21)**. **AQ10.** The City shall conduct studies on the following street segments to determine if any additional traffic controls, pavement width or other operational system improvements are needed to achieve the desired level of service. These studies may be conducted concurrent with new development proposals that may impact these facilities. If feasible improvements cannot be identified, the City retains the option of considering a reduced LOS standard **(Program 5-9)**: • Alessandro Boulevard - Old 215 Frontage Road to Day Street • Cactus Avenue - Old 215 Frontage Road. to Elsworth Street • Day Street - Ironwood Avenue to SR-60 • Day Street - Campus Parkway to Eucalyptus Avenue • Gilman Springs Road - SR-60 to Spine Road • Graham Street - Sunnymead Boulevard to Eucalyptus Avenue • Heacock Street - Manzanita Avenue to SR-60 • Heacock Street - Sunnymead Boulevard to Eucalyptus Avenue • Heacock Street - Cottonwood Avenue to J. F. Kennedy Drive • Indian Avenue - San Michele to Nandina • Kitching Street - Iris Avenue to San Michele • Moreno Beach Drive – SR-60 to Eucalyptus Avenue • Perris Blvd. - Elder Avenue to Sunnymead Boulevard • Perris Blvd. - Nandina to City Limit • Pigeon Pass Road - Ironwood Avenue to SR-60 Freeway	
A significant impact associated with sensitive receptors could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	Mitigation Measure AQ10 above.	Significant and unavoidable.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
5.4 NOISE		
A significant impact associated with construction noise could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**N5.** Construction activities shall be operated in a manner that limits noise impacts on surrounding uses (**Policy 6.5.2**). **N10.** Building construction shall be prohibited between 8 p.m. and 6.am. during the week and 8 p.m. and 7a.m. on weekends and holidays (**Policy 6.3.6**).	Less than significant.
A significant impact associated with vehicular traffic could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**N1.** The following noise control measures shall be applied to new single-family dwellings exposed to noise along major roadways: a. Install sound barriers (masonry walls or walls with earth berms) between residences and noise sources. b. Install double-paned or similar sound rated windows. c. Provide sound insulating exterior walls and roofing systems. d. Locate and/or design attic vents to minimize sound propagation into each home. e. Provide forced-air ventilation systems. f. Place dwellings as far as practical from the noise source. **N2.** Acoustical analyses shall be conducted for new residential development along State Route 60. Noise control measures shall be required to reduce the amount of noise to acceptable levels (limit interior noise levels with doors and windows closed to 45 CNEL). **N6.** The City shall reevaluate designated truck routes in terms of noise impact on existing land uses to determine if those established routes and the hours of their use should be adjusted to minimize exposure to truck noise (**Program 6-3**).	Less than significant.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	N7. The following uses shall require mitigation to reduce noise exposure where current or future exterior noise levels exceed 20 CNEL above the desired interior noise level (**Policy 6.3.1**): a. New single-family and multiple-family residential buildings shall be insulated to achieve an interior noise level of 45 CNEL or less. Such buildings shall include sound-insulating windows, walls, roofs and ventilation systems. Sound barriers shall also be installed (e.g. masonry walls or walls with berms) between single-family residences and major roadways. b. New libraries, hospitals and extended medical care facilities, places of worship and office uses shall be insulated to achieve interior noise levels or 50 CNEL or less. c. New schools shall be insulated to achieve interior noise levels of 45 CNEL or less. **N9.** The City shall enforce the California Administrative Code, Title 24 noise insulation standards for new multi-family housing developments, motels and hotels (**Policy 6.3.5**).	
A potential noise impact associated with aircraft operations could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**N3.** The City shall discourage residential uses where current or projected exterior noise due to aircraft over flights will exceed 65 CNEL (**Policy 6.3.2**). **N8.** Where the future noise environment is likely to exceed 70 CNEL due to overflights from the joint-use airport at March, new buildings containing uses that are not addressed under Policy 6.3.1 shall require insulation to achieve interior noise levels recommended in the March Air Reserve Base Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Report (**Policy 6.3.3**).	Less than significant.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
A significant impact associated with stationary noise could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	N7 and N9 (above) and N4 below: **N4.** New commercial and industrial activities (including the placement of mechanical equipment) shall be evaluated and designed to mitigate noise impacts on adjacent uses (**Policy 6.5.1**).	Less than significant.
5.5 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
No significant impact to hazards and hazardous materials has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.
5.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
A significant impact associated with soil and slope stability, fault rupture and seismicity and groundshaking could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**GS1.** The City shall reduce the fault rupture hazards through the identification and recognition of potentially hazardous conditions and areas as they relate to the San Jacinto fault zone and the high and very high liquefaction hazard zones. During the review of future development projects, the City shall require geologic studies and mitigation for fault rupture hazards in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Special Study Zones Act. Additionally, future geotechnical studies shall contain calculations for seismic settlement on all alluvial sites identified as having high or very high liquefaction potential. Should the calculations show a potential for liquefaction, appropriate mitigation shall be identified and implemented (**Policy 6.1.1**). **GS2.** The City shall require all new developments, existing critical and essential facilities and structures to comply with the most recent Uniform Building Code seismic design standards (**Policy 6.1.2**).	Less than significant.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
5.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY		
A significant impact associated with surface water quality may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**HW1.** The City shall implement National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Best Management Practices relating to construction of roadways to control runoff contamination from affecting the water resources (**Policy 5.4.2**). **HW2.** All components of the City's storm drain system shall conform to Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District master drainage plans and the requirements of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (**Policy 6.2.5**). **HW3.** The City shall comply with the provisions of its permit(s) issued by the Regional Water Quality Control Board for the protection of water quality pursuant to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (**Policy 7.2.2**).	Less than significant.
A significant impact associated with drainage may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	Mitigation Measure HW2 above.	Less than significant.
A significant impact associated with groundwater may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	Mitigation Measures H1 and H3 above.	Less than significant.
5.8 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		
A significant impact associated with agricultural resources may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	No feasible mitigation measure consistent with the General Plan Land Use Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 project objectives and/or land uses has been identified. As a result, no feasible mitigation measure has been identified.	Significant and unavoidable.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
5.9 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
A significant impact associated with biological resources may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**B1.** The City and all future public and private development projects within the City shall comply with the Long-term HCP for the Stephen's Kangaroo Rat. **B2.** The City shall comply with the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) and the associated state and federal permits. **B3.** Where feasible, projects shall be designed to minimize impacts on sensitive habitat. **B4.** Prior to physical disturbance of any natural drainage course or wetland determined to contain riparian vegetation or otherwise qualify as a "jurisdictional" wetland or Non-wetland Water of the U.S., the applicant shall obtain a Streambed Alteration Agreement and/or permit, or written waiver of the requirement for such an agreement or permit, from all resource agencies with jurisdiction over such areas (CDFG and ACOE).	Less than significant.
5.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES		
A significant impact associated with cultural and paleontological resources may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**C1.** Prior to the approval of a project, the City will assess potential impacts to significant historic, prehistoric archaeological, and paleontological resources, including impacts to human remains, pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines. If significant impacts are identified, the City will require the project to be modified to avoid the impacts, or require measures to mitigate the impacts. Mitigation may involve monitoring, resource recovery, documentation or other measures.	Less than significant.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
5.11 AESTHETICS		
A significant impact to aesthetics may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	**A1.** Enforce the Municipal Code requirements and use Specific Plans to ensure that all development within the City of Moreno Valley is of high quality, yields a pleasant living and working environment for existing and future residents and attracts business as the result of consistent exemplary design **(Objective 2-10**). **A2.** The City shall require new electrical and communication lines to be placed underground (**Policy 7.7.1**). **A3.** The City shall implement reasonable controls on the size, number and design of signs to minimize degradation of visual quality (**Policy 7.7.2**). **A4.** Gilman Springs Road, Moreno Beach Drive, and State Route 60 shall be designated as local scenic roads (**Policy 7.7.3**). **A5.** The City shall require development along scenic roadways to be visually attractive and to allow for scenic views of the surrounding mountains and Mystic Lake (**Policy 7.7.4**). **A6.** Minimize the visibility of wireless communication facilities by the public. Encourage "stealth" designs and encourage new antennas to be located on existing poles, buildings and other structures (**Policy 7.7.5**).	Less than significant.
5.12 POPULATION AND HOUSING		
No significant impact to population and housing has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
5.13 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES		
A significant impact associated with public services and utilities may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	Mitigation measures identified throughout the EIR will apply to public infrastructure and service impacts.	Less than significant. .
5.14 MINERAL RESOURCES		
No significant impact to mineral resources has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS		
LAND USE AND PLANNING		
No significant cumulative impact to land use and planning has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.
TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION		
A significant traffic impact associated with roadway segments could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	Pursuant to Section 15130(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, contributions to the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee Program (TUMF) and the Development Impact Fee Program (DIF), discussed in Section 5.2, will serve as the projects fair share contribution to mitigate cumulative impacts.	Less than significant

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
AIR QUALITY		
A significant cumulative air quality impact could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	See Mitigation Measures AQ1 through AQ10 described in Section 5.3	Cumulatively significant and unavoidable
NOISE		
A significant cumulative impact associated with vehicular traffic could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	See Mitigation Measures N1, N2, N6, N7 and N9 in Section 5.4	Less than significant
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
No significant cumulative impact to hazards and hazardous materials has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.
GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
A significant cumulative impact associated with soil and slope stability, fault rupture and seismicity and groundshaking could occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	See Mitigation Measure GS1 and GS2 in Section 5.6.	Less than significant

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY		
A significant cumulative impact associated with surface water quality may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	See Mitigation Measures HW1 through HW3 in Section 5.7.	Less than significant
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		
A significant cumulative impact associated with agricultural resources may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	No feasible mitigation measure consistent with the General Plan Land Use Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 project objectives and/or land uses has been identified. As a result, no feasible mitigation measure has been identified.	Significant and unavoidable.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
A significant cumulative impact associated with biological resources may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	See Mitigation Measures B1 through B4 in Section 5.9.	Less than significant
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
A significant cumulative impact associated with cultural and paleontological resources may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	See Mitigation Measure C1 in Section 5.10	Less than significant

TABLE 2-2
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
AESTHETICS		
A significant impact to aesthetics may occur under all of the proposed alternatives.	See Mitigation Measure A1 through A6 in Section 5.11	Less than significant
POPULATION AND HOUSING		
No significant cumulative impact to population and housing has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.
PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES		
No significant cumulative impacts to public services and utilities has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.
MINERAL RESOURCES		
No significant cumulative impact to mineral resources has been identified for any of the proposed alternatives.	No mitigation measures are needed.	Not significant.

This page intentionally left blank.