

**Environmental Assessment
For
Proposed Construction, Maintenance and Operation for
the Expansion of the Customs and Border Protection,
Air and Marine Operations Center Expansion, March
Joint Air Reserve Base, Riverside, California**



**U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
Office of Air and Marine
Washington, D.C. 20229**

Point of Contact:

Charles Parsons
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Customs and Border Protection
Laguna Facilities Center
24000 Avila Road
P.O. Box 30080
Laguna Niguel, California 92607-0080

June 2011

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 United States (U.S.) Code 4321 et seq., and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), California Public Resources Code Section 21000, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Office of Air and Marine (OAM) has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the potential effects of construction, operation, and maintenance of the expansion of the Air & Marine Operations Center (AMOC), located on March Joint Air Reserve Base (ARB), Riverside, California. March Joint ARB is located approximately 15 miles south of San Bernardino, 70 miles east of Los Angeles and 100 miles north of San Diego. The base is bordered by three communities; the City of Riverside to the northwest, Moreno Valley to the north and east, and Perris to the southeast. On the southwest border of the base is unincorporated Riverside County land (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The proposed action consists of developing two parcels of land (totaling approximately 11 acres), located adjacent to the northern and eastern property boundaries of the existing AMOC (see Figure ES-1). A two-story building, approximately 90,000 square feet (ft²) in size, with a 55,000 ft² “footprint”, would be constructed on the Northern Property.

Additional asphalt parking on both the Northern Property and Eastern Property would be constructed to accommodate the anticipated levels of staff.



FIGURE ES-1 Proposed Action Sites.

PURPOSE AND NEED

OAM is responsible for managing, controlling, and securing the nation's borders. The mission of OAM is to protect the American people and the Nation's critical infrastructure through the coordinated use of integrated OAM forces to detect, interdict, and prevent acts of terrorism and the unlawful movement of people, illegal drugs, and other contraband toward or across the borders of the US. The existing AMOC facility is situated on approximately 3.70 acres of land at the March Joint ARB and was originally constructed in 1988 to support 65 personnel. There are currently 200 full time personnel operating at the existing AMOC facility. Planned new operations at the AMOC will increase personnel levels to between 500 and 700 personnel. The current overcrowded conditions affect the efficiency of missions and operations conducted by OAM personnel operating at the AMOC. In addition, the existing AMOC facility will not support the anticipated future staff levels and operations that are planned at the facility. OAM needs additional facilities and parking to support an expansion of operations and increase in staff levels at the existing AMOC facility. The purpose of the proposed action is to expand the existing AMOC facility at March Joint ARB to provide OAM personnel with a modern, efficient, and safe facility that accommodates current and future levels of staff, vehicles, and equipment that are necessary to support OAM operations.

PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Two alternatives are analyzed in this EA, the no action and the proposed action. The following sections describe these alternatives and discuss the rationale for no additional alternatives being carried forward for analysis.

Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, expansion of the current facility and construction of new facilities would not be completed and ongoing missions and operations would continue at the existing facility. However, the existing facility would not be able to accommodate the proposed increase in staff (to a maximum of 700 personnel) due to the size of the building and would continue to threaten the efficiency and safety of the staff due to the existing overcrowded conditions.

While this alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action, the no action alternative forms the baseline for the proposed action and is required by CEQ regulations. As such, the no action alternative will be carried forward as part of the analysis.

Alternative 2: Proposed Action

The proposed action would consist of constructing a two-story building, roughly 90,000 square feet (ft²) in size (a 55,000 ft² “footprint”) with additional asphalt parking on the Northern Property and Eastern Property to support up to 700 personnel. The Northern Property is currently owned by March Joint ARB and is the location of the proposed

expansion of the existing AMOC. The Eastern Property is vacant and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing AMOC. The Eastern Property is currently owned by the City of Moreno Valley and will be deeded back to March Joint ARB for future permitted use to CBP. The Eastern Property would be used as a security buffer with the possibility of future expansion of parking facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, armory, and an indoor small arms range. The Eastern Property would be initially fenced and lit for security purposes. The proposed facility expansion would allow OAM to fulfill its mission in a safe and efficient manner.

Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Consideration

Alternatives beyond the no action and proposed action alternatives were not considered due to the very specific requirements (i.e. adjacent property and within the March Joint ARB) identified for the proposed AMOC expansion. A previous feasibility study was conducted where alternatives were compared and analyzed resulting in the selection of this proposed action (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES

The Affected Environment and Consequences section of this EA describes the resources that are potentially subject to impacts if the proposed action or the no action alternative were implemented. These resources include land use, geology and soils, vegetation, wildlife and aquatic resources, threatened and endangered species, hydrology and groundwater, surface waters and waters of the United States , floodplains, air quality, noise, cultural resources, utilities and infrastructure, traffic/roadways, aesthetics and

visual resources, hazardous materials, socioeconomics, environmental justice and protection of children, human health and safety, and sustainability and greening. A summary of Potential Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences is provided in Table ES-1.

TABLE ES-1 Summary of Potential Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences. <i>AMOC Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>		
	Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences	
Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
Land Use	No impacts.	Negligible or less than significant long-term adverse impact.
Geology and Soils	No impacts.	No impact to geology. Short-term negligible adverse impact due to site grading and potential soil loss to wind erosion.
Vegetation	No impacts.	Short-term negligible adverse impact; site is predominantly weeds, no native species. Long-term moderate beneficial impact due to weed management program and planting of drought-tolerant, native plant landscaping in planter areas.
Wildlife and Aquatic Resources	No impacts.	Negligible long-term adverse impact to rabbit and bird species due to loss of open habitat. Negligible or less than significant long-term adverse impact to burrowing owl habitat.
Threatened and Endangered Species	No impacts.	No impact as determined by the biological evaluation conducted at the property.
Hydrology and Groundwater	No impacts.	Possible negligible or less than significant long-term adverse impact due to run-off from increased impermeable surfaces and parking area pollutants. Appropriate BMPs would minimize these impacts.
Surface Waters and Waters of the United States	No impacts.	Negligible long-term adverse impact to surface waters and waters of the United States due to the increase impervious

		area on the property.
Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences		
Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
Floodplains	No impacts.	No impacts.
Air Quality	No impacts.	Negligible or less than significant short-term adverse impacts due to construction; appropriate BMPs would minimize these impacts. Negligible or less than significant long-term adverse impact on regional air quality due to increased number of privately-owned and government vehicles in this area.
Noise	No impacts.	Negligible or less than significant to moderate short-term adverse impact due to increased noise during construction. Negligible or less than significant, long-term adverse increase in traffic and operational noise.
Cultural Resources	No impacts.	No impacts.
Utilities and Infrastructure	No impacts.	Moderate positive impact due to utility and infrastructure installation.
Roadways/Traffic	No impacts.	Negligible or less than significant adverse impact due to increased number of vehicles.
Aesthetic and Visual Resources	No impacts.	Negligible or less than significant long-term adverse impacts due to increased traffic (air pollution) and the addition of new buildings which could disrupt the skyline. However there are no aesthetically pleasing views in the area so impacts to visual resources would be insignificant.
Hazardous Materials	No impacts.	Negligible or less than significant short-term impacts from construction fuels and lubricants. Negligible or less than significant long-term impacts due to the potential generation and spillage of pollutants from a variety of solvents,

		fuel and cleaners for maintenance.
Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences		
Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
Socioeconomic	<p>Negligible or less than significant long-term adverse impact as a result of continued overcrowding and insufficient staffing at the existing AMOC.</p> <p>Negligible or less than significant long-term beneficial impacts due to increased employment and earnings.</p>	<p>Negligible or less than significant short-term beneficial impacts on local economy during construction phase.</p> <p>Negligible or less than significant long-term beneficial impacts due to increased employment and earnings.</p>
Environmental Justice and Protection of Children	No impacts.	No impact.
Human Health and Safety	No impacts.	<p>Negligible or less than significant long-term adverse impact due to loss of the running track and exercise equipment. The property was deeded specifically for recreation in the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET).</p> <p>Moderate long-term beneficial impact due to improved security and safety of employees.</p>
Sustainability and Greening	No impacts.	<p>Moderate long-term adverse impact due to loss of open space and habitat for rabbits, birds, and other wildlife.</p> <p>Negligible or less than significant long-term beneficial impact due to implementation of energy efficiency policies.</p>
Cumulative Impacts	<p>Because no impacts were identified as a result of the no action alternative on most resources, by definition under National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), no cumulative effects would occur to those resources.</p> <p>Negligible or less than</p>	<p>No cumulative impacts on geology and soils, vegetation, special status species, surface and groundwater hydrology, air quality cultural resources, environmental justice and the protection of children, human health and safety, or sustainability and greening.</p> <p>Negligible or less than significant adverse cumulative impacts on land use,</p>

	<p>significant beneficial cumulative impacts on socioeconomics.</p> <p>Negligible or less than significant impacts to roadways and traffic due to increased number of vehicles.</p>	<p>and wildlife resources.</p> <p>Negligible or less than significant adverse cumulative impacts on traffic/roadways, noise, hazardous materials, and aesthetics and visual resources.</p> <p>Moderate beneficial cumulative impact on utilities and infrastructure.</p> <p>Negligible or less than significant beneficial cumulative impacts on socioeconomics.</p>
<p><u>Impact Definitions (USDHS, 2008; CEQA (Public Resources Code 21000-21177) and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000-15387))</u></p> <p>No Impact – no change from the existing conditions, beneficially or adversely; applies where a project does not create an impact.</p> <p>Negligible or Less than Significant Impact – an adverse or beneficial impact with a trace or low level of detection; applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts.</p> <p>Moderate or Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated – a readily apparent adverse or beneficial impact; applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.”</p> <p>Potentially Significant Impact – severe adverse or beneficial impact</p>		

SUMMARY OF MITIGATION ACTIONS

Impact evaluations indicate that no significant environmental impacts would result from implementation of the proposed action. Consequently, no mitigation would be necessary.

No wetlands or waters of the United States occur in or around the proposed project area; therefore, no Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948 as amended (also known as the Clean Water Act) permits from the United States Army Corps of Engineers would be required.

CBP would not need a Clean Air Act New Source Review Permit or a Title V Operating Permit from the California Air Quality Board. However, permits to construct and to

operate would be required from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for any equipment that may emit pollutants and that is not listed as exempt.

Compliance would include obtaining a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) general construction stormwater permit from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9 prior to project implementation. CBP would also prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction.

A Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasures Plan (SPCCP) would be prepared and implemented to minimize the potential for impacts from accidental release of fuels if a maintenance facility with storage of petroleum in excess of the requirement is built. Stormwater would be managed according to State and Federal requirements.

CBP would implement appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize unavoidable impacts of the proposed project such as soil erosion and fugitive dust emissions. Construction activities would occur during the daytime hours to minimize public disturbance due to noise, fugitive dust, and construction traffic.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The proposed AMOC expansion would meet the immediate and future needs of OAM. OAM has concluded that no significant adverse environmental or cumulative impacts would result from the proposed action alternative. Full compliance with the Clean Water Act and implementation of BMPs during construction and operation of the AMOC expansion would minimize any potential adverse impacts. The proposed expansion would provide short-term and long-term socioeconomic and human health and safety

benefits by providing approximately 15 construction jobs; up to 500 additional permanent positions at the expanded facilities; and more efficient and secure working conditions than the present facilities provide.

This page intentionally left blank.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ES-2
INTRODUCTION	ES-2
PURPOSE AND NEED	ES-4
PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED.....	ES-5
Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	ES-5
Alternative 2: Proposed Action	ES-5
Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Consideration.....	ES-6
AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES.....	ES-6
SUMMARY OF MITIGATION ACTIONS	ES-10
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	ES-11
CONTENTS	i
Tables	v
Figures	vii
Appendices	vii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	2
1.2 PROJECT LOCATION.....	4
1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED	6
1.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	6
1.5 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS.....	8
2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	13
2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE.....	15
2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE – CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE NEW FACILITIES	16
2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION.....	17
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES	19
3.1 INTRODUCTION	19
3.2 LAND USE.....	24
3.2.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	26
3.2.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	26

3.3	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	28
3.3.1	Affected Environment	28
3.3.1.1	Geology	28
3.3.1.2	Topography.....	29
3.3.1.3	Soils	29
3.3.1.4	Prime Farmland	30
3.3.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	30
3.3.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	30
3.4	VEGETATION.....	33
3.4.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	35
3.4.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	35
3.5	WILDLIFE AND AQUATIC RESOURCES.....	36
3.5.1.1	Common Wildlife Species and Their Habitats	36
3.5.1.2	State Special Status Species and Their Habitats.....	37
3.5.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	41
3.5.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	42
3.6	THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES	45
3.6.1.1	Critical Habitat	48
3.6.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	49
3.6.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	49
3.7	HYDROLOGY AND GROUNDWATER	50
3.7.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	52
3.7.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	53
3.8	SURFACE WATERS AND WATERS OF THE U.S.....	54
3.8.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	56
3.8.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	56
3.9	FLOODPLAINS	57
3.9.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	58
3.9.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	58
3.10	AIR QUALITY.....	58
3.10.1	Affected Environment	58
3.10.1.1	Climate and Ambient Conditions	58
3.10.1.2	Regulatory Setting	59

3.10.1.3	Project Site Air Pollutant Emissions	64
3.10.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	65
3.10.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	65
3.11	NOISE.....	70
3.11.1.1	GUIDING POLICIES: Noise.....	71
3.11.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	72
3.11.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	73
3.12	CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	75
3.12.1.1	Sites Known or Expected	76
3.12.1.2	Current Investigations	76
3.12.1.3	Results	77
3.12.1.4	Consultations	77
3.12.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	79
3.12.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	79
3.13	UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE	80
3.13.1.1	Right-of-Ways and Easements	81
3.13.1.2	Water Supply	81
3.13.1.3	Storm Drain	82
3.13.1.4	Sanitary Sewer.....	82
3.13.1.5	Gas Service.....	83
3.13.1.6	Electric Service.....	84
3.13.1.7	Communications Service.....	84
3.13.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	85
3.13.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	85
3.14	ROADWAYS/TRAFFIC.....	90
3.14.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	93
3.14.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	93
3.15	AESTHETIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES	94
3.15.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	98
3.15.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	988
3.16	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS	99
3.16.2.1	Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	100
3.16.2.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	101

3.17	SOCIOECONOMIC	102
	3.17.1.1 Demographics.....	103
	3.17.1.2 Unemployment	104
	3.17.1.3 Economic Development	104
	3.17.1.4 Household Income.....	108
	3.17.1.5 Quality of Life	108
	3.17.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	109
	3.17.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	110
3.18	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN ...	113
	3.18.1.1 Protection of Children	115
	3.18.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	116
	3.18.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	116
3.19	HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY	119
	3.19.1.1 Tyson Field.....	119
	3.19.1.2 Emergency Services	119
	3.19.1.3 Construction and Operation Safety	120
	3.19.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	120
	3.19.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	120
3.20	SUSTAINABILITY AND GREENING	122
	3.20.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative	122
	3.20.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative	123
4.0	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	125
4.1	LAND USE.....	128
4.2	GEOLOGY AND SOILS	129
4.3	VEGETATION.....	129
4.4	WILDLIFE AND AQUATIC RESOURCES.....	129
4.5	THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES	130
4.6	HYDROLOGY AND GROUNDWATER	131
4.7	SURFACE WATERS AND WATERS OF THE U.S.....	132
4.8	FLOODPLAINS	132
4.9	AIR QUALITY	132
4.10	NOISE.....	133
4.11	CULTURAL RESOURCES	134

4.12	UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE	134
4.13	ROADWAYS/TRAFFIC.....	135
4.14	AESTHETICS AND VISUAL	135
4.15	HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.....	136
4.16	SOCIOECONOMIC	137
4.17	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN ...	137
4.18	HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY	138
4.19	SUSTAINABILITY AND GREENING	138
4.20	SUMMARY.....	139
5.0	ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS	141
6.0	REFERENCES.....	143
7.0	ACRONYMNS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	149
8.0	LIST OF PREPARERS.....	153

TABLES

TABLE ES-1.....	7
Summary of Potential Environmental and Socioeconomic Consequences.	7
<i>AMOC Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	7
TABLE 2-1	14
Comparison of Alternative Characteristics Under the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives.....	14
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	14
TABLE 3-1	38
California Species of Special Concern that Occur in the Analysis Area.....	38
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	38
TABLE 3-2	45
ESA Endangered, Threatened, and Candidate Species that may Occur in the Project Area	45
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	45
TABLE 3-3	59
National Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	59
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	59

TABLE 3-4	62
NAAQS Criteria Pollutant Levels for Riverside County.....	62
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	62
TABLE 3-5	64
Types of emission sources and the associated air emissions in this region of the Basin..	64
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	64
TABLE 3-6	68
Estimated impacts of vehicles from additional CBP related personnel.....	68
TABLE 3-7	103
Population 2000, Estimated for 2006, Projected for 2020.....	103
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	103
TABLE 3-8	104
Labor Force and Unemployment	104
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	104
TABLE 3-9	105
Employment by Industry.....	105
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	105
TABLE 3-10	108
Median Household Income around March Joint ARB, Moreno Valley, Riverside County, State of California, and the U.S.	108
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	108
TABLE 3-11	109
Housing Units, Vacancy Rates, and Cost	109
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	109
TABLE 3-12	114
Action Area Race and Poverty Level Census Results Compared to Other Census Locations.....	114
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	114
TABLE 3-13	115
Individuals under the age of 18 at March Joint ARB Compared to Other Census Locations.....	115
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	115

FIGURES

FIGURE 1-1 Existing AMOC	2
FIGURE 1-2 AMOC Location, March Joint ARB, Riverside County, CA	5
FIGURE 2-1 Existing AMOC, North and East Property.	16
FIGURE 3-1 View of Tyson Field Track Looking South.	26
FIGURE 3-2 Tyson Field	35
FIGURE 3-3 Current and Future Access to AMOC Facility	92
FIGURE 3-4 Location of Adjacent Recreational Properties	97

APPENDICES

- A Section 106 Coordination & Responses
- B Public Participation Comments

1.0 INTRODUCTION

U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) are responsible for managing, controlling, and securing the nation's borders. The mission of CBP Air & Marine (OAM) is to protect the American people and the Nation's critical infrastructure through the coordinated use of integrated OAM forces to detect, interdict, and prevent acts of terrorism and the unlawful movement of people, illegal drugs, and other contraband toward or across the borders of the US. Operations at the existing Air & Marine Operation Center (AMOC) located on the March Joint Air Reserve Base (ARB) include:

- Administrative support,
- Special operations,
- Field support, and
- Training.

OAM proposes to expand the existing AMOC by constructing 90,000 square feet of administrative office space and paved parking on 2.75 acres of land located immediately north and adjacent to the existing AMOC. The 2.7 acres of land are on the March Joint ARB and are currently permitted to CBP. An additional 8.38 acres of land adjacent to and east of the existing AMOC will be deeded by the City of Moreno Valley to March Joint ARB for future permitted use to CBP . This Eastern Property would be utilized for future expansion of parking facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, armory, and an indoor small arms range (Figure 1-1). A maximum of 700 personnel (an increase of up to 500 from present staffing level of 200) would be assigned to the AMOC, which would

result in an increase of approximately 500 privately owned vehicles (POVs). A small number of Government owned vehicles would also be associated with AMOC. The expansion would also provide larger Shared Support staff office space that would accommodate the requirements of both the AMOC and potential future Unmanned Aircraft Systems National Operations Center (UASNOC).



FIGURE 1-1 Existing AMOC.

1.1 BACKGROUND

Air & Marine Operations (AMO) operates the AMOC located at March Joint ARB in Riverside, California. The existing AMOC (Figure 1-1) is a one-story facility of approximately 33,400 ft². The primary feature of the existing facility is the Operations Control Center. In addition, the AMOC contains office space, conference rooms, a small

fitness center and a break room, as well as specialized mechanical rooms and support spaces.

Created in 1988 as a state-of-the-art law enforcement radar surveillance center, the AMOC plays an integral role in protecting America. Following the 9/11 attacks, the AMOC has utilized its extensive detection, monitoring and coordination capabilities to enhance security of the national airspace - all the while maintaining its critical role in air and marine interdiction and law enforcement support.

AMOC coordinates its efforts with many other federal agencies through on-site liaisons. Liaisons are contacts for intercommunication between elements of the military or other agencies to ensure mutual understanding and unity of purpose and action. In the future, it is anticipated that as many as fifteen liaisons will utilize the technology and information available at the AMOC.

OAM's priority mission, keeping terrorists and terrorist weapons from entering the United States, places OAM on the frontline of the war on terrorism. OAM protects the American people and Nation's critical infrastructure through the coordinated use of air and marine forces to detect, interdict, and prevent acts of terrorism and the unlawful movement of people, illegal drugs and other contraband toward or across the borders of the United States. On October 1, 2005, CBP integrated its aviation assets, programs and personnel. With over 500 pilots and 250 aircraft, including the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), OAM is the largest law enforcement air force in the world.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The AMOC is located on March Joint ARB in Riverside County, California. March Joint ARB is located approximately 15 miles south of San Bernardino, 70 miles east of Los Angeles and 100 miles north of San Diego (Figure 1-2). The base is bordered by three communities; the city of Riverside to the northwest, Moreno Valley to the north and east, and Perris to the southeast. On the southwest border of the base is unincorporated Riverside County land (Ross Barney Architects, 2007). The existing AMOC is approximately 33,400 gross square feet and is a single story building with concrete walls located on 3.70 acres (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The subject properties are comprised of two parcels of land totaling approximately 11 acres, the Northern Property and the Eastern Property. This parcel is currently owned by March Joint ARB. OAM and March Joint ARB have mutually agreed to allow OAM to use and develop the property to the north to support their growing operations.

The second parcel, the Eastern Property, is 8.38 acres in size and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing AMOC. This parcel will be deeded from the City of Moreno Valley to March Joint ARB for future permitted use to CBP.

The 8.38-acre Eastern Property parcel is bounded by 5th St., to the west, 6th St., to the east, Midway Dr., to the north, and Y St. to the south and was transferred to the City of Moreno Valley through the March Joint Powers Authority (MJPA) Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) (Air Force Real Property Agency, 2007) as recreational



FIGURE 1-2 AMOC Location, March Joint ARB, Riverside County, CA.

property. The Eastern Property can currently be accessed without driving through the base via Cactus Street to Riverside Drive to Meyer Drive to 6th Avenue. The parcel has a running track, exercise stations, and a small bleacher that are available for public use under the 2007 FOSET transfer agreement.

1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED

OAM is responsible for managing, controlling, and securing the nation's borders. The mission of OAM is to protect the American people and the Nation's critical infrastructure through the coordinated use of integrated OAM forces to detect, interdict, and prevent acts of terrorism and the unlawful movement of people, illegal drugs, and other contraband toward or across the borders of the US. The existing AMOC facility is situated on approximately 3.70 acres of land at the March Joint ARB and was originally constructed in 1988 to support 65 personnel. There are currently 200 full time personnel operating at the existing AMOC facility. Planned new operations at the AMOC will require between 500 to 700 personnel. The current overcrowded conditions affect the efficiency of missions and operations carried out by OAM personnel operating at the AMOC. In addition, the existing AMOC facility will not support the anticipated future staff levels and operations that are scheduled to be operating from the facility. OAM needs additional facilities and parking to support an expansion of operations and increase in staff levels at the existing AMOC facility. The purpose of the proposed action is to expand the existing AMOC facility at March Joint ARB to provide OAM personnel with a modern, efficient, and safe facility that accommodates current and future levels of staff, vehicles, and equipment that are necessary to support OAM operations.

1.4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

CBP invites public participation in the proposed federal action through the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, 42 United States Code (USC) 4321 et seq. (NEPA) process. Consideration of the views and information of all interested parties promotes

open communication and enables better decision-making. All agencies, organizations, and members of the public having a potential interest in the proposed action, including minority, low-income, disadvantaged, and Native American groups are urged to participate in the decision-making process. Agency coordination letters were submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the California Department of Fish and Game, and the California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) (see Appendix A). OAM also has initiated consultation with potentially interested Native American tribes through submission of initial consultation letters (Appendix A).

Public participation opportunities with respect to this EA and decision-making on the proposed action are guided by DHS Management Directive (MD) 023-01, Environmental Planning Program. CBP published a Notice of Availability (NOA) for the Draft EA and Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and were made available for public review between March 1, 2011 through April 4, 2011 at the Riverside City and County Public Library, Moreno Valley Branch Library, 25480 Alessandro Boulevard, Moreno Valley, CA 92388 and via the following website <http://r2engineering.projectpath.com/projects/2551742/project/log> for a period of 35 days.

Comments received during the 35 day review period were addressed and the EA was updated as needed. Responses to comments received from the Public Participation period are included in Appendix B. CBP has published a notice to inform the public of the signed FONSI and Implementation of the proposed action.

1.5 FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS

This EA was developed pursuant to the NEPA and its implementing regulations found at 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 1500 through Part 1508

(President's Council on Environmental Quality [CEQ], 2007), and DHS MD 023-01 – *Environmental Planning Program* (DHS, 2006). The purpose of the EA is to inform decision-makers and the public of the likely environmental consequences of the proposed action and alternatives.

NEPA is the Federal environmental law for planning for federal projects and projects with federal nexus. NEPA is integrated with other planning activities to ensure that such decision makers consider environmental and socioeconomic factors as part of their project decisions. CEQA is the State environmental law passed in 1970. CEQA applies to any land use activity, but there are many details in determining if a project falls under CEQA or not. A General rule of thumb has been that CEQA applies to any discretionary project that requires approval by a local government body. This includes building projects as well as planning documents such as general plans and zoning ordinances. Requirements of applicable permits and regulations are also included in the evaluation performed under the NEPA/CEQA process. An environmental impact report (EIR), which satisfies the evaluation required by CEQA, is a detailed report written by the lead agency describing and analyzing the significant environmental effects of a proposed project, identifying alternatives and discussing ways to reduce or avoid the possible environmental damage. An EIR is prepared when the lead agency finds substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. An

environmental assessment (EA) is a substitute for the EIR under the Certified Regulatory Program. An environmental impact statement (EIS) is an environmental impact document prepared pursuant to NEPA, in place of the term EIR which is used in CEQA. This Air Quality section documents baseline conditions near the March Joint ARB.

This EA identifies, documents, and evaluates the environmental and socioeconomic effects of the proposed expansion maintenance and operations of OAM facilities on March Joint ARB. An interdisciplinary team of range ecologists, wildlife biologists, ecologists, environmental scientists, water resource managers, engineers, archaeologists, and historians has analyzed the proposed action and the no action alternative in light of existing conditions and has identified relevant beneficial and adverse effects.

This EA includes discussion of the potential environmental effects of the construction and routine operation of the expanded OAM facilities and operations. Reasonably foreseeable future needs such as additional parking facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, and an indoor small arms range are assessed in the Cumulative Impacts section of this EA.

This EA also considers the potential impacts of the no action alternative to provide a basis for comparison of the potential impacts of the proposed action to existing conditions.

Federal statutes, regulations, management directives (MDs), and executive orders (EOs) applicable to one or more components of the proposed action and no action alternative as described in this EA include, but are not necessarily limited to:

Federal Statutes

- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 USC 4321-4370)
- Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (16 USC 1531-1543)
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 USC 701, et seq.)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1972 (commonly referred to as the Clean Water Act [CWA]) and the Water Quality Act of 1987 (WQA) (33 USC 1251 §1344)
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) (as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 [SARA])
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) (42 USC 6901)
- National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (16 USC 470 et seq., as amended)
- Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (16 USC 470)
- Clean Air Act (CAA) (42 USC 7401 et seq., as amended)
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)

Regulations

- CEQ Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508)
- Protection of Historic Properties (36 CFR Part 800)

DHS Management Directives

- DHS MD 023-01, *Environmental Planning Program*

Executive Orders

- EO 11514, Protection and Enhancement of Environmental Quality
- EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
- EO 13045, Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risk
- EO 13175, Consultation and Coordination With Indian Tribal Governments
- EO 13007, Indian Sacred Sites
- EO 13423, Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management

EO 13423 revoked previous EOs pertaining to sustainability and greening. However, CEQ guidance instructs agencies to maintain activities and practices implemented under the revoked EOs until additional guidance for implementing EO 13423 is provided (CEQ, 2007).

The revoked EOs pertaining to this NEPA analysis are:

- EO 13101, Greening the Government Through Waste Prevention, Recycling, and Federal Acquisition
- EO 13123, Greening the Government Through Efficient Energy Management

- EO 13148, Greening the Government Through Leadership in Environmental Management
- EO 13149, Greening the Government Through Federal Fleet and Transportation Efficiency

These authorities are addressed in various sections of this EA when relevant to particular environmental resources and conditions.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

NEPA requires all federal agencies to consider all potential environmental impacts as they plan federal projects. The Council on Environmental Quality regulation [§1502.14(a)] require federal agencies to “evaluate all reasonable alternatives” to a proposed action. OAM used the following criteria as the basis for selection of alternatives. Those criteria are as follows:

1. Adequate Size – Two proposed parcels of land (2.75 Northern Property and 8.38 Eastern Property) would provide sufficient area for necessary perimeter security and space for the initial and expected future programmed functions. These parcels would allow for expansion of administrative office space, parking, and future facility construction.
2. Proper Location - The proposed parcels of land must be immediately adjacent to the current AMOC and would allow for contiguous facilities and ensure ease of operations. The parcels must be situated in such a way as to not compromise the security and safety of the facility and staff by providing easy access and egress through existing roadways as well as permitting increased security to this specific location.
3. Ease of Access - Access to the new facility will be the same as the existing facility. Personnel will access the AMOC through the main or secondary entrances to the March Joint Air Reserve Base. No new entrance to the AMOC will be constructed.

In addition to the operational requirements, other factors that could have adverse affects on the facility, the public, or the community are considered when selecting an acceptable site. These factors include, but are not limited to:

1. Proximity to residential areas, schools, parks, or churches;
2. Adequate utility services;
3. Proximity to natural hazards (e.g. flood zones, faults); and
4. The potential for environmental effects to the property and surrounding community from the development, construction, and operation of the AMOC.

The following sections and Table 2-1 present a description of the No Action alternative and the Preferred Alternative.

TABLE 2-1 Comparison of Alternative Characteristics Under the No Action and Proposed Action Alternatives <i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>	
Alternative	Characteristics
No Action	Existing facility would continue to be used. No expansion would occur. An increase in OAM staffing would occur and would continue to cause OAM personnel to work in overcrowded and unsafe conditions, ultimately affecting the efficiency and effectiveness of the mission.
Proposed Action	Up to an additional 500 staff would be assigned to the expanded facilities. Facility expansion would be constructed on 2.75-acre Northern Property parcel and the adjoining 8.38 acre Eastern Property parcel. Station components may include some or all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of the existing building on the 3.7-acre OAM parcel. • Constructing a two-story office space, with roughly 55,000 square feet footprint. • Construction of additional asphalt parking space as available on the 2.75 acre Northern Property. • Possible future construction on the 8.38-acre Eastern Property would include asphalt parking, office space, a warehouse, and an indoor small arms range. The proposed action would eliminate the existing public running track and exercise stations that are in disrepair, but are still

	<p>utilized by the public.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New utility lines for water, sewer, and power. • Security fencing, automatic gates, security lighting, and security cameras to exclude public access. • Sidewalks and driveways to buildings. • Native plant xeriscape type landscaping. • Operation and Maintenance of the entire OAM property and newly constructed facilities.
--	--

2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the no action alternative, expansion of the current facility and construction of new facilities would not occur and ongoing missions and operations would continue at the existing facility. However, the existing AMOC (Figure 2-1) would not be able to accommodate an increase in staff (from current 200 level to a maximum of 700 personnel operating at the facility) and would continue to threaten the efficiency and safety of the increased staff due to the existing overcrowded conditions. Increased future needs for OAM would not be met.

While this alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action, the no action alternative forms the baseline for the proposed action. As such, the no action alternative (as required by NEPA) will be carried forward as part of the analysis.



FIGURE 2-1 Existing AMOC, Northern and Eastern Property.

2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2: PROPOSED ACTION ALTERNATIVE – CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE NEW FACILITIES

The preferred alternative consists of constructing a two-story office building, roughly 90,000 ft² in size with a 55,000 ft² foot-print, with additional asphalt parking space as

available on the entire 2.75 acre Northern Property (Figure 2-1). This property is currently owned by March Joint ARB. Both the existing AMOC and the Northern Property are under lease to OAM under an Air Force Use Permit. The City of Moreno Valley currently owns the Eastern Property (also known as Tyson Field) and will deed the property back to March Joint ARB. CBP will acquire the 8.38-acre Eastern Property through a use permit with March Joint ARB, The proposed future expansion would include part or all of the following: additional parking facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, and an indoor small arms range. The expansion of the current operations would allow OAM to fulfill its mission in a safe and efficient manner. The design would be required to be in compliance with federal laws, policies and established government requirements.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

Due to the facility requirements (i.e. property be adjacent to existing AMOC facility), no additional alternatives were considered for analysis.

This page left intentionally blank.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing environmental resources, cultural resources, and socioeconomic conditions that would be potentially affected by the no action and proposed action alternatives. This section also provides a baseline against which to identify and evaluate environmental and socioeconomic changes likely to result from implementation of the proposed action. Baseline conditions represent conditions in 2008, when the initial site visits and project kickoff meeting for this EA were completed.

In compliance with NEPA, CEQ regulations, and DHS MD 023-01, the description of the affected environment focuses on those resources and conditions potentially subject to impacts. These include land use, geology and soils, vegetation, wildlife and aquatic resources, threatened and endangered species, hydrology and groundwater, surface waters and waters of the U.S., floodplains, air quality, noise, cultural resources, utilities and infrastructure, roadways/traffic, aesthetic and visual resources, hazardous materials, socioeconomic, environmental justice and children, human health and safety, and sustainability and greening.

This section also analyzes the direct and indirect effects to environmental resources, cultural resources, and socioeconomics that would likely occur with the proposed action or no action alternative, and identifies any adverse environmental effects that cannot be avoided through project design. Cumulative effects are discussed in Chapter 4.0.

3.1.1 Direct versus Indirect Effects

The terms “effect” and “impact” are, as defined by CEQ regulation (1508.8), synonymous as used in this EA. Effects may be beneficial or adverse and may apply to the full range of natural, aesthetic, historic, cultural, and economic resources within the proposed project area and also within the surrounding area. Definitions and examples of direct and indirect impacts as used in this document are as follows:

- ***Direct Impact.*** A direct impact is one that would be caused directly by implementing an alternative and that would occur at the same time and place.
- ***Indirect Impact.*** An indirect impact is one that would occur later in time or farther removed in distance, but would still be a reasonably foreseeable outcome of implementing an alternative. Indirect impacts may include induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate, and indirect effects to air, water, and other natural resources and social systems.
- ***Relationship between Direct versus Indirect Impacts.*** For direct impacts to occur, a resource must be present. For example, if onsite erosion of soils occurred due to conditions caused by the effects of heavy equipment use (soil loosening, particle size reduction, etc.) during the construction of a home; this could indirectly affect water quality if stormwater runoff containing sediment from the construction site were to enter a stream.

3.1.2 Short-Term versus Long-term Effects

Although CEQ regulations do not specifically include duration in the definition of impact context or intensity, the duration of an identified effect can support the analysis of an

impact on a resource. For example, the construction of a building on a generally level area would expose soil in the immediate area of construction. This effect would be considered short-term because vegetation would be expected to reestablish on the unconstructed portion of the area, stabilizing the soil, within a year of the disturbance.

For the purposes of this analysis, duration of short-term impacts typically is considered to be 1 year or less. Long-term impacts last beyond 1 year. Long-term impacts can continue indefinitely, in which case the impact would be considered to be permanent.

3.1.3 Impact Characterization

Impacts are characterized by their relative magnitude. In this document, four descriptors are used to characterize the level of impacts. In order of degree of impact, the descriptors are as follows.

- No Impact – no change from the existing conditions, beneficially or adversely; applies where a project does not create an impact.
- Negligible or Less than Significant Impact – an adverse or beneficial impact with a trace or low level of detection; applies where the project creates no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts.
- Moderate or Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated – a readily apparent adverse or beneficial impact; applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.”
- Potentially Significant Impact – severe adverse or beneficial impact

3.1.4 Significance

The term “significant,” as defined in Section 1508.27 of CEQ regulations “Implementing the Procedural Regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act” ” (40 CFR 1500 to 1508), requires consideration of both the context and intensity of the impact evaluated.

Significance can vary in relation to the context of the proposed action. Thus, the significance of an action must be evaluated in several standpoints that can vary with the setting of the proposed action. Context may include consideration of effects on society as a whole, regional, and locality of the proposed action. Both short-term and long-term effects may be relevant (NEPA, 1970).

3.1.5 Mitigation

Mitigation may be required if significant impacts are identified which cannot be avoided.

Mitigation measures can be used to reduce impacts to below significance thresholds.

Where potentially significant adverse impacts are identified, measures could be implemented to mitigate or reduce the magnitude of impacts as defined in 40 CFR1508.20 (a-e) and include:

- Rectifying an impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.
- Reducing or eliminating an impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- Compensating for an impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

Where no significant adverse impacts are identified, mitigation measures are not proposed. Where appropriate, CBP would implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) and project design features to avoid impacts or minimize unavoidable impacts that are less than significant.

3.1.6 Preliminary Impact Scoping

The purpose of preliminary impact scoping is to aid in the development of an EA under NEPA as described in the CEQ implementing instructions. An examination of the proposed project and alternatives is bound by a rule of reason - level of analysis is commensurate with severity of impact.

The EA document is to contain sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to issue a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or to prepare a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). If no EIS is necessary, the EA should serve as an environmental aid to the agency. The EA shall include a brief discussion of the purpose and need for the proposed action, alternatives, environmental impacts of the proposed action and alternatives, and a listing of agencies and persons consulted.

It was determined through preliminary scoping that the most appropriate level of analyses to address the potential impacts of the proposed action is an EA.

3.2 LAND USE

3.2.1 Affected Environment

The existing AMOC is located on March Joint ARB in Riverside County, California. March Joint ARB is located approximately 15 miles south of San Bernardino, 70 miles east of Los Angeles and 100 miles north of San Diego. The base is bordered by three communities; the City of Riverside to the northwest, Moreno Valley to the north and east, and Perris to the southeast. On the southwest border of the base is unincorporated Riverside County land (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The City of Riverside is the county seat and the largest city neighboring March Joint ARB. It is the commercial center of the western portion of Riverside County with concentrated commercial development in its downtown area and along State Route (SR)-91. The City of Moreno Valley was incorporated in 1984 is largely a residential area with some commercial development along SR-60 and a mix of commercial and industrial development at its edges. The City of Perris is also largely a residential area with most commercial development in its downtown area (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

Maintenance facilities, warehouses, and administrative centers support the mission of the March Joint ARB. The land surrounding March Joint ARB includes areas of residences, light industry, and agriculture. Light industrial areas are located to the north. Agriculture is located to the east and south. Residential areas are located in all directions around March Joint ARB (EPA, 1996).

Properties adjoining the proposed project location include AMOC, March Joint ARB to the south and west, and March Field Park to the northeast. March Joint ARB is a military installation used to support the Air Force, Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the California Air National Guard. March Field Park, owned and operated by the City of Moreno Valley, is a recreational area with ball fields, skate park, and summer day camp (R₂H Engineering, Inc., 2008).

The Northern Property, approximately 2.75 acres in size, is within the March Joint ARB. The majority of the Northern Property, located directly north of the existing AMOC, is barren ground interspersed with weeds and debris. The Northern Property is also used for overflow parking and as a dumping ground for landscaping debris. All land on the March Joint ARB, including the existing AMOC and the Northern Property, is within a fenced/secure perimeter.

The Eastern Property, north of Y Street, and known as “Tyson Field” is currently owned by the City of Moreno Valley and will be deeded back to the March Joint ARB with future permitted use to CBP. The 8.38 acre Eastern Property was transferred to the City of Moreno Valley through the March Joint Powers Authority (MJPA) as recreational property in 2008. The MJPA has authority over the land use and development in and around the March Air Force Base. There is a public running track, a small set of bleachers, a large stone sign identify “Tyson’s Field”, and multiple exercise stations on the property. The track is regularly used by the local population for exercise and dog walking (Figure 3-1). During the site visit, recent footprints and bike tracks were evident as well as 1 runner and 2 dog walkers. A track groomer (in good condition) was present at the side of the track indicating regular maintenance.



FIGURE 3-1 View of Tyson Field Track Looking South.

3.2.2 Consequences

3.2.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, no construction or changes in land use would occur on the proposed parcels and OAM operations would continue at the existing AMOC. No direct or indirect effects to land use would be anticipated.

3.2.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

The development of the Eastern Property would result in a change in land use from open, recreational to developed facilities to accommodate a maximum of 700 employees,

vehicles, and associated equipment. This change, in terms of adding more buildings, would not result in a significant alteration of the land use as compared to the surrounding community, which is predominantly light manufacturing, residential, office, and airport uses. However, direct adverse impacts to recreational land use would be expected and would be minor, but long term. The Northern Property is currently part of the March Joint ARB and is not available for public use.

Indirect Impacts

There is potential for minor indirect adverse impacts due to the change in land use that could occur to meet the increased demand for housing (potentially 500 new families); secondary services (e.g. schools, medical, retail); and also to meet transportation needs from increased traffic. The current local housing is capable of accommodating the increased demand and no indirect land use impacts are expected from the need for construction of housing to accommodate new employees and their families (City of Moreno Valley, 2008). Some new development for secondary services is possible, though any such construction and associated land use changes would be expected to be minor as this type of development would be normal in cities where there is growth, as is happening in neighboring Moreno Valley.

3.3 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

3.3.1 Affected Environment

3.3.1.1 Geology

The March Joint ARB lies in the Perris Valley where alluvial soils underlie the site. The Perris Valley is characterized as a broad, nearly flat surface dotted with bedrock hills. Alluvial deposits are composed of alternating layers of varying amounts of clay, silt, sand, and gravel. Based on borehole data, the thickness of the alluvial deposits range from zero to over 150 feet in depth (EPA, 1996). Water-bearing properties of the weathered bedrock are highly variable, depending on the degree of fracturing and weathering. Weathered bedrock is generally considered non-water bearing, except in located fracture zones (EPA, 1996).

At approximately 20 to 28 feet below the ground surface, isolated soil layers were identified with the possibility for liquefaction during design level shaking. Analyses indicate that approximately 1.5 to 2.2 inches of liquefaction may occur inducing a differential settlement of $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ inch (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

Probabilistic ground motion values for the County of Riverside are among the highest in southern California, due to the County's proximity to major fault systems with high earthquake recurrence rates. With the exception of the Blythe region, the incorporated cities of Riverside County are exposed to very high and extremely high values that exceed 50 percent of the force of gravity with a 10 percent chance of occurring in 50 years. Communities along the San Jacinto fault (Moreno Valley, San Jacinto and Hemet)

have a greater risk of ground shaking than those along the San Andreas, because San Jacinto earthquakes have a higher probability of occurrence (TLMA, 2008).

3.3.1.2 Topography

Based on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7½-minute topographic map of the Sunnymead quadrangle, the Northern and Eastern Properties are described as a portion of Township 3S, Range 4W, Section 24, San Bernadino Base and Meridian. The approximate coordinates are latitude 33.8945 degrees North and Longitude 117.2489 degrees west. The average elevation the Northern and Eastern Properties is 1,509 feet above mean sea level (amsl). The existing AMOC and the Northern and Eastern Properties are relatively flat, with a slight inclination from the northwest to the southeast. Site (existing AMOC, the Northern Property, and the Eastern Property) elevation ranges from about 1511 feet amsl at the northwest corner to about 1508 feet amsl at the southeast corner (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

3.3.1.3 Soils

Two major soil associations exist in the March Joint ARB area: the Cieneba-Rockland-Fallbrook association and the Monserate-Arlington-Exeter association. The Monserate-Arlington-Exeter association is derived from granitic alluvium and occurs on the eastern portion of the base. These soils have a surface layer of sandy loam to loam, are well drained, are fine- to medium-grained, and are gently sloping (EPA, 1996). The existing AMOC, the Northern Property, and the Eastern Property are in the eastern portion of the former March ARB, these parcels have a surface texture of sandy loam to loam, are well drained, and are fine- to medium-grained as per EPA, 1996.

Four (4) exploratory borings (within the Northern and Eastern Properties) to a depth of fifty (50) feet were conducted in 2002 (Ross Barney Architects, 2007). Soils were recovered and identified as fill consisting of silty sand within the upper 1 to 3 feet, and native soils consisting of silty sand with clay and sand with silt in the lower strata. The soils encountered were typically loose to very dense.

3.3.1.4 Prime Farmland

No designated prime farmland exists on the proposed project site and no portion of the site is used as farmland (R₂H Engineering, 2008).

3.3.2 Consequences

3.3.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

No alteration of soils or geology would occur under the no action alternative since the proposed action would not occur. Therefore, no direct or indirect impacts would occur.

3.3.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

Under the proposed action, minor topographic alterations would result from clearing and grading associated with site/building preparation, which could result in soil erosion and sedimentation. Full compliance with sections 401 and 402 of the CWA would minimize the potential for soil impacts. As a requirement of Section 402 of the CWA, site development would be subject to a General Construction Permit, which requires implementation of a SWPPP and appropriate BMPs to mitigate potential detrimental water quality effects. To prevent soil erosion and potential sediment delivery to

waterways, a combination of the following specific BMPs as needed based on slope and drainage patterns would be implemented:

- Site grading to minimize runoff.
- Construction entrances would be surfaced to minimize mud deposition on roadways.
- Check dams, straw bales, and silt fences to decrease water flow rates and allow sediment to settle onsite.
- Sediment basins and filter berms to retain sediment on site for later removal to an approved location.
- Mulching, seeding, or other suitable stabilization measures to protect exposed areas.
- Permanent reseeded of disturbed soils with vegetation in landscaped areas or placement of crushed rock where vegetation is not desired within 6 months of completion of construction.

Compliance with the CWA and implementation of BMPs would minimize the potential for soil erosion and delivery of sediment to wastewater systems or wastewater collection areas.

The asphalt parking areas and buildings would create large areas of impermeable surface that would increase run-off and erosion potential. The potential for soil erosion and sediment delivery to wastewater systems or collection areas would be based on soil permeability, drainage structures, slope, stormwater facilities and use of BMPs as well as daily and stormwater event management.

The proposed project site is not designated as prime farmland; therefore, no impacts to prime farmland would occur at the site (R₂H Engineering, 2008).

Indirect Impacts

All impacts to geology and soils associated with the proposed action would be confined to the proposed project site, which includes the Northern and Eastern Properties. No indirect impacts to geology or soils in the region would occur as a result the proposed action. However, Riverside County is a historically active seismic zone (TLMA, 2008). Several historic earthquakes in Riverside County have resulted in up to Modified Mercalli Intensity VIII (severe) ground shaking. Most recently MMI VI was reported in the southern Coachella Valley region of Riverside County for the October 1999 Mw 7.1 Hector Mine earthquake. Several fatalities occurred due to the San Jacinto fault earthquakes in 1899 and 1918. The two most seismically active faults in California are located in Riverside County (the San Jacinto and San Andreas faults). As a result, more than 45,000 earthquakes (M>1.0, 1931-1999) have been located in Riverside County. About 90% of the earthquake epicenters in Riverside County occur along the three major fault zones: San Andreas, San Jacinto, and Elsinore fault zones (Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities, 1995; Earth Consultants International, 2000).

With implementation of the proposed action, structure and other infrastructure would be built which could be impacted by seismic activity. Therefore, before a project is approved or otherwise permitted within an A-P Zone, County Fault Zone, within 150 feet of any other active or potentially active fault mapped in a published United States Geologic Survey (USGS) or CGS reports, or within other potential earthquake hazard area (as determined by the County Geologist), a site-specific geologic investigation shall

be prepared to assess potential seismic hazards resulting from development of the project site. Where and when required, the geotechnical investigation shall address the issue(s), hazard(s), and geographic area(s) determined by the County Geologist to be relevant to each development. The site-specific geotechnical investigation shall incorporate up-to-date data from government and non-government sources.

Based on the site-specific geotechnical investigation, no structures intended for human occupancy would be constructed across active faults. This site-specific evaluation and written report will be prepared by a licensed geologist and will be submitted to the County Geologist for review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits. If an active fault is discovered, any structure intended for human occupancy will be set back at least 50 feet from the fault. A larger or smaller setback may be established if such a setback is supported by adequate evidence as presented to and accepted by the County Geologist (TLMA, 2008).

3.4 VEGETATION

3.4.1 Affected Environment

Both parcels of the approximately 11-acre proposed project site have been previously disturbed and/or developed. The disturbed areas are located on the north and east portions of the proposed project area. Existing disturbance is due to grading, vehicle use, dumping of debris, and development into a running track and exercise area. These disturbed areas consist of barren and weed-infested land and include trash and debris (such as lawn and tree clippings, cans, wood, and pipes) and dirt piles from site grading. The eastern property is currently known as Tyson Field and consists of a running track with exercise

stations and a small set of bleachers. Non-native grasses and forbs dominate the site, which is interspersed with barren areas. Much of Tyson Field shows evidence of mowing to control weeds (Figure 3-2). The vegetation consists mainly of invasive species, such as cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), wild oat (*Avena fatua*), Russian thistle (*Salsola kali*), and halogeton (*Halogeton glomerata*). Across the project area, approximately nine non-native trees have become established, six of which appear as landscaping planted along 5th Street, just northeast of the existing AMOC.

No unique or sensitive plant habitats were observed onsite or in the immediate surrounding area during a site investigation conducted on November 13-14, 2008 (The S.M. Stoller Corp., 2008a).



FIGURE 3-2 Tyson Field.

3.4.2 Consequences

3.4.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

No direct or indirect impacts to vegetation would occur to the proposed project area under the no action alternative because no construction and construction-related disturbance would occur.

3.4.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

Approximately 11 acres of non-native vegetation and barren lands would be directly impacted as a result of the new facility. Most existing vegetation would be removed during site grading and replaced with buildings, pavement, and landscaping. However,

these impacts in the proposed project area would be minor within the region, particularly since the sites have been disturbed previously. No sensitive plant habitats were found onsite; therefore, no direct impacts to sensitive plant habitats are anticipated. The proposed action would include on-going weed management and re-vegetation of open areas with native xeric plant species, rather than lawn grass to help promote a green facility with water saving landscape options.

East March Joint ARB undeveloped lands mostly consist of fields/croplands or non-native grasslands. Therefore there is no critical habitat as designated under the ESA on the Northern or Eastern Properties.

Indirect Impacts

Under the proposed action, all impacts would be confined to the proposed project area. Possible short-term, minor, indirect impacts to surrounding plant habitats caused by the generation of dust during construction grading operations could occur. However, BMPs and engineering controls would be used to minimize the amount of dust generated during construction grading activities.

3.5 WILDLIFE AND AQUATIC RESOURCES

3.5.1 Affected Environment

3.5.1.1 Common Wildlife Species and Their Habitats

A local population of cottontail rabbits (*Sylvilagus* sp.) inhabits the area surrounding the large tree on the portion of the eastern property south of Y Street. Other rodent activity is evident across the entirety of the site. Common house sparrows (*Passer domesticus*) and

mourning doves (*Zenaida macroura*) were observed during the November 13-14, 2008 site visit. There were numerous small rodent holes in the barren areas, and an unidentified raptor was seen using the northern property as a hunting ground (S.M. Stoller Corp., 2008a).

At present, the project area does not contain any high quality wildlife habitat. As previously stated, the project area has been graded and consists mainly of weedy non-native vegetation, barren areas, and the running track. Therefore, wildlife habitat would be considered to be low quality where present.

More vacant land, similar in quality to the project area, is located immediately to the east. These adjacent parcels consist of barren, graded land, weedy non-native vegetated areas, asphalt pads, and areas that are disturbed due to vehicle use.

A review of the aerial photographs and soil surveys (NRCS, 2008) indicated that no wetlands, streams, or other aquatic habitats are present on the proposed project site. The November 2008 ecological site investigation confirmed the absence of aquatic resources on and immediately adjacent to the site. During the site visit, no aquatic resources were observed on the site (S.M. Stoller Corp., 2008a).

3.5.1.2 State Special Status Species and Their Habitats

The California Natural Diversity Database (CNDD) (CDFG, 2008) and the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (RC, 2002) were reviewed and compared to determine if any state special status species have the potential to occur within the project area. The MSHCP has been designed to compensate for the loss of biological resources throughout western Riverside County, and cumulative impacts to

existing biological resources resulting through increased future development have been addressed in the MSHCP Final EIR/EIS (RC, 2003). Therefore, future development projects within the planning area that conform to the MSHCP would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for those biological resources adequately covered by the MSHCP. The CNDD search included a nine quadrangle analysis area that was centered on the proposed project site (USDHS, 2008). The search identified 10 California species of special concern that are known to occur in the nine quadrangle analysis area (Table 3-1).

TABLE 3-1 California Species of Special Concern that Occur in the Analysis Area <i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>			
Common Name	Scientific Name	Habitat Requirements	Potential Habitat in the Project Area
Western burrowing owl ¹	<i>Athene cunicularia</i>	Open dry annual grassland, deserts, and scrublands, characterized by low growing vegetation with burrowing mammals present.	Yes
Tricolored blackbird	<i>Agelaius tricolor</i>	Annual grasslands, wet and dry vernal pools, and other seasonal wetlands.	Yes
Loggerhead shrike	<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>	Grasslands, orchards, and open areas with scattered trees.	Yes
San Diego black tailed jackrabbit	<i>Lepus californicus bennettii</i>	Open areas or semi-open country, typically in grasslands, agricultural fields or sparse coastal scrub.	Yes
Northern red diamond rattlesnake	<i>Crotalus ruber ruber</i>	Occupies environments from the coast to the desert slopes of the mountains in areas of rock and brush.	Yes
Coastal cactus wren	<i>Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus sandiegensis</i>	Obligate of coastal sage scrub; can be found in deserts and	No

		other arid terrain with thickets, patches, or tracts of larger, branching cacti, stiff-twigged, thorny shrubs, and small trees. Closely associated with three species of cacti and occurs almost exclusively in thickets of cholla, prickly pear, and <i>Opuntia oricola</i> dominated stands of coastal sage scrub.	
Southern grasshopper mouse	<i>Onychomys torridus ramona</i>	Alkali desert scrub and desert scrub habitats, succulent shrub, wash, and riparian areas. Also occurs in coastal scrub, mixed chaparral, sagebrush, low sage, and bitterbrush habitats.	No
Dulzura pocket mouse	<i>Chaetodipus californicus femoralis</i>	Chaparral, occasionally venturing into desert grassland areas.	No
Western mastiff bat	<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>	Open, semi-arid to arid habitats, including conifer and deciduous woodlands, coastal scrub, annual and perennial grasslands, palm oases, chaparral, desert scrub, and urban.	No
Coast patch-nosed snake	<i>Salvadora hexalepis virgultea</i>	Semi-arid brushy areas and chaparral in canyons, rocky hillsides, and plains.	No

Sources: CDFG, 2008; Zipcode Zoo, 2008

¹Western burrowing owl is also protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The nine quadrangle analysis area and the project area has potential habitat for five state species of special concern: the western burrowing owl, tricolored blackbird, loggerhead shrike, San Diego black-tailed jack rabbit, and the northern red-diamond snake.

There is no suitable riparian woodland, desert scrub, alkali desert scrub, coastal sage scrub, desert cactus, chaparral, or native grassland habitat within the project area for the other five state species of special concern: coastal cactus wren, southern grasshopper mouse, Dulzura pocket mouse, western mastiff bat, and the coast patch-nosed snake (Table 3-1), and these species are not discussed further.

The western burrowing owl prefers non-forested plains, grasslands, deserts, and open areas such as vacant lots near human habitations or airports. The burrowing owl depends upon mammal burrows in areas of short vegetation for nesting, roosting, and escape (DeGraaf *et al.*, 1991). The owl commonly perches on fence posts, bushes, utility wires, roadside billboards, and burrow mounds. The MSCHP indicated the burrowing owl was the only state sensitive species that may have suitable habitat on the March Joint AFB properties (RC, 2002). There are eight large mammal burrows on the Eastern Property that would provide suitable habitat for burrowing owl.

The tricolored blackbird can be found in annual grassland communities; however it is most closely associated with vernal pool and wetlands systems with adjacent feeding habitats. Nesting is often in agricultural fields (Audubon, 2007). The tricolored blackbird is not expected to occur within the proposed project area due to the high density of urban development and roadways, and lack of vernal pool or wetland habitat.

Loggerhead shrike can be found year round throughout Riverside County (CDFG, 2005). Preferred habitat types include grasslands, active pastures, riparian areas, open woodland, agricultural field, desert washes, and other scrub communities (RC, 2002). While the project area does include some grassland, the area is closely surrounded by urban

development and there are no riparian areas, open woodlands, or scrub communities, decreasing the likelihood of the loggerhead shrike occurring.

The San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit occupies many diverse habitats, but is found primarily in arid regions supporting short-grass habitats (CDFG, 2008). Jackrabbits are common in grasslands that are overgrazed by cattle and they are well adapted to using low-intensity agricultural habitats. The San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit is found throughout western Riverside County in suitable grassland, sage scrub and chaparral habitat (RC, 2002). It is also found in substantial numbers in agricultural and rural residential settings. It ranges from being relatively uncommon to locally common (RC, 2002), and is likely to occur in or adjacent to the project area.

The northern red diamond rattlesnake can occur in a wide variety of habitats but it is most commonly associated with heavy brush with large rocks or boulders. Rattlesnake microhabitats of sage scrub and chaparral with boulder and rock outcrop exist throughout western Riverside County (RC, 2002). The project area may contain some of these rattlesnake habitat components; however, there are no rock outcroppings to provide denning and nesting habitat. Therefore, the northern red diamond rattlesnake is not expected to occur within the project area.

3.5.2 Consequences

3.5.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, no construction activities would occur and there would be no direct or indirect impacts to wildlife or aquatic resources.

3.5.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

Construction of the new AMOC Facility would result in permanent conversion of approximately 11.13 acres of previously disturbed land for the main building and associated structures, landscaping, and parking area. Minor impacts to wildlife could occur as a result of clearing the 11.13 acre site. Resident species would be displaced from the site during construction and subsequent operation. Native and non-native fauna could include snakes, lizards, various birds, small rodents, and rabbits. Common mobile species would be expected to relocate to similar, adequate habitat east of the project area (Figure 2-1). However, there would be the potential for incidental loss of individuals of less mobile species. Direct impacts would be considered minor within the region.

The area does not have any quality desert scrub habitat for migratory bird species, although birds were seen using the ground and weedy vegetation for foraging and resting during the 2008 site visit (The S.M. Stoller Corp, 2008). It is possible that the site could be used as an incidental stop-over during migration. Should land clearing to implement the proposed action occur during the spring and fall migration periods, it is expected that the level of human activity would cause the migrants to relocate. Short-term construction impacts would be limited to temporary disturbance and subsequent relocation of these birds, and may occur during one or more migration seasons. In the long-term, anticipated landscaping (e.g., rock, desert groundcover and grass species) would not provide any additional desert scrub or tree habitat. It is expected that migratory birds would no longer use the site once construction is completed. The landscaping would also result in less foraging habitat for mourning doves that require open country with some bare ground

(DeGraaf *et al.*, 1991). However, the adjacent six-acre block, east and adjacent to the Eastern Property and south of the softball fields, consists of identical habitat and may support all birds migrating through the area with no loss of numbers. The proposed action area contains no desert scrub habitat for nesting birds. Although the habitat quality is very low and a low level of bird activity was observed during the November 2008 site visit, there is potential for nesting birds to utilize the site during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31). If land clearing to implement the proposed action were to occur during the nesting period, the proposed project area would be surveyed for nesting birds or nest trees or shrubs prior to construction.

The western burrowing owl is a state species of special concern and protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) that prohibits the taking, killing, possession, transportation, and importation of migratory birds, their eggs, parts, and nests, except when specifically authorized by the Department of the Interior. A pre-construction survey for western burrowing owl would be required to determine whether active owl burrows exist within the limits of the site. Should nesting owls or other species protected by California Department Fish and Game (CDFG) or the MBTA be found in or adjacent to the area that would be cleared, USFWS and CDFG would be notified; avoidance measures approved by USFWS and CDFG would be implemented; and work would be delayed in the vicinity until after the young had fledged. If the western burrowing owl is present on the proposed project site, the USFWS may recommend avoiding ground-disturbing activities during the breeding season (February 1 – August 31); using trap doors to exclude owls from burrows prior to the breeding season; or using other measures to off-set potential impacts to this species. With these avoidance measures, direct

construction impacts to nesting western burrowing owl and other special status species would be considered minor.

In the long-term, the new facilities and post-construction landscaping would not provide any quality nesting habitat for desert scrub, tree, or ground nesting species, and it is likely there would be a loss of habitat potential for these species. The new facilities may provide more nesting habitat for the common house sparrows found on the site.

Some barren and grassland areas do exist and may be colonized by burrowing or reptilian species such as the San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit and the northern red diamond rattlesnake. It is unknown for certain if these species occur within the project area. Implementation of the project would likely result in loss of potential habitat for these species. However, the loss would be considered minor given the presence of similar habitat in the surrounding lands.

No aquatic habitat is present at the proposed action site. Full compliance with sections 401 and 402 of the Clean Water Act and implementation of BMPs would prevent delivery of sediment or hazardous materials to nearby bodies of water. Therefore, no direct or indirect impacts to aquatic resources are expected.

Indirect Impacts

Although there would be increased noise levels during construction that could impact surrounding wildlife, especially birds that rely on vocal communication, the impacts would be temporary. There would be minor, indirect impacts to wildlife during construction and no indirect impacts to aquatic resources.

3.6 THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

3.6.1 Affected Environment

ESA Listed and Candidate Species

The USFWS Threatened and Endangered Species System internet database identified 44 federally listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species with the potential to occur in Riverside County (USFWS, 2008a). Additionally, the CNDD was reviewed to determine if any federally listed endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species have the potential to occur specifically within the proposed project area (CDFG, 2008). The CNDD search included a nine quadrangle search area that was centered on the proposed project site. The search identified seven federal endangered, threatened, and candidate species that are known to occur within the analysis area (Table 3-2) (USFWS, 2008a). Four of these species are also state threatened and endangered species (CDFG, 2008a).

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Habitat Requirements	Potential Habitat in the Project Area
Western yellow-billed cuckoo	<i>Coccyzus americanus occidentalis</i>	ESA Candidate State Endangered	Riparian forest nester, along the broad, lower flood-bottoms of larger river systems.	No
Southwestern willow flycatcher	<i>Empidonax traillii extimus</i>	ESA Endangered State Endangered	Riparian woodlands along streams and rivers with mature, dense stands of willows, cottonwoods, or smaller spring-fed or boggy areas with willows or alders, often with a dense understory.	No

Coastal California gnatcatcher	<i>Poliopitila californica californica</i>	ESA Threatened	Coastal sage scrub habitat	No
Least Bell's vireo	<i>Vireo bellii pusillus</i>	ESA Endangered State Endangered	Riparian woodlands, scrub, and thickets for breeding.	No
California tiger salamander	<i>(Ambystoma californiense)</i>	ESA Threatened	Grassland, oak savanna, and edges of mixed woodland and lower elevation coniferous forest.	No
Quino checkerspot butterfly	<i>Crotalus ruber ruber</i>	ESA Endangered	Patchy shrub or small tree landscapes with openings between large plants. Areas with alternating open swales, dense shrubs, and coastal bluffs.	No
Stephens' kangaroo rat	<i>Onychomys torridus ramona</i>	ESA Endangered State Threatened	Flat or gently rolling, often degraded, annual grassland.	No

Sources: CDFG, 2008a; USFWS, 2008a

The nine quadrangle analysis area has potential habitat for seven ESA listed or candidate species. The project area has no potentially suitable habitat such as aquatic, riparian woodlands, or coastal sage scrub habitat that would support six of the federally listed or candidate species: western yellow-billed cuckoo, southwestern willow flycatcher (USFWS, 2008b; 2005a), coastal California gnatcatcher (Audubon, 2008; USFWS, 2008c), least Bell's vireo (CDFG, 2008a; USFWS, 2008a), and California tiger salamander (USFWS, 2008d; 2005b) (Table 3-2). Therefore, it is determined the proposed action would have No Effect on these species, and these species are not discussed further.

The endangered Quino checkerspot butterfly had historic habitat in southwestern and western Riverside County (Mattoni *et al.*, 1997). However, the butterfly has not been

documented in the project area. The butterfly requires patchy shrub or small tree landscapes with openings between large plants, and areas with alternating open swales, dense shrubs, and coastal bluffs (USFWS, 2008e). There is no suitable Quino checkerspot butterfly habitat in the project area. Therefore, it is determined the proposed actions would have No Effect on this species.

There are records of the Stephens' kangaroo rat within one mile of the project area (CDFG, 2008). The kangaroo rat's preferred habitat includes flat areas, or areas with a slight aspect, often in degraded annual grasslands. Some barren and grassland areas do exist and may be colonized by burrowing rodent species in the project area, however the suitable habitat has been degraded by long-term use and disturbance including grading; installation of asphalt and sidewalks; installation of a running track and exercise equipment; mowing; dumping; and vehicle use. The adjacent areas to the west and south of the 2.75 area parcel in the March Joint ARB are developed with buildings, parking lots, and other facilities. The adjacent areas to the north of the 2.75 acre parcel and to the north, south, and east of the 8.38 acre City of Moreno Valley parcel are parks and open areas with some recreational development (Figure 2-1). Both of the proposed parcels are surrounded by paved roadways, and a major highway divides the open parcels to the east of the project area. Both of the proposed parcels are predominantly non-native grass and weed community with barren areas and a few non-native trees.

An assessment for Stephen's kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*) (SKR) was conducted by Mark Pavelka of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service on March 9, 2009. His assessment concluded that there are no SKR on either parcel and that SKR are not likely to naturally immigrate into the area in the foreseeable future. This determination was

based on 1) the lack of burrow and other rodent sign on the property, 2) the high level of compaction of the soil, 3) the relatively high gravel content on the surface and in the tailings from deeper digging by gophers (*Thomomys spp.*) (very few gopher burrows found), 4) the high density of vegetation, 5) the existing level of urban development surrounding the site, 6) the apparent lack of any suitable habitat or areas known to be occupied by SKR within the vicinity of the site, and 7) the historic lack of SKR captures on March Air Force Base east of Interstate 215. As a result, the Fish and Wildlife Service indicated that a project on this site would not affect SKR and that "take" authorization for SKR pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is not required. The 11.13 acre project area has been graded, partly developed, and planted with non-native grasses and a few non-native trees. Weedy species and areas of barren soil cover much of the open ground on the proposed project area. Due to the poor quality of the impacted habitat and the proximity of other development and human activity no significant cumulative effects are anticipated.

3.6.1.1 Critical Habitat

Critical habitat is designated as specific geographic areas, whether occupied by a listed species or not, that are essential for its conservation and that have been formally designated by rule published in the Federal Register (USFWS glossary - <http://www.fws.gov/endangered/pdfs/glossary.pdf>). The Quino checkerspot butterfly is the only species with ESA designated Critical Habitat in the nine quadrangle analysis area, approximately 6 miles southwest of the proposed project area (USFWS, 2008e). There are six Quino checkerspot butterfly recovery units in California, including 97,030 acres in Riverside County (FR, 2002). There is no designated Critical Habitat for the

butterfly or the other listed species in the project area. Therefore, it is determined the proposed actions would have No Effect on designated Quino checkerspot butterfly critical habitat.

3.6.2 Consequences

3.6.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, construction activities would not occur and there would be no direct or indirect impacts to threatened and endangered species within the proposed project area.

3.6.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

No aquatic or riparian habitat is present at the proposed action site; therefore, no direct impacts to the candidate western yellow-billed cuckoo or endangered southwestern willow flycatcher are expected to occur during project implementation.

There is no coastal sage scrub habitat present at the proposed action site. Therefore, no direct impacts to the threatened coastal California gnatcatcher are expected to occur during project implementation

There is no suitable desert riparian woodland, desert scrub, alkali desert scrub, chaparral, native grassland, vernal pool, or oak savanna habitat within the proposed project site; therefore, there would be no impacts to the endangered least Bells vireo, endangered Quino checkerspot butterfly, or threatened California tiger salamander.

It was determined during a survey of the Eastern property by Mark Pavelka of the USFWS on March, 2009 that a project on this site would not affect Stephen's kangaroo

rat (SKR) and that "take" authorization for SKR pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is not required.

Indirect Impacts

All impacts would be confined to the project area. There would be no indirect impacts to ESA listed or candidate species or their potential or designated critical habitats outside of the project area.

3.7 HYDROLOGY AND GROUNDWATER

3.7.1 Affected Environment

The March ARB is located in the Perris Valley. Coarse-grained alluvial deposits form the main groundwater aquifer. These deposits are highly permeable and capable of yielding large amounts of water under unconfined conditions. Based on previous studies and the results of the Operable Unit One (OU1) located at East March/Main Base, remedial investigation/feasibility studies (RI/FS) (EPA Region 9 Superfund; <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r9/sfund/r9sfdocw.nsf/vwsoalphabetic/March%20Air%20Force%20Base?OpenDocument>), the permeability of the alluvium varies both laterally and vertically. Boring logs indicate that the general stratigraphy consists of silty sands and sandy silts from the surface to depths of approximately 50 feet below ground surface (bgs).

Below a depth of approximately 50 feet bgs, boring logs from OU1 reveal highly permeable, clean sands ranging in thickness from a few inches to tens of feet. The sands

alternate with relatively impermeable clays, silts, and silty sands of similar thickness. These clays and silts act as local leaky confining units (EPA, 1996).

The project area is generally flat and does not contain natural drainages, irrigation ditches, or other surface water features. The estimated depth to groundwater is approximately 15 to 20 ft below land surface, and groundwater flows in a southwest direction. There is no surface water on or adjacent to the Northern or Eastern Properties (R₂H Engineering, Inc., 2008).

The 2008 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment revealed a groundwater plume of Perchloroethylene (PCE) in the upper alluvial layer, under the northeast quadrant of the Northern Property and Eastern Property (R₂H Engineering, Inc., 2008). The PCE concentration levels are just above the drinking water standard. Based on the depth of groundwater, concentrations of PCE, and the south and west flow pattern of groundwater there is not a significant environmental concern to the proposed parcels since the Installation Restoration Program Site 4 (source of PCE's) is located to the east of the Northern and Eastern Properties and are therefore not in the general flow direction of the groundwater plume (Air Force Real Property Agency, 2007). The proposal to transfer this Property by the U. S. Air Force (Responsible Party) to the March Joint Powers Authority has been adequately assessed and evaluated for (a) the presence of hazardous substances and contamination on the Property, (b) environmental impacts anticipated from the intended use of the Properties, (c) the adequacy of use restrictions and notifications to ensure that the intended use is consistent with protection of human health and the environment, and d) adequate notice of disclosures, including those required by CERCLA 120(h). The future use of these Properties does not present a current or future

risk to human health or the environment, subject to inclusion and compliance with the appropriate restrictions on use and disclosures as addressed above. CERCLA § 120(h)(3)(A)(ii)(I) requires that a covenant indicating that all remedial action necessary to protect human health and the environment with respect to any hazardous substances remaining on the Properties has been taken prior to transfer by deed (Air Force Real Property Agency, 2007).

The Deed will state that the Air Force will be responsible for conducting any CERCLA remedial action found to be necessary for hazardous substances released or disposed of on the property prior to the date of the Deed, so long as the property recipient is not a potentially responsible party under CERCLA for the release or disposal. The above response assurance by the Air Force does not mean the Air Force will perform or fund any remediation to accommodate a change in land use desired by the property recipient that is inconsistent with use restrictions or covenants contained in the Deed or other related property transaction documents (Air Force Real Property Agency, 2007).

3.7.2 Consequences

3.7.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, the proposed project site would remain unimproved and there would be no change at the existing facility. No direct or indirect impacts to surface water hydrology or groundwater would occur.

3.7.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

Site grading activities for project construction would occur within the surficial soil layers. However, it is not expected that construction activities would impact the flow direction of the local groundwater, given the minimum reported depth of the groundwater as 15 to 20 feet bgs and the granular silty sand and sandy silt nature of the soil (Multiquip, Inc., 2008).

No additional chemical groundwater contaminants are expected as a result of the proposed actions. However, continued monitoring of the groundwater plume, flow direction, and PCE levels in the upper alluvial layer of the project area will be conducted under the IRP Site 4 Remedial Action to ensure continued compliance with the CERCLA March Joint ARB Federal Facilities Agreement (EPA *et al.*, 1990). Any future development of the proposed site will consider the location of all current groundwater wells on the proposed site and that the wells must to be secured and available for future use by the Navy for monitoring purposes.

Indirect Impacts

Indirect impacts to groundwater are typically associated with increased demand for potable water that results in higher levels of groundwater withdrawal and possible over drafting. The March ARB has sufficient capacity to accommodate potable water needs of the increased population and operation of the proposed AMOC through the Western Municipal Water District (WMWD) which services the base. It is anticipated that no new

potable groundwater wells would be developed as part of the proposed action. However, since southern California receives an average rainfall of about 15 inches annually, water supplies must be imported and thus water conservation programs should be implemented.

3.8 SURFACE WATERS AND WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

3.8.1 Affected Environment

No surface waters or waters of the U.S. exist on the proposed AMOC expansion project area (R₂H Engineering Inc., 2008). The National Wetlands Inventory Database was searched for the subject property and there are no wetlands within ½ mile of the property. Additionally, no surface waters or waters of the United States were observed in or adjacent to the proposed project area during the June 2008 ecological site investigation (The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008a).

However, a number of wetlands and riparian areas are located on or in the immediate area of the base with most being located on March Joint ARB west side. The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers (USACE) has performed a jurisdictional wetlands determination associated with the Cactus and Heacock flood control channels which are south of Cactus Avenue and west of Heacock Street. The wetlands are located 1 mile north and 0.2 miles east of the Northern and Eastern Properties, respectively. Though these are artificial channels excavated in uplands, they act as ephemeral streams that flow during runoff conditions; support some scattered wetland vegetation; and are considered waters of the United States.

The USACE determined that approximately 2.17 acres of jurisdictional wetlands exist in the Heacock storm drain channel, with 0.8 acres of wetlands adjacent to the Site 4 landfill, which is located east of the subject property. The wetlands are not continuous but are localized patches of wetland vegetation that change position each year due to the high volume, high velocity stormwater flow during spring rains. Runoff causes scouring of the earthen bottom and sides of the channels (EPA, 1996).

As discussed in the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) the Deed will reference the existence of these wetlands and their regulatory control, and will contain restrictive provisions ensuring that no actions can be taken which would adversely affect those wetlands. Any property development affecting wetlands will be subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and any state provisions. Additionally, the NEPA Disposal ROD, as required by E.O. 11990, specified that certain wetlands will be protected. The deed will include a protective covenant advising the Transferee of these protected wetlands and its associated responsibilities (Air Force Real Property Agency, 2007).

There are two permanent surface water bodies within 4 miles of March Joint ARB. The first, a very small recreation lake, is located approximately 2 miles east of the base. It is maintained by the Moreno Valley Ranch Homeowners Association, and is located just south of Iris Street and west of Lasselle Street in the City of Moreno Valley (EPA, 1996). The second, Lake Perris, is located 4 miles southeast of the base, and provides approximately 130,000 acre feet of storage for State Project Water. The water is brought to the lake by the California Aqueduct which runs north and east of the base. Additionally, an east-west portion of the Colorado River Aqueduct is located

approximately 3.5 miles south of the base. This aqueduct flows into Lake Matthews, which is located about 10 miles west of March Joint ARB.

3.8.2 Consequences

3.8.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, the proposed project site would remain unimproved and there would be no change at the existing AMOC. No direct or indirect impacts to surface waters or waters of the United States would occur.

3.8.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Under the proposed action alternative, there would be no direct and minor indirect impacts to waters of the United States due to a potential increase volume of stormwater runoff from additional (new) impervious areas on the property. There are no surface drainage patterns capable of transporting stormwater from the project area to natural waterbodies. The existing stormwater drainage system flows to waters of the United States. Therefore, minor indirect impacts to waters of the United States would be expected from an increase in impervious area at the property.

Prior to construction, CBP would be required to obtain a General Construction Permit in compliance with Section 402 of the CWA. CWA compliance also requires preparation of an SWPPP and implementation of appropriate BMPs to reduce pollutants and sediment in stormwater discharges from construction sites (see Section 3.3 Geology and Soils).

Construction of buildings and parking lots could result in an increase of up to 2.75 acres of impervious surface on the Northern Property. This increase could result in an increase

of stormwater and/or urban runoff leaving the site. The potential increase in impervious surface area on the Eastern Property has not been determined. However, the proposed action alternative does not include handling of hazardous material that may be released to the environment and transported off site via stormwater. Full compliance with the CWA and implementation of construction BMPs would minimize the amount of runoff to the city sewage system. Stormwater would be managed according to State and Federal requirements.

A minor increase in impervious surfaces would result on the site as a result of project development, which could result in a slight increase of stormwater and/or urban runoff leaving the site. The storm drain system is designed to prevent flooding by carrying excess rainwater away from streets.

There are no surface drainage patterns capable of transporting water from the project area to natural waterbodies. However, the existing stormwater drainage system flows to waters of the United States and therefore minor indirect impacts to offsite surface waters or waters of the United States would be expected due to the potential increased volume of stormwater from new impervious area at the property.

3.9 FLOODPLAINS

3.9.1 Affected Environment

During the Phase I Environmental Assessment a floodplain analysis was performed and it was determined that the site is not within a 100 year floodplain.

3.9.2 Consequences

3.9.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, the proposed project site would remain unimproved and there would be no change at the existing AMOC. No direct or indirect impacts to floodplains would occur.

3.9.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Under the proposed action alternative, neither direct nor indirect impacts would occur to a floodplain as the site is not in a floodplain. The 100-year floodplain existing approximately 500 feet east of the proposed AMOC would not be affected by the proposed action.

3.10 AIR QUALITY

3.10.1 Affected Environment

For purposes of a NEPA/CEQA analysis, air quality refers to ambient air quality conditions.

3.10.1.1 Climate and Ambient Conditions

Baseline data were taken from two different stations, March Joint ARB (Lat 3354 Long 11715) and Perris (Lat 3347 Long 11714). The temperature data are from the Perris station, all other climate data are from March Joint ARB.

March Joint ARB is located in western Riverside County approximately 15 miles south of San Bernardino. The average annual maximum and minimum temperatures are 78.7

degrees Fahrenheit (°F) and 45.3°F, respectively (WRCC, 2008a). The average summer and winter monthly temperatures are in the mid-90s and low 40s respectively. The prevailing wind direction is west-northwest, and the average rainfall is less than 10.0 inch per year (WRCC, 2008b).

3.10.1.2 Regulatory Setting

The Federal Clean Air Act

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the EPA to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment. The primary CAA standards protect public health, including the health of sensitive populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly. The secondary standards protect public welfare, including protection against decreased visibility and damage to animals, crops, vegetation, and buildings (EPA, 2008). EPA has established NAAQS for six principal pollutants, which are called “criteria pollutants” (Table 3-3).

Pollutant	Primary Standards		Secondary Standards	
	Level	Average Times	Level	Averaging Times
Carbon Monoxide	9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	8-hour ⁽¹⁾	None	
	35 ppm (40 mg/m ³)	1-hour ⁽¹⁾	None	
Lead	0.15 µg/m ³⁽²⁾	Rolling 3-Month Average	Same as Primary	
	1.5 µg/m ³	Quarterly Average	Same as Primary	
Nitrogen Dioxide	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m ³)	Annual (Arithmetic Mean)	Same as Primary	
	0.100 ppm	1-hour ⁽³⁾	None	

Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	150 µg/m ³	24-hour ⁽⁴⁾	Same as Primary	
Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	15.0 µg/m ³	Annual ⁽⁵⁾ (Arithmetic Mean)	Same as Primary	
	35 µg/m ³	24-hour ⁽⁶⁾	Same as Primary	
Ozone	0.075 ppm (2008 std)	8-hour ⁽⁷⁾	Same as Primary	
	0.08 ppm (1997 std)	8-hour ⁽⁸⁾	Same as Primary	
	0.03 ppm	1-hour ⁽⁹⁾	Same as Primary	
Sulfur Oxides	0.03 ppm	Annual (Arithmetic Mean)	0.5 ppm (1,300 µg/m ³)	3-hour ⁽¹⁾
	0.14 ppm	24-hour ⁽¹⁾		

(1) Not to exceeded more than once per year.

(2) Final rule signed October 15, 2008.

(3) To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average at each monitor within an area must not exceed 0.100 ppm (effective January 22, 2010)

(4) Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years.

(5) To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the weighted annual mean PM_{2.5} concentrations from single or multiple community-oriented monitors must not exceed 15.0 µg/m³.

(6) To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour concentrations at each population-oriented monitor within an area must not exceed 35 µg/m³ (effective December 17, 2006).

(7) To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentrations measured at each monitor within an area over each year must not exceed 0.075 ppm (effective May 27, 2008).

(8) (a) To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the fourth-highest daily maximum 8-hour average ozone concentrations measured at each monitor within an area over each year must not exceed 0.08 ppm.

(b) The 1997 standard—and the implementation rules for that standard—will remain in place for implementation purposes as EPA undertakes rulemaking to address the transition from the 1997 ozone standard to the 2008 ozone standard.

(c) EPA is in the process of reconsidering these standards (set in March 2008).

(9) (a) EPA revoked the 1-hour ozone standard in all areas, although some areas have continuing obligations under the standard (“anti-backsliding”).

(b) the standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with maximum hourly average concentrations above 0.12 ppm is less and or equal to 1.

The 1997 standard—and the implementation rules for that standard—will remain in place for implementation purposes as EPA undertakes rulemaking to address the transition from the 1997 ozone standard to the 2008 ozone standard.

Source: EPA, 2008.

General Conformity

Section 176(c), General Conformity, of the CAA requires that federal activities demonstrate their conformity with the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The SIP is the State's plan for complying with the federal CAA administered by EPA. The SIP consists of narrative, rules, technical documentation, and agreements that an individual state will use to meet clean air standards in non-attainment areas. All federal actions occurring in air basins designated as a non-attainment or maintenance area must conform to the applicable SIP.

Prevention of Significant Deterioration

In addition to requirements under Section 176(c), General Conformity, of the CAA, the EPA's prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) program is designed to keep an attainment area in continued compliance with NAAQS. For actions in attainment areas, PSD approval would be required if the action includes a new major stationary source (generating more than 250 tons per year [tpy]) or major modification to an existing major source (40 CFR 52.21).

South Coast Air Quality Management District

California Public Resources Code §21080.5 allows public agencies with regulatory programs to prepare a plan or other written document in lieu of an environmental impact report once the Secretary of the Resources Agency has certified the regulatory program. Under its certified regulatory program, the Air Quality Management District (AQMD) prepares substitute Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs) or negative declarations, which are called environmental assessments (EAs). The AQMD's regulatory program was certified by the Secretary of the Resources Agency on March 1, 1989, and is codified as

AQMD Rule 110. Regulatory programs apply to agencies that adopt or approve standards, rules, regulations or plans, or involve the issuance of a lease, permit, license, certificate, or other entitlement of use.

The potential influence of emissions on regional air quality would typically be confined to the air basin in which the emissions occur (40 CFR 81.66). March Joint ARB is located in the portion of Riverside County that is located in the South Coast Air Basin. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is responsible for maintaining and improving the air quality throughout the Basin. Based on measured ambient criteria pollutant data, EPA designates areas of the United States as having air quality equal to or better than NAAQS (attainment), worse than NAAQS (non-attainment), or areas recently re-designated as attainment from non-attainment (maintenance).

Western Riverside County is located in the portion of the SCAQMD that is in non-attainment or maintenance for federally regulated criteria pollutants (EPA, 2008).

Riverside County has non-attainment status for ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM₁₀ (Scorecard, 2003). Table 3-4 summarizes the NAAQS criteria pollutant levels for Riverside County. Data specific to western Riverside County was not available.

TABLE 3-4					
NAAQS Criteria Pollutant Levels for Riverside County					
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>					
Pollutant	NAAQS Standard	Highest Recorded Concentration	Second Highest Recorded Concentration	Number of NAAQS Exceedances	Stations Monitoring Pollutant
Carbon Monoxide					
1-hour average	35 ppm	4.6 ppm	4.5 ppm	0	4
8-hour average	9 ppm	3.7 ppm	3.6 ppm	0	4

Lead					
Quarterly average	1.5 µg/m ³	0.02 µg/m ³	0.01 µg/m ³	0	3
Nitrogen Dioxide					
Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.053 ppm	0.02 ppm	0.01 ppm	0	4
Ozone					
8-hour average	0.08 ppm	0.14 ppm	0.14 ppm	268	7
PM_{2.5}					
24-hour average	35 µg/m ³	104 µg/m ³	89 µg/m ³	1	4
Annual Arithmetic Mean	15 µg/m ³	24.8 µg/m ³	22.6 µg/m ³	2	4
PM₁₀					
24-hour average	150 µg/m ³	309 µg/m ³	227 µg/m ³	4	6
Annual Arithmetic Mean	50 µg/m ³	56 µg/m ³	55 µg/m ³	1	6
Sulfur Dioxide					
3-hour average	0.50 µg/m ³	0.01 µg/m ³	0.01 ppm	0	1
24-hour average	0.14 ppm	0.01 ppm	0.01 ppm	0	1
Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.03 ppm	0.003 ppm	0 ppm	0	1

Source: 2003 Summary of Pollutant Concentrations (Scorecard, 2003).

Permit Requirements

The SCAQMD requires permits for all equipment with the potential to emit air pollutants prior to beginning construction and/or operation. For any equipment items associated with the proposed action that are not listed as exempt by AQMD Rule 219, a permit to construct and a permit to operate would have to be received from the SCAQMD (SCAQMD, 2008). Emission sources such as building heating units, water heaters, and

backup generators may require a permit if the capacity and emission thresholds listed in Rule 219 are exceeded.

3.10.1.3 Project Site Air Pollutant Emissions

Table 3-5 identifies the types of emission sources and the associated air emissions in this region of the Basin. Mobile sources, such as vehicular emissions, are the primary contributor to air pollutant emissions in this region of the Basin (CARB, 2008).

TABLE 3-5								
Types of emission sources and the associated air emissions in this region of the Basin <i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>								
Source Type	Annual Emission Tons Per Year							
	TOG	ROG	CO	NOX	SOX	PM	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Fuel Combustion	1.0	0.3	1.6	3.8	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2
Waste Disposal	2.3	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cleaning and Surface Coatings	6.4	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.2
Petroleum Production and Marketing	2.3	2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Industrial Processes	1.7	1.6	0.0	0.2	0.1	3.4	2.0	0.7
STATIONARY SOURCES SUBTOTAL	13.7	8.4	1.6	4.1	0.4	3.8	2.4	1.1
Solvent Evaporation	14.4	12.6	-	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0
Miscellaneous Processes	45.0	4.4	10.4	2.2	0.1	73.4	36.4	6.8
AREAWIDE SOURCES SUBTOTAL	59.4	17.0	10.4	2.2	0.1	73.4	36.4	6.8
On-road Motor Vehicles	31.0	28.0	313.6	72.0	0.6	3.6	3.6	2.6
Other Mobile Sources	15.6	14.3	69.9	24.3	0.4	1.6	1.6	1.4
MOBILE AIR SOURCES SUBTOTAL	46.6	42.3	383.5	96.3	1.0	5.2	5.2	4.0
REGIONAL BASIN TOTALS	119.7	67.7	395.5	102.6	1.5	82.4	44.0	11.9

Source: CARB, 2007.

As previously stated, western Riverside County is located in a non-attainment area for the federally regulated criteria pollutants ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} and a maintenance area for carbon monoxide (Scorecard, 2003). General conformity applies to non-attainment and

maintenance areas. Therefore, western Riverside County requires a general conformity applicability analysis. In 2007, the Final 2007 AQMP was adopted by the AQMD Governing Board which details attainment strategies. The Basin is classified as a “severe-17” non-attainment area for ozone (8-hour) with an attainment date of 2021 and a non-attainment area for PM_{2.5} with an attainment date of 2010 [South Coast Management District (SCMD, 2007)]. In 2005, the Basin exceeded the federal standards for ozone, PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5} on a total of 89 days at one or more locations. Despite improvement in air quality over the past few decades, some areas in the Basin still exceed the National NAAQS criteria for ozone more frequently than any other area of the U.S (SCMD, 2007). Since 2003, the Basin has met NAAQS carbon dioxide and re-designation for attainment has been requested, and is currently pending.

3.10.2 Consequences

3.10.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, no construction-related emissions would occur. However, a slight increases in commuter vehicle emissions would still be generated due to the increase in employees as space in the existing AMOC facility is available (potentially an additional 35). Existing air pollutant emissions associated with routine operations would remain in force and complied with and therefore, there would be no significant direct or indirect impacts generated as a result of the no action alternative.

3.10.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

Emissions during construction activities would be generated by ground disturbances, engine exhaust from construction workers' POVs and off-road construction equipment, including earth-moving equipment and trucks. The emissions would primarily consist of fugitive dust, NO_x, SO₂, PM, CO, and VOCs, which are typical of the emissions commonly observed at construction sites and would not extend past the construction period. Construction emissions would likely be local and would be limited to the duration of the construction activities.

The primary risks of blowing dust particles transported offsite and combustion emissions from construction equipment relate to human health and human nuisance values. Fugitive dust can contribute to respiratory health problems and can create an inhospitable working environment. In addition, deposition on surfaces can be a nuisance to those living or working downwind.

Ground disturbance would be minimal and would be limited to grading prior to constructing the new BPS. BMPs appropriate to the relative potential for adverse impact would be implemented to reduce or eliminate fugitive dust emissions. BMPs that would be implemented during or following construction to reduce or eliminate fugitive dust emissions could include, but not be limited to:

- Groundcover vegetation and crushed rock would be used for permanent dust control in landscaped areas around buildings and pavement within 6 months after construction is complete.

- Straw or other mulch materials would be used to control dust in disturbed areas during construction, prior to completion of the permanent groundcover vegetation and crushed rock stabilization.
- Periodic watering would be used to minimize fugitive dust emissions during construction. A water truck may be used to maintain moist disturbed surfaces and distribute water during visible dusting episodes [Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District (MDAQMD, 1996)].

No substantial changes in air quality from the baseline conditions would be likely during construction. Fugitive dust would increase in the immediate area during construction, but impacts would be temporary and minor. Dust abatement measures previously discussed would limit the direct and secondary creation of dust. With these BMPs, the proposed action would cause only minor, short-term impacts on air quality due to construction activities.

The New Source Review (NSR) permitting program was developed as part of the 1977 Clean Air Act Amendments as a reconstruction permitting program to prevent the degradation of air quality as a result of new construction or industries (EPA, 2008b). Sources of operation-related emissions would be limited to building heating units, water heaters, and the backup generator. Collectively, these sources would not have the potential to emit 10 tons per year (typ) of any single hazardous air pollutant (HAP), or 25 tpy of any combination of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs), or 100 tpy or more of any NAAQS criteria air pollutant. Therefore, NSR is not required for the proposed action.

However, permits to construct and to operate would be required for any equipment that may emit pollutants and that is not listed as exempt.

Because the proposed AMOC expansion is located in a non-attainment area, a general conformity applicability analysis may be required before construction can begin.

Provided no stationary sources associated with the proposed action would generate more than 250 tpy of emissions, a PSD analysis would not be applicable to the proposed action.

Operation of the proposed expanded AMOC facility would result in increased emissions but would create negligible, long-term air quality impacts.

Indirect Impacts

TABLE 3-6 Estimated impacts of vehicles from additional CBP related personnel				
Average Emissions Per Vehicle	Average emissions/vehicle (g/mi)	Est. Additional Emissions to Moreno Valley ^a (kg/year)	Est. Impact from Additional Personnel ^b (kg/year)	Change in Emissions (%)
Exhaust HC ^c	0.543	1170176	1629	0.14
Non-exhaust HC ^c	0.604	1301632	1812	0.14
Total HC	1.147	2471808	3441	0.14
Exhaust CO ^c	11.318	24390516	33,954	0.14
Exhaust NO _x ^c	1.726	3719565	5178	0.14
PM ^d	0.129	277998	387	0.14
<p>a. Assumes 2 vehicles per worker family and 500 additional workers. Assume workers travel 6000 miles per year in Moreno Valley area.</p> <p>b. Assumes 2 vehicles per family and a population of 179,585. Assume residents travel 6000 miles in Moreno Valley area.</p> <p>c. Data from U.S. Department of Transportation.</p> <p>d. Assume the maximum emission factor for PM-10. Data from Fitz, 2001.</p>				

The expanded facilities would employ up to 500 more employees than the current staffing levels. This increase in staffing could result in as many as 500 more POVs driving to and from the site on a daily basis. Most of these employees are expected to commute from residences within Riverside County.

Based on the typical American family (1.9 vehicles per household), the proposed action could result in up to 950 additional POVs in the county or surrounding areas (FHWA, 2003). Further assuming 1 round trip for work not associated with CBP operations, and 2 non-work-related round trips per household per day, 500 new families (the maximum) would generate 2,783 new one-way vehicle trips per day. These additional employee family POVs would result in an increase in the average daily trips in the communities surrounding March ARB, where most personnel and staff would live. The impact of an additional 500 vehicles on the Moreno Valley area were estimated (Table 3-6), based on data from the U.S. Department of Transportation on vehicle emissions and research by the University of California on emission factors for PM 2.5 and PM 10. The addition of new workers to the valley will increase the regional emissions, and thus decrease air quality, by less than 0.14 %. Thus, the impact of the additional workers proposed by this project is not significant.

This would be expected to have an insignificant impact on air quality. Increases in traffic volume, traffic related emissions, traffic related accidents, and road maintenance costs would occur. However, State and local governments would collect greater amounts of tax related revenue from the increase in vehicles.

3.11 NOISE

3.11.1 Affected Environment

Noise can be defined as an unwanted sound and is regulated to maintain acceptable noise limits and protect sensitive receptors, such as hospitals or schools. Primary sources of noise in the proposed project area are the nearby March Joint ARB and vehicles along adjacent highways. This section documents the baseline noise conditions in and around the proposed project site. An evaluation of potential impacts that may result from the proposed action is also provided.

To determine impacts to human receptors, noise measurements are weighted to increase the contribution of noises within the normal range of human hearing and decrease the contribution of noises outside the hearing range. Human hearing is evaluated by using an A-weighted decibel (dBA) scale. The dBA level increases by three (The Engineering Toolbox, 2005) when sound pressure doubles. Psychologically, most humans perceive a doubling of sound as an increase of 10 dBA (EPA, 1974). Sound pressure decreases with distance from the source. Typically, the sound measured from a point source decreases at a rate of six dBA per doubling of distance and sound from a continuous source decreases at a rate of three dBA per doubling of distance. However, factors including the ground type, atmospheric conditions, and shielding by vegetation and structures further affect the amount of decrease in sound over distance (FHWA, 2007).

Two measurement scales commonly used in California are the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and the day-night level (Ldn). In order to account for increased human sensitivity at night, the CNEL level includes a five dB penalty on noise during the

7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. time period and a 10 dB penalty on noise during the 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. time period. The Ldn level includes only the 10 dB weighting for late-night noise. These values are nearly identical for almost all noise sources (City of Moreno Valley, 2006). Noise attenuation is required where necessary to achieve acceptable interior noise levels. The acceptable interior noise for sensitive receptors is 45 CNEL. Although noise pollution can affect all segments of the population, certain groups are more susceptible to its adverse affects than others. Children, the elderly, and the chronically or acutely ill are the most sensitive population groups, and hospitals, churches, and residences are the most susceptible land uses. In busy urban areas, noise levels are typically near 75 dBA, and can reach 85 dBA near airports and major freeways (The Engineering Toolbox, 2005). Sound levels in rural residential areas typically average 40 dBA. In business and commercial areas, sound levels typically range from 50 dBA to 60 dBA (The Engineering Toolbox, 2005).

The City of Moreno Valley has established noise policies in the General Plan (City of Moreno Valley, 2006) which are discussed below.

3.11.1.1 GUIDING POLICIES: Noise

The Moreno Valley General Plan discourages new residential development where noise due to aircraft over flights exceeds 65 CNEL. In addition, noise attenuation is required where necessary to achieve acceptable interior noise levels. The acceptable interior noise is 45 CNEL for residences and schools and 50 CNEL for libraries, hospitals, places of worship and office uses.

Existing Noise Conditions

The proposed project area is located in the eastern portion of the March Joint ARB, near the City of Moreno Valley. Noise generated by transportation activity is the primary noise source in Moreno Valley. Vehicular noise is concentrated along transportation corridors and aircraft flight patterns associated with the March Joint ARB. High traffic volumes along State Route 60 and roadways contribute to high noise levels (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

Land use limitations based on noise levels have been established according to the 1998 March Joint ARB Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) study and have been accommodated in the Land Use Plan. In 1998, the United States Air Force prepared an AICUZ Study for the March Joint ARB. This study identified areas subject to aircraft safety and noise concerns, as well as identifying appropriate land uses for those areas subject to these concerns. Moreno Valley adopted the AICUZ Report guidelines for land uses within those areas that are most susceptible to air crashes (City of Moreno Valley, 2006). Noise levels range from 65 dB in the vicinity of the proposed project area to 60 dB just beyond the western boundary of the March Joint ARB (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

3.11.2 Consequences

3.11.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative there would be no change from existing noise conditions at the existing AMOC. Therefore, there would be no indirect or direct effects under the no action alternative.

3.11.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

During construction activities, heavy equipment such as bulldozers, graders, backhoes, excavators, dump trucks, and cement trucks would generate noise at the proposed site that could affect the onsite workers. There are no private residences, schools, hospitals, or commercial buildings or other sensitive receptors adjacent to the project area. An adult day care center is located approximately 2 miles to the north of the project area. A single family home residential area exists approximately 1/16 mile to the northeast of the project area.

Construction equipment typically emits noise between 86 and 96 dBA at 50 feet from the source (Occupational Safety and Health Administration [OSHA], 2003). The highest level of construction noise would occur during site earth work, which is the time when most of the construction equipment would be in operation. Earth work operations, including clearing and grading for most components of the proposed action, would occur over 15 days. Site preparation for larger components, such as the building, expansion on the northern property, and construction at the site would be expected to occur over a 24-month timeframe.

Construction workers would use hearing protection and would follow OSHA standards and procedures; thus, no noise impacts to workers would be expected.

Noise impacts would be short-term and would not be considered significant due to the surrounding land uses and lack of sensitive receptors. The closest receptor would be the subdivision to the northeast of the site which is less than ½ mile. Construction equipment

would operate in daylight hours during the normal workweek. Nearby workers and residents would notice construction-related noise, which would be above background levels. Direct exposure to construction-related noise would be temporary. Construction-related noise would attenuate and is not expected to be substantial.

Once constructed, the facility would operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week.

Compared to the lack of activity currently at the site, a new permanent noise source would occur during operation of the facility. These operations may cause an increase in noise; however, no sensitive receptors are located in the area and noise would likely blend with the surrounding local and interstate traffic. Furthermore, site operation noises would be similar to those generated at the existing AMOC. No increased nuisances resulting from operational noises are anticipated.

In summary, temporary construction-related noise and permanent, intermittent operational noises would be noticeable, but because of the expected short duration of construction and low potential for nuisance above existing traffic and background noise, this direct impact is considered to be minor. There would be no harmful effects of exposure to noise at the proposed site as a result of the construction, operation, and maintenance activities. Therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary for noise sources.

Indirect Impacts

As stated above, temporary construction-related noise and permanent, intermittent operational noises would be noticeable, but because of the expected short duration of construction and low potential for nuisance above existing traffic and background noise,

this direct impact is considered to be minor. There would be no harmful effects of exposure to noise sources expected at the proposed site as a result of the construction, operation, and maintenance activities. Therefore, no indirect impacts to noise would result under the proposed action.

3.12 CULTURAL RESOURCES

3.12.1 Affected Environment

Section 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA P.L. 89-655) ensure that federal agencies consider resources, defined as any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), in their proposed programs, projects, and actions prior to initiation. The prehistory, history, and ethnography of the region and Riverside County, and military history of March ARB and the project Area of Potential Effects (APE), are summarized in the cultural resource inventory report (The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008b). This report includes the results of historic archives review and pedestrian ground survey as required under federal and state historic preservation and environmental compliance law and regulation.

This section presents the expectations for encountering cultural resources from several periods of human occupation and activity in the area, dating from 10,000 years ago until the recent past. The region has a rich cultural heritage that includes the presence of several Native American tribes, exploration and settlement by the first Euroamericans, through the initiation of agriculture, commerce, transportation and the establishment of March ARB in 1918.

3.12.1.1 Sites Known or Expected

During the archive search prior to the field inventory, no previously recorded archaeological or historic sites, features, or artifacts have been recorded for the APE. Due to intensive land use in the project area, from early historic to recent military activity and ground disturbance, it is not expected that prehistoric or early historic sites would have survived on this project acreage. Remnants of previous structures or archaeological remains from ranching/agricultural, residential, and military occupation may remain buried at this locale. Expectations for historically significant artifacts or structures on the property are low (The S.M. Stoller Corporation 2008a, 2008b; *PWEC and JRB, 2000:4-10, 4-32*).

The March Field National Historic District is located between one-eighth and one-quarter of a mile away centered on Graber Street, outside of the APE (The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008b; *PWEC and JRB, 2000: 4-10, 4-32*).

3.12.1.2 Current Investigations

An archive search of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), California State Historic Places Registry, California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), Eastern Information Center, and Native American Heritage Commission sacred land files was conducted (USDHS 2006; R₂H Engineering, Inc., 2008). No historic properties, prehistoric archaeological sites or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are recorded on or near the project area.

An intensive site walk-over and photographic record of the APE was completed in November, 2008 (The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008a) for purposes of evaluating

cultural and natural resources on the properties. No historic features or cultural artifacts of significance were observed on the surface (The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008a, 2008b; USDHS 2006).

3.12.1.3 Results

No cultural resources significant to any time period or culture, or to the history of March Joint ARB were noted or formally recorded (S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008b) on the proposed site during the field inventory. Over the centuries, much of this region's prehistoric and early historic archaeology has been lost or buried due to modern agricultural, urban and industrial/commercial development. No cultural resources eligible to the NRHP or of historic importance were detected during this survey (The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008b). The existing AMOC building (Figure 3-4) was constructed about 1994 (< 50 years old), does not appear to have architectural significance or a historic association with a period of time, significant events or persons, and is not deemed eligible under NRHP guidelines (USDI National Park Service 1995, 1998).

3.12.1.4 Consultations

As mandated by Section 106 of the NHPA, NEPA, and other state and federal historic preservation mandates, consultation with federally recognized Native American tribes began on in December, 2008, when letters were distributed by CBP to local Tribes who claim traditional lands in the area and have expressed an interest in Base historic and cultural resources. Consultation letters were sent to the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation, California; the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, California; the Morongo Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Morongo

Reservation, California; the Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Los Coyotes Reservation, California; the Torres-Martinez Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of California; the Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Santa Rosa Reservation, California; the Pap Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pala Reservation, California; The Lone Band of Miwok Indians of California; the Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Augustine Reservation, California; the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California; the Cabazon Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Cabazon Reservation, California; the Barona Band of Mission Indians; the Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians of the Cahuilla Reservation, California; and the La Jolla Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Cahuilla Reservation, California.

This communication invited comments and solicited information regarding the presence of TCPs within the APE. Three local tribes responded to the coordination letters sent by CBP. The Cabazon Band of Mission Indians response indicated they had no records specific to the site but recommended an archaeologist be present during ground disturbing activities. The Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians responded and indicated the site was within the Tribe's traditional territory and requested a Tribal monitor be on site during ground disturbing activities, among other requests. The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians responded and requested that a Native American Monitor from the Tribe be present during ground disturbing activities, among other requests. CBP provided responses to both the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians and the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians indicating their requests could not be granted at this time. Copies of Section 106 consultation correspondence and responses received are included in Appendix A.

Therefore, based on the results of the cultural resource investigation completed, it was determined there would be no impact to culturally sensitive areas or resources eligible for the NHRP as a result of the proposed action.

A letter announcing intent to study this property for potential transfer to CBP and requesting consultation on any cultural resource concerns was sent to the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) by CBP in December, 2008 (USDHS 2008). A second letter and copy of the Archaeological and historic Survey Report prepared in relation to the proposed action was transmitted to the SHPO on January 30, 2009. The January letter requested concurrence from the SHPO with the determination of no effect to cultural resources as a result of the proposed action. Copies of the letters transmitted to the SHPO and the responses are included in Appendix A.

3.12.2 Consequences

3.12.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

No ground disturbance would take place under the no action alternative. Therefore, there would be no impacts to cultural and Native American resources.

3.12.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

No negative impacts to architectural or other cultural resources would be expected as a result of the proposed action. No buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP are located in the proposed project area. No cultural or historic resources were found that were potentially eligible for the NRHP during a

pedestrian inventory conducted on November 13-14, 2008. No cultural resources would be affected by the proposed action.

As with any ground-disturbing project, there remains a potential for the accidental discovery of buried cultural resources. If cultural resources or materials are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the work in the vicinity of the discovery would cease and the area would be protected until the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. Depending on the nature of the find, additional consultation with the SHPO or affected tribes may be necessary before work can resume in the area of the find.

No Native American lands or reservations are located within the proposed project area. No traditional cultural properties are located within the proposed project area. Therefore, no direct impacts to Native American resources would be expected from implementation of the proposed action.

Indirect Impacts

Due to the absence of historic properties in the proposed project area, there would be no indirect impacts to cultural and Native American resources.

3.13 UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

3.13.1 Affected Environment

The affected environment includes existing utilities and infrastructure such as right-of-way easements, water supply, storm drains, sanitary sewer systems, and natural gas, electric and communications services. The addition of 500 employees may require modification of any or all of these systems.

3.13.1.1 Right-of-Ways and Easements

March Joint ARB does not have specific requirements for right-of-way and easements on base property. However, the current base norm is similar to most suburban planning strategies. Buildings are typically set back from the streets a minimum of 25 feet (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

3.13.1.2 Water Supply

A 10” water main runs along the east edge of the site and an 8” water main runs along the south edge of the site. The existing building is supplied with water from the 10” water main that enters the building in the southeast corner Mechanical room (Ross Barney Architects, 2007). The drinking-water wells at March Joint ARB were closed in the late 1980's, and the base now gets its drinking water from the WMWD as will the proposed action alternative. WMWD is part of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (<http://www.mwdh2o.com/>) which services 26 cities and water agencies (including March Joint ARB) serving 19 million people in six counties, including the City of Moreno Valley. This water is managed by the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWDSC). It is MWDSC’s policy to provide its service area with adequate supplies of water to meet expanding and increasing needs in the years ahead. MWDSC currently maintains that successful implementation of its Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) will provide sufficient water to supply all projected imported water demands for the next 20 years. When additional water is required to meet the water district’s increasing needs for domestic, industrial, and municipal water, MWDSC will be prepared to deliver such supplies. About one-fifth of the water WMWD purchases come from the Colorado River Aqueduct. Most of the imported water supply comes from the State

Water Project, which transports water from Northern California via the California Aqueduct. WMWD also imports a very small quantity of water from the San Bernardino basin (City of Moreno Valley, 2006). Due to drought, current water levels are depleting. Metropolitan has implemented a Water Supply Allocation Plan which will initiate mandatory conservation throughout Southern California, effective July 1, 2009. Without the Plan, Metropolitan's reserve levels could have been reduced by as much as 60 percent, or 650,000 acre-feet. With implementation of the Plan, use of water from the storage reserves is expected to be less.

3.13.1.3 Storm Drain

The existing AMOC courtyard is drained to a dry well located near the south wall of the building. When the well is filled, a pump sends the water further south of the site to a drainage ditch. There is no storm drain line located on or near the site (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

3.13.1.4 Sanitary Sewer

The existing building connects to an 8" sanitary main running north and south below the center of the existing building. Another 8" line connecting to a building to the west ties into the north south main below the AMOC building (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The City of Moreno Valley has adopted a General Plan which serves as a policy guide for determining the appropriate physical development of the City (City of Moreno, 2006).

General Plan Policy 2.12.1 requires that adequate septic or sewer service capacity will be available in a timely manner prior to approval of any development application. Policy 2.13.3 requires each project to provide the infrastructure needed to support that project at

the time it is needed. Program 2-3 calls for the City to work with Western Municipal Water District and the Edgemont Community Services District and the Regional Water Quality Control Board to prepare a wastewater master plan for southwest Moreno Valley that addresses the need for sewer services and the timing for facility improvements (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

3.13.1.5 Gas Service

The March Joint Powers Utility Authority (MJPUA) was formed in July 2002 and consists of the Cities of Riverside, Moreno Valley, and Perris. The focus of the MJPUA is to provide natural gas and electrical service to the West March Business Park. However, the MJPUA is not limited to providing gas and power to West March: it also has the flexibility to provide all utilities except water and sewer to the entire base. An abandoned 2” gas main line runs north and south below the existing building, west of its center. An active 3” gas line runs north-south along 4th Street at the west edge of the site. This gas line turns and runs east-west along Midway Street at the north edge of the site. In addition, at the north end of the site, a Cathodic Protection Rectifier (CPR) with buried ground anodes is attached to the gas line pipe. (Ross Barney Architects, 2007). The land uses proposed by the project would use electricity and gas as the dominant sources of energy. Gas will be provided by Southern California Gas Company. Energy consumption levels would not be expected to exceed typical requirements for similar development, and service providers have the ability to serve the project without significantly affecting the provision of energy resources. The project will be conditioned to comply with Titles 20 and 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Riverside County’s building permit process will ensure compliance that Titles 20 and 24 are accomplished.

3.13.1.6 Electric Service

The existing 15 kilo volt overhead power line is tapped and runs approximately two feet bgs to a pad mounted transformer located at the southeast corner of the building.

Electrical service from the transformer is 750 kilo volt amperes. Secondary service enters the building underground at the southeast corner. Emergency power is supplied to the building by two 250 kilo watt diesel generators. An Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) filters incoming commercial power to prevent surges and voltage fluctuations and provides emergency back-up power for the emergency diesel (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The land uses proposed by the project would use electricity and gas as the dominant sources of energy. Electricity will be provided by Southern California Edison Company. Energy consumption levels would not be expected to exceed typical requirements for similar development, and service providers have the ability to serve the project without significantly affecting the provision of energy resources. Riverside County's building permit process will ensure compliance that Titles 20 and 24 are accomplished.

3.13.1.7 Communications Service

Existing communications cables run underground along the west edge of the site. A communications manhole is located at the edge of the property, directly west of the existing loading dock. Two cable conduit lines run from the manhole east into the building and enter in the telecommunications room. Another communications manhole is located at the northwest corner of the site (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

Communications are regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and services are offered by a multitude of providers.

3.13.2 Consequences

3.13.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, The AMOC would not be expanded. No additional wastewater, stormwater, energy, or solid waste would be generated. No direct or indirect impacts on utilities or infrastructure would result from the no action alternative.

3.13.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Due to the former federal status of the March Joint ARB, the base roadways and infrastructure were not completed in accordance with civilian codes and requirements. Utilities are not in easements, nor are the roadways dedicated as public roadways. The Main Base Area has limited street widths and points of access, while West March is devoid of many necessary improvements to support development. Any infrastructure development needed will be done in compliance with local, state and federal codes (i.e. IBC, UPC, etc.). Best management practices will be implemented to ensure minimal impacts to the surrounding areas and environments (i.e. silt fence, protecting existing structures, etc.). With planned and required improvements, utility systems would be able to accommodate increased demands (FEIS, 1996).

3.13.2.2.1 Right-of-Ways Easements

March Joint ARB does not have specific requirements for right-of-way and easements on base property. However, the current base norm is similar to most suburban planning strategies. Buildings are typically set back from the streets a minimum of 25 feet (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

Because March Joint ARB does not have specific requirements for right-of-way and easements on base property, there would be no direct or indirect effects to rights-of-way or easements.

3.13.2.2.2 Water Supply

A 10” water main runs along the east edge of the proposed site and an 8” water main runs along the south edge of the eastern property. The existing building is supplied with water from the 10” water main that enters the building in the southeast corner Mechanical room. (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

Connections to water service will be performed in accordance with WMWD requirements. Therefore no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated by the proposed action (City of Moreno Valley, 2006). Water supply for the new building on the Northern Property may be supplied by the 10 inch water main.

3.13.2.2.3 Sanitary Sewer

The existing building connects to an 8” sanitary main running north and south below the center of the building. Another 8” line connecting to a building to the west ties into the north south main below the AMOC building (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

Wastewater generated by WMWD customers is collected via pipelines and pumped to the treatment plant, processed and discharged into the Santa Ana River. The City of Moreno Valley General Plan Policy (Section 2.12.1) requires adequate septic or sewer service capacity be available in a timely manner prior to approval of any development application. The additional sewage from the proposed action is within the systems

capacity and therefore, no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated by the proposed action (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

3.13.2.2.4 Storm Sewer

The existing AMOC courtyard is drained to a dry well located near the south wall of the building. When the well is filled, a pump sends the water further south of the site to a drainage ditch. There is no storm sewer line located on or near the site (Ross Barney Architects, 2007). The Northern and Eastern Properties are not within a flood zone however, the area east of Heacock Street is a flood prone area (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

Because there are no storm sewer lines located near the proposed action site, construction of such a system may be required. If required, CBP will need to comply with the WMWD specifications. No direct and minor indirect impacts are anticipated due to the current developed nature of the proposed action area and an increase in impervious area at the property (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

CBP may need to obtain necessary permits and licenses to meet the WMWD requirements. Best management practices and WMWD regulations will be followed, if required, when installing necessary water and sanitary sewage systems for the CBP proposed action. A flood control system has been constructed within much of Moreno Valley to direct runoff from developed areas and prevent flooding. Flood control deficiencies have been identified and improvements have been proposed in the Master Drainage Plans (West End, Sunnymead Area, Perris Valley and the Moreno Valley

Master Drainage Plan). A master drainage plan has not been adopted for the area generally located east of Theodore Street (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

3.13.2.2.5 Gas Service

An abandoned 2” gas main line runs north and south below the existing building, west of its center. An active 3” gas line runs north/south along 4th Street at the west edge of the site. This gas line turns and runs east-west along Midway Street at the north edge of the site. In addition, at the north end of the site, a Cathodic Protection Rectifier (CPR) with buried ground anodes is attached to the gas line pipe. This CPR is an electronic device that helps to protect the steel pipes against corrosion (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

CBP will work with the MJPUA to obtain the necessary gas services for the proposed action. No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated through the added natural gas service and impacts to the natural gas infrastructure and grid are not anticipated due to the addition of relatively few (500) personnel onto the natural gas system (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

3.13.2.2.6 Electric Service

The existing 15kilovolts, 3 phase, overhead power line running along the south edge of the site is tapped and runs in underground concrete encased duct bank, approximately 2 feet below grade, to a pad mounted transformer located at the southeast corner of the building. Electrical service from the transformer is 750 kilovolts amps, 3 phase, 13.2 kilovolts Delta Primary, 480 Y/277V secondary service entering building underground at the southeast corner. Emergency power is supplied to the building by two 250 kilowatts diesel generators located in the southeast corner generator room. An Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) filters incoming commercial power to prevent surges and voltage

fluctuations. The UPS also provides emergency back-up power when the emergency diesel generator comes on-line. The UPS is located just north of the generator room (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

As indicated in the previous section the MJPUA was formed in July 2002. MJPUA can provide electrical service to the proposed site. CBP will work with the MJPUA to obtain the necessary electrical services for the proposed action. No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated through the added electrical service and impacts to the electrical infrastructure and grid are not anticipated due to the addition of relatively few (500) personnel onto the electrical grid (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

3.13.2.2.7 Communications Service

Two-way communications connectivity will be required between all airborne Unmanned Aircraft (UAs') and the Unmanned Aircraft Systems National Operations Center (UASNOC), Air Traffic Control, military range controls and the AMOC. The UASNOC will be the primary facility for mission video and data dissemination. Video feeds will be fed into the UASNOC during UAS missions where they will be available to be "pulled" by designated offices and agencies with requirements for information (Ross Barney Architects, 2007). Existing communications cables run underground along the west edge of the site. A communications manhole is located at the edge of the property, directly west of the existing loading dock. Two cable conduit lines run from the manhole east into the building and enter in the telecommunications room located in the southwest corner of the building. Another communications manhole is located at the northwest corner of the

site. Four 4” PVC conduit ducts, encased in concrete run between the two manholes on the site (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The MJPUA also has the ability to provide communications services to the proposed site. CBP will work with the MJPUA to obtain those communication systems that MJPUA can support. For all other communications will be provided/installed by CBP. No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated through the added communications service and impacts to the communications infrastructure and grid are not anticipated due to the addition of relatively few (500) personnel onto the electrical grid due to the large infrastructure provided by the CPUC and the MJPUA.

3.14 ROADWAYS/TRAFFIC

3.14.1 Affected Environment

Roadways and Streets

March Joint ARB is currently active as a center for military reserve activities and as a military communication center. Although its long-term future as a military facility is uncertain, it is not slated for expansion or closure at this time. Much of the original base has been transferred to the jurisdiction of the Joint Powers Authority (JPA), and is slated for commercial, industrial and warehousing development. From a transportation standpoint, all vehicular access to and from the Base must travel through Moreno Valley on Cactus Avenue or Heacock Street (City of Moreno Valley, 2006).

The site is bound on all sides by secondary two-way streets (Figure 3-3), 5th Street at the east edge of the site runs along the base perimeter and is patrolled regularly. ‘Y’ Street

runs east west along the south edge of the site. Midway Street runs east west along the north edge of the site. The west edge is bordered by 4th Street running north (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

Site Access and Circulation

Access (Figure 3-3) to the AMOC site is through March Joint ARB. The base is accessed from Cactus Avenue through the main gate located off Elsworth Street. After passing through the main gate, Elsworth Street turns into Graeber Street (Ross Barney Architects, 2007). During the construction of the proposed facilities there would be short-term increases in traffic due to the use of heavy equipment and other construction related vehicles. Following construction, there would be long-term increases in daily commuter and business traffic in and out of the site. No changes in the traffic lights or turn lanes are proposed to regulate the increased traffic. Both Heacock Street and Cactus Avenue existing volume to daily capacity (V/C) are 0.91 and 0.81, respectively indicating roadways that were near capacity as of 2000 (City of Moreno Valley, 2006). The addition of another 500 vehicles (currently 200 employees) would increase the V/C for Heacock Street and Cactus Avenue to 0.93 and 0.83, respectively or less than a 10 percent increase in V/C.

The existing AMOC has four vehicular entrances, two from 5th Street on the east and two from 4th Street on the west edge. Both accesses from the east lead into the existing parking lots. One access from the west leads to the parking lot, while the other is for loading dock access. Primary entry into the facility is through the main entrance at the north end of the building, with limited entry through the loading dock area located on the west side of the building (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

No changes in the traffic lights or turn lanes are proposed to regulate the increased traffic.

Parking

The existing site has three parking lots on the west, north and east sides of the building with a total capacity of approximately 90 vehicles. The parking lot to the west is currently



FIGURE 3-3 Current and Future Access to AMOC Facility

a double-loaded, 90-degree parking lot with space for 25 cars (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The expanded facilities would staff up to 500 new commuting employees.

Approximately 57,000 ft² of new asphalt surface parking lot(s) for up to 230 employee-owned and government passenger vehicles on three shifts would be constructed on the

northern 2.75-acre March Joint ARB property. Future parking would also be constructed on the eastern property. This could add an additional 500 one-way trips each way per day. However, as discussed earlier, this is not a significant increase in the present traffic volume.

3.14.2 Consequences

3.14.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, no new facility, parking, or roads would be constructed. Operations would continue at the existing facility. Parking availability may be limited for this increase in daily capacity. This would cause minor direct impact to parking under the no action alternative.

3.14.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

During construction, there would be localized traffic increases from construction workers and construction equipment. Truck and equipment traffic associated with delivery and removal of construction and paving materials at the current site would be temporary.

The proposed action could cause minor, short-term impacts to traffic due to temporary delays from movement of construction equipment and supplies. All construction-related impacts would cease upon completion of site development.

Once the station is constructed, there would be up to 500 new personnel assigned to the AMOC. Approximately 230 additional POVs (assuming that each of three shifts would be staffed equally) would be leaving and entering the station per shift. This would

minimize the increase in POV traffic at any one time. Traffic on the other secondary roads would be spread throughout the area.

Following construction, there would be long-term increases in daily commuter and business traffic on and off site. No changes in the traffic lights or turn lanes are proposed, on or off the March Joint ARB, to regulate the increased traffic.

Indirect Impacts

Spouses and children of personnel would not be expected to commute great distances due to the availability of employment and schools in the area. It is expected that the increased employee family traffic would be spread throughout the area and would not be expected to affect traffic or roadways based on the traffic evaluations for the City of Moreno Valley and Riverside County (City of Moreno Valley, 2006; RCTD, 2008).

3.15 AESTHETIC AND VISUAL RESOURCES

3.15.1 Affected Environment

Aesthetics and visual resources can be defined based on an individual or group of individuals' judgment on the visual setting of the proposed project area as to whether or not an object is pleasing or would influence the quality of life that currently exists. The points of concern may include cultural modifications; topographic features; water resources; building and fence designs, height, materials, and colors; and/or vegetation and landscaping. This section discusses both the current setting and the assessment of proposed changes to the project location and the public's possible reaction to those changes.

The proposed project area is located on 11.13 acres of mostly open land that is unfenced except for a security fence separating the existing AMOC from the eastern property. The eastern property (also known as Tyson Field) is used primarily for public recreation and is the larger of the two parcels (8.38 acres). The parcel is currently owned by the City of Moreno Valley and will be acquired by CBP through an easement from the City of Moreno Valley. The property was transferred to the City of Moreno Valley through the March Joint Powers Authority (MJPA) as recreational property in 2008. There is a public running track with exercise stations, a small set of bleachers, and a large stone sign identify “Tyson Field” on the property. The track is regularly used by the local population for exercise and dog walking as evidence by fresh human and dog footprints as well as bicycle tracks during the site walk over. Tyson Field is largely overgrown and in disrepair (The S.M. Stoller Corp, 2008). Other recreational facilities adjacent to the project area include a skate park and softball fields in March Field Park to the north and east of the project parcels (Figure 3-4). Additional open space located directly east of the eastern property remains available for public access and will not be developed in the foreseeable future (Air Force Real Property Agency, 2007).

The proposed actions would develop the 2.75 March Joint ARB parcel and the 8.38 City of Moreno parcel, eliminating the Tyson Park public recreation area. The chain link fence that separates the parcels would be removed during construction. The perimeter of the 11.13 acre project site would be fenced to prevent future public access. The new perimeter fence would be constructed according to CBP security requirements.

There is a one-story building south of the 2.75 acre March Joint ARB Northern Property that would be expanded as part of this project. None of the buildings in the immediate

vicinity are over two stories tall. The next closest buildings (less than 200 feet away) include a former daycare facility that is now office space, and some government apartment complexes that house residents.

New building(s) would not exceed two-stories in height and would be designed to fit into the local landscape. Exterior colors would be neutral or earth colors similar to the existing building. All new parking on the proposed parcels would be covered with gravel or asphalt and delineated to show designated parking spaces.

The March Joint ARB base is essentially in the middle of Moreno Valley and the city lights are on every evening during the hours of darkness. The well lit March Joint ARB runway is within 1/3 mile of the project area. However, the project area is essentially undeveloped and there is relatively little artificial light directly surrounding the immediate site. The exterior of the expanded facilities, including the walkways and parking lots, would be lit during the night shifts 365 days a year for security reasons and employee safety. Security lighting would be positioned so that all light would be directed inward and downward onto the facility, parking, and open areas.

The project area landscaping consists of grass lawns and some non-native trees. Most of the proposed site has been mowed and there are numerous weedy species and disturbed areas of barren soil. None of the weeds are listed California state noxious weeds.

The northern property, located north of the existing AMOC is used by March Joint ARB for dumping of wood chips, gravel, straw waddles, bark, grass clippings and other landscape maintenance materials, and is mostly devoid of any vegetation. Following construction of the expanded facilities, another location would be designated for disposal

of these materials. Xeric species and crushed rock would be used to landscape the undeveloped areas within the site, following construction.

The entire 11.13 acres site has been graded and has very little topographic relief. Roads already exist on all sides of the 11.13 acres providing access to the area from both March Joint AFB and the City of Moreno Valley (Figure 3-4).



FIGURE 3-4 Location of Adjacent Recreational Properties (outside or north and east of dashed line) (Ross Barney Architects, 2007).

The proposed area does not lie within the view shed of a designated scenic highway, and no Congressionally designated or proposed Wild and Scenic rivers or Wilderness are near the site.

The area labeled “Existing Sites – 6.5 acres” includes the 3.75-acre portion which is occupied by the existing AMOC facility as well as the 2.75 undeveloped portion of the Northern Property.

3.15.2 Consequences

3.15.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, no development or alteration of the 11.13 acres would occur. The public would still have access to the City of Moreno Valley Tyson Field recreational area, for dog-walking, use of the work-out stations, and other activities. There would be no visual or aesthetic impact under this alternative.

3.15.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

The proposed action includes the development of existing open space, construction of two-story building(s), construction of parking lots, increased vehicle storage, year-round lighting, perimeter security fencing, and xeric landscaping that would change the visual character of the project area. These changes would be partially mitigated by design criteria (e.g. building materials and colors) that would blend the new facilities into the existing landscape to the greatest extent possible. The changes would not affect any

sensitive visual resources. No direct impacts are anticipated due to implementation of the proposed action.

Indirect Impacts

The March Joint ARB base is essentially in the middle of Moreno Valley and the city lights are on every evening during the hours of darkness. The well lit March Joint ARB runway is within 1/3 mile of the project area. However, the project area is essentially undeveloped and there is relatively little artificial light directly surrounding the immediate site. New building(s) would not exceed two-stories in height and would be designed to fit into the local landscape. Exterior colors would be neutral or earth colors similar to the existing building. All new parking on the proposed parcels would be covered with gravel or asphalt and delineated to show designated parking spaces. Due to the planned design elements for the proposed structures and the current industrial use (i.e. airstrip, other military facilities), indirect impacts as a result of the proposed action are not anticipated.

3.16 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

3.16.1 Affected Environment

Hazardous and regulated materials refer to a range of contaminants, including substances listed in the code of federal regulation 40 CFR 264. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on these proposed properties and was completed in January 2009. At present, stored hazardous materials are limited to: one 2,500-gallon diesel above ground storage tank; and small quantities of cleaners, solvents, and lubricants used to clean and maintain the facility. The purpose of the Phase I Environmental Site

Assessment was to identify, to the extent feasible, the presence or likely presence of any hazardous materials or petroleum products or any conditions that indicate a release of any hazardous materials or petroleum products on the property. The study identified evidence of hazardous materials in the groundwater directly below the subject property from releases on adjacent properties.

The subject property is located within the former March Air Force Base, which was placed on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) National Priority List (NPL) in November 1989. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment revealed a groundwater plume of Perchloroethylene (PCE) in the Upper Alluvial groundwater aquifer under the northeast quadrant of the eastern property. The origin of the contamination is from a closed landfill that is located approximately 600 ft to the east of the subject properties. The existing PCE concentration levels of 9.8 micrograms per liter (ug/L) in groundwater are slightly above the drinking water standard of 5 ug/L. Based on the depth of groundwater (12 to 17 feet) beneath the proposed property, the southwest direction of groundwater flow, and due to the fact that future construction would not likely encounter groundwater, there is not a significant environmental concern associated with the proposed site.

3.16.2 Consequences

3.16.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, there would be no new development of facilities, including parking lots, warehouse, indoor small arms range and armory, or other infrastructure. AMOC expansion would not occur. Groundwater contamination will

continue to be monitored by others in support of CERCLA actions. Therefore, there will be no direct or indirect impacts from hazardous materials under the no action alternative.

3.16.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

The construction, maintenance, and routine operations of the CBP expansion would result in the use of small quantities of hazardous or regulated materials. These could include:

- Construction Activities could potentially generate petroleum, oil, and lubricants contamination at the construction site due to the storage of this material for maintenance and refueling of vehicles and fuel storage tanks.
- Small quantities of cleaners, solvents, lubricants and universal wastes (batteries, fluorescent light bulbs, etc.) used to clean and maintain the station.

During construction activities primary and secondary containment measures will be used during fueling and maintenance operations to contain any accidental spills. All stationary equipment will utilize drip pans or alternative means to capture any petroleum, oil or lubricants during operations.

For the proposed future indoor range OAM would develop and implement an operations and maintenance plan to collect the used bullets and casings and recycle the metal at an approved metal recycler.

All solid, liquid and hazardous and regulated wastes and materials, including universal wastes would be handled in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws and guidelines governing disposal of these items. Lastly, the implementation of BMPs would

minimize or eliminate spills associated with hazardous and regulated materials during the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed facilities.

The direct impacts from hazardous materials under the proposed action would be negligible and long-term.

Indirect Impacts

Under the proposed action, quantities of hazardous materials used and stored would not substantially increase above what is currently used at the existing AMOC facility.

Therefore, there would be no indirect impacts anticipated from the use or storage of hazardous material as a result of the proposed action.

3.17 SOCIOECONOMIC

3.17.1 Affected Environment

The March Joint ARB, in Riverside County is considered a census-designated place (CDP). A CDP is a type of place (a concentration of population) identified by the United States Census Bureau for statistical purposes. CDPs are delineated for each decennial census as the statistical counterparts of incorporated places such as cities, towns and villages. CDPs are communities that lack separate municipal government, but which otherwise physically resemble incorporated places. CDPs are delineated solely to provide data for settled concentrations of population that are identifiable by name but are not legally incorporated under the laws of the state in which they are located. The boundaries of a CDP have no legal status. The March Joint ARB CDP, had an estimated 2000 population of 370,397 (Census, 2000). The AMOC is located in the eastern portion of

March Joint ARB, in Riverside County, west of Moreno Valley. The location of the proposed AMOC expansion site was discussed previously in Section 1.2. It is anticipated that the housing pattern of new CPB personnel would be similar to the pattern among existing CBP personnel, with most living in Moreno Valley, Riverside, or Perris. Therefore, these areas are where most of the population-related impacts to community resources, such as housing and schools, would occur.

3.17.1.1 Demographics

Table 3-7 presents population trends for Moreno Valley, Riverside County, the State of California, and the U.S. These trends are expected to continue into 2020, with all jurisdictions exceeding the national growth rate.

TABLE 3-7					
Population 2000, Estimated for 2006, Projected for 2020					
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>					
Geographic Area	Census 2000 Population	Estimated 2006-07 Population	Percent Growth	Projected 2020 Population	Percent Growth
March Joint ARB Block Group 9, Census Tract 429	370	NA	NA	NA	NA
Moreno Valley, CA	142,548	179,585	23%	220,390	22%
Riverside Valley, CA	1,545,387	2,026,803	31%	2,904, 848	39%
State of California	33,871,648	36,457,549	8%	44,135,923	21%
United States	281,421,906	296,507,134	5%	308,935,581	4%

Source: U.S. Census 2000, ACS 2006; Southern California Association of Governments, 2008; Claritas Inc., 2008

These population data do not portray the non-permanent population of the area, such as migrant farm workers during the harvest season, or part-time “snowbird” residents.

3.17.1.2 Unemployment

As Table 3-8 shows, the civilian unemployment rate at March Joint ARB in 2000 was much lower than in Moreno Valley or Riverside County, which were slightly higher than rates in the State of California and the nation. Unemployment in those larger areas has risen since then.

TABLE 3-8				
Labor Force and Unemployment				
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>				
Geographic Area	Civilian Labor Force 2000	Unemployment Rate 2000	Civilian Labor Force 2007	Unemployment Rate 2007
March Joint ARB Block Group 9, Census Tract 421 ¹	128	1.9%	NA	NA
Moreno Valley, CA	61,663	5.5%	87,063	4.4%
Riverside Valley, CA	680,722	5.4%	909,758	6.2%
State of California	16,857,578	4.9%	18,188,055	5.4%
United States	142,582,500	4.0%	153,124,000	4.6%
¹ Only Census 2000 employment data available for Census Tract 421.				
NA=Not Available				
Source: Census 2000; ACS 2007.				

3.17.1.3 Economic Development

Primary industries at March Joint ARB include retail trade, educational/health/ social services, public administration and information. Moreno Valley and Riverside County data show the primary industry as educational/health/social services, followed by retail trade and construction. Table 3-9 presents employment at March Joint ARB, the City of Moreno Valley, and surrounding Riverside County.

TABLE 3-9										
Employment by Industry										
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>										
	Census Tract 421, March Joint ARB ²		Moreno Valley, CA				Riverside County, CA			
Industry	2000		2000		2007		2000		2007	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	0	0.0%	344	0.6%	442	0.5%	13,063	2.2%	12,336	1.4%
Construction	8	6.3%	4,305	7.6%	9,713	12.0%	55,751	9.2%	97,768	10.8%
Manufacturing	5	3.9%	7,497	13.3%	8,145	10.0%	72,837	12.1%	88,970	9.9%
Wholesale Trade	5	3.9%	2,247	4.0%	2,721	3.4%	21,400	3.5%	28,706	3.2%
Retail Trade	38	29.7%	7,974	14.1%	9,630	11.9%	76,466	12.7%	115,116	12.8%
Transportation/Warehousing/Utilities	0	0.0%	3,988	7.1%	8,841	10.9%	31,683	5.3%	47,751	5.3%
Information	10	7.8%	1,492	2.6%	1,744	2.2%	13,956	2.3%	19,421	2.2%
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate	3	2.3%	3,123	5.5%	3,713	4.6%	34,348	5.7%	59,266	6.6%
Professional	4	3.1%	3,751	6.6%	6,675	8.2%	51,577	8.6%	89,496	9.9%
Educational/Health/Social Services	30	23.4%	12,343	21.9%	15,220	18.8%	113,407	18.8%	161,830	17.9%
Entertainment/Recreation/Food Service	8	6.3%	3,734	6.6%	5,861	7.2%	59,131	9.8%	97,931	10.9%
Other Services	0	0.0%	2,298	4.1%	4,389	5.4%	30,166	5.0%	41,972	4.7%
Public Administration	17	13.3%	3,333	5.9%	4,019	5.0%	29,071	4.8%	41,565	4.6%
Total Employment ¹	128	100%	56,429	100%	81,113	100%	602,856	100%	902,128	100%

Source: U.S. census, 2000; ACS 2007.

¹ Civilian employed population 16 years and over.

² Data not available for 2007.

This page left intentionally blank.

The City of Moreno Valley acts as a clearinghouse for most activities and proposals in the city. The following ongoing activities and proposals could have a cumulative effect on environmental, social, and economic resources in the area (City of Moreno Valley, 2008):

- Commercial/Retail Projects - Nearly 2.6 million square feet of commercial and retail development underway.
- Commercial Projects in Planning - 331,250 square feet of commercial development in planning.
- Hotel/Hospitality - 676 guestrooms in seven projects under development.
- Office - 706,280 square feet of office development in progress.
- Industrial - Nearly 23 million square feet of industrial buildings under development.

Residential

- Single-Family: Nearly 4,000 new homes have been recently completed or are being marketed. Another 3,300 have been approved over the last few years, but construction has not started.
- Multi-Family: More than 3,700 multi-family units (apartments and condominiums) are approved or under construction.

3.17.1.4 Household Income

Table 3-10 presents the 2000 median household income for the area encompassing March Joint ARB, Moreno Valley and Riverside County. These are compared to the State of California and the U.S. Median income.

TABLE 3-10		
Median Household Income around March Joint ARB, Moreno Valley, Riverside County, State of California, and the U.S.		
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>		
Geographic Area	Median Household Income, 2000	Median Household Income, 2007
Block Group 9, Census Tract 421 ^a	\$31,364	NA
Moreno Valley, California	\$47,387	\$55,613
Riverside County, California	\$42,887	\$64,572
California	\$47,493	\$59,948
United States	\$41,994	\$50,740

Source: Census, 2000; ACS, 2007

^a ACS 2007 data for March Joint ARB unavailable

3.17.1.5 Quality of Life

Quality of life is characterized by many factors, including access to housing, community services, and goods that have become standard for much of the United States.

Table 3-11 shows the housing supply in both Moreno Valley and Riverside County in 2000 and 2007. In 2000, the cost of housing in Moreno Valley was 19 percent lower than in Riverside County as a whole. By 2007, this number had decreased to 6 percent. The median value of housing in Moreno Valley more than tripled from 2000 to 2007, while the median value of housing in Riverside County more than doubled from 2000 to 2007, before the recent housing market correction.

TABLE 3-11 Housing Units, Vacancy Rates, and Cost <i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>						
Geographic Area	Total Housing Units¹	Vacancy Rate	Owner Vacancy Rate	Rental Vacancy Rate	Median Gross Rent	Median Value
March Joint ARB Block Group 9, Census Tract 421 2000	152	24.3%	0.0%	7.3%	\$1,173	NA
Moreno Valley, CA 2000	41,431	5.3%	2.8%	5.9%	\$743	\$118,900
Moreno Valley, CA 2007	53,628	8.6%	3.5%	9.4%	\$1,216	\$379,300
Riverside County, CA 2000	584,674	13.4%	2.5%	7.2%	\$660	\$146,500
Riverside County, CA 2007	755,325	13.9%	4.2%	7.2%	\$1,066	\$406,300

Source: US Census 2000 SF 1 and SF 4; ACS 2007 .

¹ Total housing units includes seasonal, recreational, or occasional use (10 units in March Joint ARB at 2000 Census)

3.17.2 Consequences

3.17.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, no AMOC facility expansion would occur. There would be no effect on the social or economic characteristics of March Joint ARB and the surrounding communities. The AMOC operational efficiency, however, would continue to degrade as a result of overcrowding. This would be a long-term minor impact on the community. The additional 500 CBP personnel may still be added. However, with the small increase (0.4%) compared to the overall population and the projected population

increase of 23% it is not anticipated that there would be direct or indirect impacts on the local economy, housing, or educational resources from the no action alternative.

3.17.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

The Proposed Action Alternative could result in a temporary and minimal increase of up to 100 construction workers, during construction which would increase demand for temporary housing for non-resident workers but would not result in a permanent population increase or an increased demand for public services, and would not substantially affect local income due to the transient nature of this workforce. Under the Proposed Action alternative, the addition of up to 500 CBP personnel and associated families would affect population levels, housing availability, and local income. However, the overall population increase (0.8 percent compared to projected population increase of 23 percent) and associated increase in services caused by the Proposed Action alternative would have minor impacts on the socioeconomic environment.

Direct Impacts

Construction Phase: Over the two-year construction phase, fifty to one hundred fulltime equivalent positions (FTEs) in construction trades, with associated construction wages and personal spending, would be created by the construction project. Suppliers would experience a short-term increase in the sale of construction-related materials and provision of services. As such, there would be short-term minor benefits to the local economy and employment as a result of the construction of the expanded AMOC.

Approximate construction costs would be estimated at between 10 and 20 million dollars.

Operations Phase: Under the proposed action, the expanded facility would support up to 500 new personnel. These new personnel are anticipated to increase the total regional

population by approximately 1,305 people: 500 personnel and 982 family members, based upon the national average household size of 2.61 (ACS, 2007). Assuming 90 percent of personnel and their families (about 1,175 people) live in the Moreno Valley, that could result in a 0.8 percent increase in the city's population, compared to 23 percent estimated growth from 2000 to 2007.

The proposed action also would result in a minor long-term beneficial impact to the economy.

In addition to these expenditures, the salaries and personal expenditures of the new personnel and their families would increase activity in the economy of the area. The beneficial long-term effects to the regional economy would be considered minor and the change in regional population would also be minor in comparison to the overall population.

Indirect Impacts

The addition of up to 500 new personnel to the AMOC on March Joint ARB would increase the demand for housing, public education, and other community services in Moreno Valley and the surrounding areas. These new personnel would require a total of up to 500 housing units and increase the student population by approximately 261 school-aged children (based upon current United States average household size of 2.61 and 20 percent of the population 5 to 18 years of age (ACS, 2007).

Assuming that 90 percent of the new families live in Moreno Valley, 450 of the needed housing units and 235 of the new school-aged children would be in Moreno Valley. It is unlikely that many of the construction workers would need to relocate to the area,

because specialized trade skills are not required for the expansion and an ample construction workforce exists in the area.

A number of new housing developments are being or have recently been built in Moreno Valley and sufficient housing is available in Riverside County. Therefore, only minor impacts on housing supply are anticipated. Planned residential developments include (City of Moreno Valley, 2008):

- **Single-Family:** Nearly 4,000 new homes have been recently completed or are being marketed. Another 3,300 have been approved over the last few years, but construction has not started.
- **Multi-Family:** More than 3,700 multi-family units (apartments and condominiums) are approved or under construction.

Although it is not possible at this time to forecast which schools would receive the estimated 235 new school-aged students, minor indirect impacts on educational resources are anticipated because schools in the area have available capacity (City of Moreno Valley, 2008).

Although Moreno Valley would incur some minor additional costs for schools, police and fire protection, and other public services, the City and surrounding communities would also benefit from additional sales tax and property tax revenues.

3.18 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

3.18.1 Affected Environment

Environmental justice (EJ) is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies (CEQ, 1997a). “Fair treatment” means that no group—including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups—should bear a disproportionate share of the adverse environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, or commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies.

In 1994, EO 12898, 59 FR 7629, Executive Order on Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations was issued and was designed to focus on environmental and human health conditions in minority and low-income communities. EO 12898 requires federal agencies to achieve EJ "to the greatest extent practicable" by identifying and addressing "disproportionately high adverse human health or environmental effects of...activities on minority populations and low income populations." The CEQ has issued guidance to federal agencies to assist them with their NEPA procedures so that EJ concerns are effectively identified and addressed (CEQ, 1997a).

The minority population within the action area is lower than that of nearby Moreno Valley, but similar to that of surrounding Riverside County and the State of California

(Table 3-12). The percent of the population living at or below the poverty level is similar across all evaluated areas (U. S. Census, 2000; City of Moreno Valley, 2008).

TABLE 3-12					
Action Area Race and Poverty Level Census Results Compared to Other Census Locations					
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>					
Race	Proposed Action Area Block Group 9, Census Tract 429, March Joint ARB	Moreno Valley, CA	Riverside County, CA	State of California	United States
White	239	66,689	1,013,478	20,170,059	211,460,626
Black	66	28,310	96,421	2,263,882	34,658,190
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2	1,343	18,168	333,346	2,475,956
Asian	17	8,427	56,954	3,697,513	10,242,998
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders	7	733	3,902	116,961	398,835
Some other single race	11	28,584	288,868	5,682,241	15,359,073
Two or more mixed races	28	8,295	67,596	1,607,646	6,826,228
Hispanic origin ¹	44	54,689	559,575	10,966,556	35,305,818
Total Population ²	370	142,381	1,545,387	33,871,648	281,421,906
Minority Population (%)	35.4	53.2	34.4	40.5	24.9
Hispanic Population (%) (1/3 of minority population)	11.8	38.4	36.2	32.4	12.5
INCOME BELOW POVERTY LEVEL					
Number below the poverty level	52	20,141	214,084	4,706,130	33,899,812
Percent below the poverty level (%)	14.0	14.1	13.9	13.9	12.4

Source: U.S. Census, 2000

¹The 2000 census category for “Hispanic or Latino” includes individuals who classified themselves as Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or other Spanish, Hispanic, Latino origins and may be of any race. Origins can be viewed heritage, nationality group, lineage, or country of birth of the person, the person’s parents, or ancestors before arrival in the U.S.

²Total population data provided by the 2000 census in Summary File 3 for CT 421 BG 9.

3.18.1.1 Protection of Children

EO 13045 “Protection of Children from Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risk”

requires that federal agencies make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children and to ensure that policies, programs, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health or safety risks.

Approximately 37 percent of the population in Census Tract (CT) 429, Block Group (BG) 9 (the area surrounding the proposed action area) were children under the age of 18 (Table 3-13).

TABLE 3-13			
Individuals under the age of 18 at March Joint ARB Compared to Other Census Locations			
<i>AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside, CA</i>			
Geographic Area	Total Population	Individuals Under the Age of 18	Percent (%)
March Joint ARB Block Group 9, Census Tract 429	370	137	37.0
Moreno Valley, CA	142,381	52,412	36.8
Riverside Valley, CA	1,545,387	468,691	30.3
State of California	33,871,648	9,249,829	27.3
United States	281,421,906	72,293,812	25.7

Source: U. S. Census, 2000

3.18.2 Consequences

3.18.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, The AMOC expansion would not be constructed. An additional 35 CBP personnel may still be added as space becomes available at the existing AMOC facility. However, with the slight increase compared to the overall population and the projected population increase no direct or indirect impacts to minority or low-income populations, or children.

3.18.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Minority Populations

Direct Impacts

Under the proposed action, an AMOC facility expansion would allow for up to 500 new personnel. Block Group 99 that includes the site (CT 429 BG 9) currently has a 35.4 percent minority population and 11.8 percent Hispanic population. The construction and operation of the new station would not disproportionately impact minority or Hispanic populations.

The proposed action would result in additional vehicle traffic. However, vehicles would use the main access routes through town and are not anticipated to be driving on residential roads.

Construction would be completed during normal business hours to avoid potential impacts of noise, lighting and other normal construction disturbance to nearby populations. Construction of individual components would be shorter in duration,

ranging from several days to several months each depending on size. The proposed action would not cause disproportionate negative impacts on populations living nearby due to the use of planning construction activities to minimize impacts.

Indirect Impacts

The economic benefits of the proposed action would likely benefit minority populations of March Joint ARB, Moreno Valley, and surrounding communities to some degree, either directly by offering new jobs or indirectly through secondary job creation and increased services from the increased tax revenue.

The proposed action would be a minor positive economic stimulus to Riverside County and the local economy. Any adverse human health and environmental consequences from the proposed action would not be borne disproportionately by minority populations as there area considered for the proposed action is not populated or used disproportionately by minority populations (U. S. Census, 2000).

Low-Income Populations

Direct Impacts

The BG (CT 429 BG 9) encompassing the site of the proposed action and is not considered a “poverty area” because the poverty rate (14.0 percent) is well below the 20 percent threshold for designation as a poverty area. Likewise, CT 429 BG 9 is not an “extreme poverty” area. The proposed action would be compatible with other uses in the vicinity and would have no impact on low-income populations.

Indirect Impacts

The addition of up to 500 personnel to the area would slightly enhance the local economy by providing a greater level of employment in the area and would result in increased secondary spending by CBP personnel and the families of personnel who choose to reside in the community. The increased tax revenue from expenditures in the local area would be a minor positive impact on the community and could assist in providing greater services for low-income persons.

Protection of Children

Direct Impacts

The site will be secured with fencing during construction and operation, there will be no impacts to environmental health and safety risks to children living on or near March Joint ARB.

Only minor adverse impacts, mainly the loss of Tyson Field as a recreational play area, would be associated with the proposed action, and none would create environmental health and safety risks to children.

Indirect Impacts

Beneficial indirect impacts could include participation in local schools by new personnel and increasing interactions by local children with the children of new CBP personnel.

3.19 HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY

3.19.1 Affected Environment

3.19.1.1 Tyson Field

The area east of the existing AMOC is known as Tyson Field and consists of a running track, exercise stations, and a small set of bleachers. The field currently is used by the public for recreation as was observed during the site visit on November 13, 2008 (The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008). Evidence of track grooming and use was evident; the area is also used as a dog-walking area by the public and contributes to open space.

3.19.1.2 Emergency Services

As of 2000, approximately 370 people lived within Census Tract 429 Block Group 9, which includes March Joint ARB and 142,381 people lived in neighboring Moreno Valley. There are seven hospitals in the area including Moreno Valley Community Hospital and Riverside County Regional Medical Center both of which are within approximately 5 miles of the proposed AMOC expansion.

Local and regional emergency service providers include the Moreno City Police Department, the Riverside County Sheriff, and the California Highway Patrol. The Moreno Valley City Police and Riverside County Sheriff's Department Offices are located approximately 1 mile north of March Joint ARB and the California State Highway Patrol Office is located approximately 10 miles east, in the City of Riverside.

The Riverside County Fire Department Station 65 and the Moreno Valley Fire Department are both located within one mile (north and east, respectively) of the existing

AMOC. Each station includes paramedics and fire crews and operates 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. March ARB also has a fire department and security force.

3.19.1.3 Construction and Operation Safety

Applicable state and federal construction and operations safety standards including guidelines for fire protection and life safety will be implemented.

3.19.2 Consequences

3.19.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

There could be an increase of up to an additional 35 CBP personnel under the no action alternative. However, no construction would take place. Although work conditions would continue to be overcrowded, there would be no increased adverse impact to human health and safety beyond current staffing levels as a result of the no action alternative.

3.19.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

The construction of the AMOC expansion would result in the loss of the Tyson Field running track, exercise stations, and bleacher set. A loss of open space would also occur. The loss of convenient exercise facilities could be considered as a health impact to those currently using Tyson Field. There are other appropriate facilities nearby which could alleviate this impact.

The addition of up to 500 personnel to the AMOC would result in a negligible increase in demand on local emergency services. The capacity of existing services is sufficient to meet this increased demand. No direct impacts to these services are anticipated.

Construction of the AMOC expansion has the potential for minor, short-term impacts to health and safety during construction. This includes the temporary presence of construction vehicles onsite. Health and safety practices during construction and operation would be consistent with OSHA guidelines. No impacts to human health and safety are anticipated to result from construction or operation of the proposed AMOC expansion or the increase in personnel.

With the addition of up to 500 personnel to the AMOC, munitions storage and use at the facility would increase. However, all storage and use would conform to established AMOC policies to manage the safety risk posed by these materials.

Direct impacts to human health and safety are the negative impact of the loss of Tyson Field to public use and the potentially beneficial impact on the efficiency of AMOC facility operations.

Indirect Impacts

The indirect impacts on human health and safety are difficult to quantify, among others because of synergistic effects and the time-lag between exposure and reaction. Indirect impacts could be caused by emissions due to increased transportation or increased contamination of water systems and soil near landfills. However, the small increase (0.4 percent) to the current and projected populations would have minor adverse impacts.

3.20 SUSTAINABILITY AND GREENING

3.20.1 Affected Environment

In January 2007, EO 13423, “Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management”, was signed and established goals in the areas of energy efficiency, acquisitions, renewable energy, toxics reductions, recycling, sustainable buildings, electronics stewardship, fleets, and water conservation. EO 13423 reinforces the requirement for more widespread use of Environmental Management Systems to manage and improve these practices.

3.20.2 Consequences

3.20.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the no action alternative, no long-term impacts on the greening and sustainability initiatives required by EO 13423 would be expected. The existing AMOC would continue to maximize the use of green office products and energy efficient appliances. There would be no change to the current AMOC facility fleet. There would be no impact on the sustainability and greening program resulting from the no action alternative.

3.20.2.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Action Alternative

Direct Impacts

The proposed facility would incorporate sustainable practices during construction and operation. The proposed facility would be designed to the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) Silver rating. The AMOC would use green office products and energy-efficient appliances to the maximum extent practicable.

There would be no vehicle fleet. Preferred parking spaces would be made available to fuel efficient POVs.

The overall direct impact on the OAM sustainability and greening program would be beneficial due to the LEED®-focused design and operational goals. Under the proposed action alternative, there will be opportunities to use green practices in the new landscaping design around the building extension as well as around the parking structures.

Indirect Impacts

There would be no indirect impacts on the overall greening program at the AMOC as a result of implementing the proposed action.

This page left intentionally blank.

4.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The most severe environmental degradation may not result from the direct effects of any particular action, but from the combination of effects of multiple, independent actions over time. As defined in 40 CFR 1508.7 (CEQ Regulations),

a “Cumulative Impact” is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions.

Some authorities contend that most environmental effects can be seen as cumulative because almost all systems have already been modified. Principles of cumulative effects analysis are described (CEQ, 1997b) as follows:

For cumulative effects analysis to help the decision-maker and inform interested parties, it must be limited through scoping to effects that can be evaluated meaningfully. The boundaries for evaluating cumulative effects should be expanded to the point at which the resource is no longer affected significantly or the effects are no longer of interest to affected parties.

Guidance for implementing NEPA recommends that federal agencies identify the temporal and geographic boundaries of the potential cumulative effects of a proposed action (CEQ, 1997b). For purposes of this EA, CBP considered activities and effects into the foreseeable future, with emphasis given to projects that may have a bearing on determining current conditions and future impacts. This temporal boundary includes the

period in which new personnel would be assigned to and integrated into the AMOC Expansion, and until the proposed infrastructure would be constructed. The geographic boundaries of analysis are generally contained within the City of Moreno Valley, unless otherwise specified.

Commercial Developments

The City of Moreno Valley acts as a clearinghouse for most activities and proposals in the city. The following ongoing activities and proposals could have a cumulative effect on environmental, social, and economic resources in the area (City of Moreno Valley, 2008):

Commercial/Retail Projects - Nearly 2.6 million square feet of commercial and retail development is underway.

Commercial Projects in Planning - 331,250 square feet of commercial development in planning.

Hotel/Hospitality - 676 guestrooms in seven projects under development.

Office - 706,280 square feet of office development in progress.

Industrial - Nearly 23 million square feet of industrial buildings under development.

Residential

- Single-Family: Nearly 4,000 new homes have been recently completed or are being marketed. Another 3,300 have been approved over the last few years, but construction has not started.

- Multi-Family: More than 3,700 multi-family units (apartments and condominiums) are approved or under construction.

Public Works Developments

Approximately 80 public works developments are slated for 2008 and 2009 (City of Moreno Valley, 2008). Planned projects include, but are not limited to:

- Bridge Maintenance Program – various locations
- Design and construction of traffic signals – various locations
- Renovation of Fire Station No. 48
- Citywide Speed Hump Program
- Sunnymead Boulevard Revitalization From Frederick Street to Perris Boulevard
- Main Library at City Hall Civic Center (Phase I)
- Sheila Neighborhood Park
- Heacock Street and Cactus Avenue Flood Control Channel Improvements

No other activities are being planned within the City of Moreno Valley. While projects are planned at other CBP facilities in the western region, none of these would be connected directly or indirectly with the proposed action. Therefore, no cumulative impact consideration is given to these activities.

Because no impacts were identified as a result of the no action alternative, by definition no cumulative effects to resources would occur. The following discussion provides analysis of the potential for cumulative impacts when combined with the proposed action

as a result of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities within the temporal and geographic boundaries, as defined above.

4.1 LAND USE

The proposed Federal action is not subject to local zoning, however, the proposed AMOC expansion would result in a conversion of 8.38 acres of open land known as Tyson Field that was designated for public recreation in the Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) (Air Force Real Property Agency, 2007) to a fenced area with developed government facilities with restricted access. Land that is currently open to the public is becoming more limited in the county and development of open land is expected to continue for an unknown period into the future. The open land to the east of the project area and March Field Park to the north is owned by the City of Moreno Valley, however use of the East Property by CPB OAM will be granted through a long term easement agreement. No changes to these parcels are expected in the reasonably foreseeable future. Therefore, the proposed land use conversion would not result in a significant cumulative effect on the county land use or the surrounding area in general. However, the conversion of open, public land to fenced, government facilities may cumulatively impact the quality of life of the people who currently walk their dogs and exercise in Tyson Field. The adjacent recreational facilities at March Field Park, the base's open land to the east, or other open space areas within the City of Moreno Valley or Riverside County may mitigate the loss of Tyson Field for these individuals.

4.2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Although other development projects are proposed, planned, and underway in the area, there would be no potential for the minor impacts anticipated from the proposed action to combine with those of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Therefore, there would be no cumulative geologic impacts because of the size of the proposed action. No disturbance to geology such as digging across active faults in the area will occur as a result of or be affected by the proposed action.

4.3 VEGETATION

The 11.13-acre project area has been graded, partly developed, and vegetated with non-native grasses and a few non-native trees. Weedy species and areas of barren soil cover large portions of the 11.13 acres. Following construction, the open areas would be landscaped with xeric groundcover and crushed rock. The landscaped areas would be maintained, reducing the current weed coverage. Although other development projects are proposed, planned, and underway in the area, there would be no potential for the minor impacts anticipated from the proposed action to combine with those of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Therefore, no significant cumulative effects to vegetation are anticipated.

4.4 WILDLIFE AND AQUATIC RESOURCES

The proposed action may cause minor adverse impacts to common wildlife and the burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), a state species of special concern due to

development of 11.13 acres of predominantly open space. A walking survey of the East Parcel on March 9, 2009 by Mark Pavelka, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service revealed eight (8) larger burrows in the "infield" of the track. These burrows were appropriately sized for ground squirrels and burrowing owls. No evidence of either species was present, although a light rain had fallen the previous day and may have obscured any sign.

Based on this survey, CBP agreed to pursue burrowing owl surveys following the California Department of Fish and Game Survey Protocols (California, April 1993). If burrowing owls are detected, they will be relocated to another suitable area using artificial burrows.

Due to the poor quality of the impacted habitat and the proximity of other development and human activity no significant cumulative effects are anticipated from the proposed action to combine with those of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

Aquatic resources would not be impacted by the proposed actions.

4.5 THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

The proposed action would result in the development on what is now predominantly open space. An assessment for Stephen's kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*) (SKR) was conducted by Mark Pavelka of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service on March 9, 2009. His assessment concluded that there are no SKR on either parcel and that SKR are not likely to naturally immigrate into the area in the foreseeable future. This determination was based on 1) the lack of burrow and other rodent sign on the property, 2) the high

level of compaction of the soil, 3) the relatively high gravel content on the surface and in the tailings from deeper digging by gophers (*Thomomys spp.*)(very few gopher burrows found), 4) the high density of vegetation, 5) the existing level of urban development surrounding the site, 6) the apparent lack of any suitable habitat or areas known to be occupied by SKR within the vicinity of the site, and 7) the historic lack of SKR captures on March Air Force Base east of Interstate 215. As a result, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicated that a project on this site would not affect SKR and that "take" authorization for SKR pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is not required. The 11.13-acre project area has been graded, partly developed, and planted with non-native grasses and a few non-native trees. Weedy species and areas of barren soil cover much of the open ground on the proposed project area. Due to the poor quality of the impacted habitat and the proximity of other development and human activity no effects are anticipated.

4.6 HYDROLOGY AND GROUNDWATER

Full compliance with CWA requirements; implementation of appropriate construction BMPs, and the city sewer and water systems would minimize any potential effects to surface water hydrology and groundwater. Continued monitoring of the groundwater plume, flow direction, and PCE levels in the upper alluvial layer of the project area by the U.S. Air Force, the Responsible Party, will ensure continued compliance with the CERCLA March AFB Federal Facilities Agreement (EPA *et al.*, 1990) (also see: <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r9/sfund/r9sfdocw.nsf/vwsoalphabetic/March%20Air%20Force%20Base?OpenDocument#documents>). Therefore, no cumulative impacts to surface water

hydrology or groundwater from the incremental impact of project construction and operation in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would result.

4.7 SURFACE WATERS AND WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

No cumulative impacts to surface waters from the incremental impact of project construction and operation would result.

4.8 FLOODPLAINS

Because there would be no impact to floodplains associated with the proposed action, there would be no opportunity for contribution to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects and therefore there would be no cumulative effect.

4.9 AIR QUALITY

The AMOC expansion site would be graded and paved prior to facility construction. The construction activities would produce minor, localized, elevated air pollutant concentrations for a short duration. These increases would be minimized by construction BMPs and coordination of construction phases during an 18-month period. No other developments or construction activities are planned on the base property or the immediate surrounding areas in or around the proposed project location that may collectively contribute to a cumulative air quality impact.

The expanded facilities would employ up to 500 new employees. These employees and their families are assumed to find residence within the immediate area. The addition of new workers to the valley will increase the regional emissions, and thus decrease air quality, by less than 0.15 %. Thus, the impact of the additional workers proposed by this project is not significant.

4.10 NOISE

Construction activities associated with the proposed AMOC expansion would produce localized elevated noise levels for a short duration. Noise levels, however, would not form a significant elevated noise level, and there are no sensitive receptors such as private office buildings, schools, and hospitals in the area. The closest residences are north and east of the proposed site. There are several development projects within a 1 mile radius of the Northern and Eastern Properties including several million square feet of industrial development to the southeast, road construction to the north, and a several million square foot industrial business park to the northwest as well as a multitude of small businesses and multifamily residences within a 3-mile radius of the proposed action (http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/do_biz/new-development.shtml).

Construction and increased numbers of POVs would increase traffic-related noise in the area in the short- and long-term. Operational and traffic-related noise would be expected to be absorbed into surrounding noise levels, such as traffic along I-215 and local traffic influences.

Future growth would be expected to blend into existing growth trends, and there are no foreseeable plans to develop March Field Park or the other open base property to the north and east of the project area. Therefore, no significant cumulative effects from past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects from the construction or operational noise would be expected. Cumulative noise impacts resulting from the increase in traffic noise would be long-term and minor.

4.11 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The proposed action would not affect cultural resources on the proposed site as there were no known cultural resources identified on the proposed property as a result of the literature and pedestrian surveys (R₂H, Engineering, Inc., 2008). Therefore, there is no potential for cumulative impacts to cultural resources from interaction with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects.

4.12 UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Demands on potable water, wastewater treatment capacity, energy, and solid waste collection would increase as a result of cumulative development activities and subsequent increased growth at March Joint ARB and surrounding Moreno Valley.

At present, the utility providers have more than adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed AMOC expansion and that of other planned projects. Based on the known growth-inducing activities, cumulative demand on utility systems is expected to increase substantially over the next few years. Existing utility systems and infrastructure and

currently planned projects are sufficient to serve this projected growth. The cumulative impact on utilities and infrastructure would be long-term and moderate.

4.13 ROADWAYS/TRAFFIC

The proposed AMOC expansion and cumulative development activities would result in temporary increases in construction-related traffic along I-215 and regional roadways surrounding the project area. The proximity of March ARB along I-215 would reduce the potential for incremental traffic congestion on regional corridors. Both Heacock Street and Cactus Avenue existing volume to daily capacity (V/C) are 0.91 and 0.81, respectively indicating roadways that were near capacity as of 2000 (City of Moreno Valley, 2006). The addition of another 500 vehicles (currently 200 in the long term potentially increasing to 700 employees) would increase the V/C for Heacock Street and Cactus Avenue to 0.93 and 0.83, respectively or less than a 10% increase in V/C.

Thus, this level of additional traffic will not cause significant cumulative impacts particularly when the overall population of the area is projected to increase by 23% (City of Moreno Valley, 2008).

4.14 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL

The proposed actions including development of open recreational space; construction of two-story buildings; paving surface area to create parking lots; increased vehicle storage; year-round lighting; perimeter fencing; and xeric landscaping would change the visual character of the project area. These changes would be partially mitigated by design criteria (e.g. building materials and colors) that would blend the new facilities into the

existing landscape to the greatest extent possible. The changes would not affect any sensitive visual resources. The conversion of open land to developed, fenced land would result in cumulative effects resulting from a loss of recreational opportunities and open space. These effects would be partially mitigated by the proximity of March Field Park and the open property to the north and east of the project area.

4.15 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The construction and routine operations of the CBP expansion would result in increased storage and the use of hazardous materials. The increased number of vehicles stored on site would increase the risk of petrochemical and antifreeze spills and leaks in the long-term. Full compliance with CWA permit requirements and BMPs would minimize any direct impacts from hazardous materials that may occur during construction. All solid, liquid, and hazardous wastes and materials, including universal wastes would be handled in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws and guidelines governing disposal of these items. Continued monitoring of the groundwater plume, flow direction, and PCE levels in the upper alluvial layer of the project area by the Air Force would ensure continued compliance with the CERCLA March AFB Federal Facilities Agreement (EPA *et al.*, 1990). Therefore, the proposed action would not have the potential to interact with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects to produce cumulative impacts.

4.16 SOCIOECONOMIC

The proposed action and the other projects in the region would be expected to have a minor, beneficial, short-term cumulative impact on the local economy resulting from construction and installation activities. There also would be a minor, long-term benefit to the regional economy because the new AMOC facility and influx of agent families would result in growth and increased the tax base in the surrounding communities. The area would benefit from the increased work force and wages of the personnel and from any jobs that other family members may obtain.

Development in the area is expected to attract new residents locally and enhance the economy proportionally. All of these activities would beneficially affect the economy in the long-term. The estimated demands from the proposed action on schools and local community services are tentative at this time, but the cumulative effect would be offset to some extent by the recent reduction in housing demand in Moreno Valley and surrounding communities and, over time, by the increased tax revenue that would become available for community services.

4.17 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE AND PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

The proposed action would not disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations. No interaction with other projects would result in any such disproportionate impacts. No cumulative impacts to EJ would be expected from interaction of the proposed action with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects.

There could be minor cumulative benefits to environmental health and safety for children as a result of the proposed action, which would increase the ability of AMOC to respond to incidents where children are at risk.

The proposed action would have no other potential to interact with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects with regard to environmental health and safety for children.

4.18 HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY

Human health and safety impacts from the proposed action during the construction phase would include air emissions resulting from grading and truck traffic, increased noise from equipment, increase in stockpiled construction waste such as soils and construction debris, and various hazards to workers. Health and safety impacts to the public would be short-term. Cumulative impacts would result from increased traffic with the resultant pollutants and accidents. Most impacts will be alleviated to the public and workers by implementing BMPs during the construction phase. Health and safety impacts from increased traffic due to the additional of 500 CBP personnel is anticipated to be minimal due to the small increase of this traffic compared to overall traffic (a 0.8% increase vs. a 23% overall increase).

4.19 SUSTAINABILITY AND GREENING

Below is a list of items to increase sustainability and greening.

- Reduce the use of paper by increasing electronic documents and information sharing
- Recycle paper, plastic, metals, oils, cardboard, and electronic equipment
- Increase use of recycled products
- Purchase of green cleaning products
- Recycling facilities at public events
- Reuse wood chips for park paths and tree mulch
- Erosion and sediment control programs
- Water conservation and leak detection program
- Energy conservation audits
- Energy-efficient lighting
- Hazardous waste disposal and reporting program

Because there would be no impacts to sustainability and greening associated with the proposed action, there would be no potential for a cumulative effect. After occupancy, these practices can be implemented to provide positive sustainability and greening. However, the overall impact to sustainability and greening would be minor adverse impact due to the increased need for resources. These impacts would not be considered significant.

4.20 SUMMARY

There is potential for cumulative impacts from the various activities, including the proposed action, city works projects, and commercial and domestic development. These activities may also result in a regional increase in population and a subsequent increase in

employment and the demand for water, housing, education, traffic management, and other social infrastructure. Existing public services, roadways and utility infrastructure in the region are sufficient to accommodate the increase in population without expansion and without reduction in the flow of traffic. Any cumulative impacts on the social or physical environment would be negligible or minor. There would be minor short-term beneficial impacts on the regional economy from the various construction activities.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

A number of BMPs and other measures that are typically incorporated as standard operating procedures by CBP would be implemented as part of this project to reduce or eliminate the potential for adverse impacts to the human and natural environment.

Although no substantial impacts were identified associated with implementation of the proposed action, the following mitigation measures were identified to enhance protection of certain resources that could potentially be affected by the expansion and operation of the March AMOC Facility.

Vegetation: Attempts would be made to salvage or relocate native plants prior to the initiation of construction activities. During occupancy of the property, CBP will control the spread of invasive plant species on the property, as necessary.

Wildlife and Aquatic Resources: Attempts would be made to time construction activities to avoid disturbance during the nesting season. Efforts would be made to locate any active nest sites for birds protected under the ESA or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act prior to construction and to avoid such sites to the extent practicable.

Surface Waters and Waters of the U.S.: A SWPPP would be prepared and BMPs would be implemented and maintained throughout the construction period to minimize runoff, reduce the movement of sediment offsite, and stabilize disturbed soils.

Air Quality: Project-related particulate matter (PM₁₀) emissions are expected to occur only during the construction activities. Proper and routine maintenance of all vehicles

and other equipment would be implemented to ensure that air emissions are within the design standards of all construction equipment. Other measures, such as dust suppression methods to minimize airborne fugitive dust, would be implemented during construction activities.

Cultural Resources: As with any ground-disturbing project, there remains a potential for the accidental discovery of buried cultural resources. If cultural resources or materials are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the work in the vicinity of the discovery would cease and the area would be protected until the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist. Depending on the nature of the find, additional consultation with the SHPO or affected tribes may be necessary before work can resume in the area of the find.

6.0 REFERENCES

1. Air Force Real Property Agency. 2007. Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer For Parcels D-1, I-2, J-4, and K-5D South. _Final FOSET for Parcels D-1, I-2, J-4 and K-5D south, February 2007. _____
2. ACS. 2007. American Community Survey 2005-2007. U.S. Census Bureau.
3. Audubon. 2008. Audubon watchlist: Coastal California gnatcatcher website <http://www.audubon2.org/watchlist/viewSpecies.jsp?id=57>. Accessed on December 11, 2008.
4. California Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, web site <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/wildlife/nongame/docs/boconsortium.pdf>. April 1993.
5. California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2008. California natural diversity database web site <http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb>. Accessed December 11, 2008.
6. California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board (CARB). 2007. Estimated Annual Average Emissions, Riverside County, South Coast Air Basin. Accessed December 11, 2008. Available online at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/app/emsinv/emseic1_query.php.
7. City of Moreno Valley, 2008. City Website. http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/do_biz/new-development.shtml and http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/do_biz/pdfs/newdev-sum-1108.pdf and http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/city_hall/departments/pub-works/project%20list-08-09_11-08.pdf Accessed December 10, 2008.
8. City of Moreno Valley. 2006. Final Environmental Impact Report: City of Moreno Valley General Plan. Volume 1. SCH# 200091075. July 2006. 628 p. Available online at: http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/city_hall/general-plan/06gpfinal/ieir/eir-tot.pdf.
9. Claritas, Inc. Executive Summary for Moreno Valley CA, http://www.moreno-valley.ca.us/do-biz/pdfs/Exec_Summary_MV_Mall_357_10-08.pdf, Accessed 12/10/08.
10. Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997a. Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act. December 10, 2007.
11. DeGraaf, R. M., V. E. Scott, R. H. Hamre, L. Ernst, and S. H. Anderson. 1991. Forest and rangeland bird of the United States: Natural history and habitat use. USDA Forest Service Agricultural Handbook 688. 625 p.
12. Earth Consultants International. 2000. Natural Hazard Mapping, Analysis, and Mitigation: a Technical Background Report in Support of the Safety Element of the New Riverside County 2000 General Plan, August 1, 2000 in Riverside County Integrated Project General Plan.

13. Earth Tech, Inc. 2003. United States Air Force installation restoration program 5-year review report for former March Air Force Base and March Air Reserve Base, Riverside County, California. Earth Tech, Inc., Colton, CA, and San Antonio, TX. Contract No. F41624-97-D-8018, Delivery Order No. 64. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/fiveyear/f04-09002.pdf>.
14. Engineering Toolbox. 2005. Sound levels web sites http://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/decibel-d_341.html, and http://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/outdoor-noise-d_62.html, and http://www.engineeringtoolbox.com/sound-level-d_719.html. Accessed December 11, 2008.
15. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2007. Highway traffic noise web site <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/3.htm>. Last modified December 12, 2007.
16. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), 2003. Distribution of Vehicles and Persons per Household. <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ohim/hq/bar2.htm>. Last modified April 21, 2003. September 12, 2008.
17. Federal Register (FR). 2002. USFWS Federal Register 50 CFR Part 17 endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: Designation of critical habitat for the Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*): Final Rule. April 15, 2002.
18. Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). 1996. Disposal of Portions of March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California. U. S. Air Force, February 1996.
19. Fitz, D. R. 2001, Measurement of PM 10 and PM 2.5 Emission Factors from Paved Roads in California, University of California. <http://www.cert.ucr.edu/research/pubs/18381-fr.pdf>. Note: The investigators used real-time measurements and are lower than less precise AP-42 factors, which are based on default silt loadings
20. Mattoni, R., G. F. Pratt, T. R. Longcore, J. F. Emmel, and J. N. George. 1997. The endangered quino checkerspot butterfly, *Euphydryas editha quino* (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae). Urban Wildlands Group, UCLA Department of Geography, Los Angeles, CA and Department of Entomology, University of California, Riverside, CA, California. Published in the Journal of Research Lepidoptera. Available at <http://www.doylegroup.harvard.edu/~carlo/JRL/34/PDF/34-099.pdf>.
21. Multiquip, Inc. 2008. Soil compaction handbook. Available online at http://www.concrete-catalog.com/soil_compaction.html.
22. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2007. Farmland mapping and monitoring program web site http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/overview/Pages/prime_farmland_fmmp.aspx. Accessed on December 2008.

23. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2008. Custom soil resource report for March Air Force Base, California, National Cooperative Soil Survey, Western Riverside Area, California.
24. NEPA, 1970. NEPA. the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.), sec. 309 of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7609), and E.O. 11514 (Mar. 5, 1970, as amended by E.O. 11991, May 24, 1977).
25. RCTD. 2008. Riverside County Transportation Department, Traffic Analysis Preparation Guide, Juan C. Perez, director of Transportation, April 2008.
26. Riverside County (RC). 2002. Western Riverside County multiple species habitat conservation plan: Section A, Multispecies Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). Available at <http://www.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/mshcp/volume2/AppendixA.html#2.4>. Accessed December 11, 2008.
27. Riverside County (RC). 2003. Western Riverside County multiple species conservation plan: Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement. June 2003.
28. R₂H Engineering, Inc., 2008. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for 2.75 Acres North and 8.38 Acres East of Air and Marine Operations Center, March Air Force Base, California
29. Ross Barney Architects, 2007. Unmanned Aircraft Systems National Operations Center Feasibility Study, Ross Barney Architects, 10 West Hubbard St., Chicago, IL 60610. Final Submission December 18, 2007.
30. Scorecard. 2003. Emissions Summary of Criteria Pollutants. Available online at: South Coast Management District (SCMD). 2007. Final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan. June 2007. Available online at: <http://www.aqmd.gov/aqmp/07aqmp/index.html>
31. South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2006. Understanding AQMD Permits. Accessed December 11, 2008. Available online at: http://www.aqmd.gov/permit/perm_net.html.
32. Stormwater Authority. 2008. Stormwater Authority BMPs in a flash: Construction BMPs web site http://www.stormwaterauthority.org/bmp/bmp_presentation.aspx.
33. The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008a. AMOC site visit notes. November 13-14, 2008.
34. The S.M. Stoller Corporation, 2008b. Draft Archaeological and Historic Survey Report. S.J. Miller (Faunal Analysis and CRM Services, 1450 Antares Dr. Idaho Falls, ID 83402) for Stoller Corp. and H2H, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
35. Transportation Land Management Agency (TLMA). 2008. Riverside County General Plan (http://www.rctlma.org/genplan/general_plan_2008/general_plan_2008.aspx).

36. U.S. Census Bureau (Census). 2000. U.S. Census Bureau web site <http://www.census.gov/index.html>. Accessed on December 9-10, 2008.
37. U.S. Department of Homeland Security (USDHS). 2006. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment For the Lease Acquisition of 10 Acres of Property U.S. Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine Operations Center March Air Force Base, California. Final. 155 pp.
38. USDHS, 2008. Draft Environmental Assessment for Proposed Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of the New Blythe Station Yuma Sector, Blythe, California, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection Headquarters Facilities Management and Engineering, Washington, D.C. October 2008.
39. U.S.D.I. National Park Service. 1995. National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Washington, DC. 54 pp.
40. U.S.D.I. National Park Service. 1998. National Register Bulletin: Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties That Have Achieved Significance Within the Past 50 Years. Washington, DC. 18 pp.
41. U.S. Department of Justice. 2003. *U.S. Border Patrol Facilities Design Guide*.
42. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2008. National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Air and Radiation. Accessed, December 2008. Updated October 20, 2008. Available online at: (NAAQS) <http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html>
43. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1974. Information Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety. EPA/ONAC 550/9-74-004. Accessed December 11, 2008.
44. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2008b. New Source Review (NSR). Internet Web site: <http://www.epa.gov/NSR/>. Accessed December 20, 2008.
45. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2006. EPA Superfund Record of Decision: March Air Force Base EPA ID: CA4570024527 OU 01 RIVERSIDE, CA 06/20/1996
46. U.S. EPA, California Department of Health Service, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the U.S. Air Force. 1990. March Air Force Base federal facility agreement under CERCLA Section 120. EPA Region 9, CA Dept. of Health Service, CA Regional WQCB Santa Ana Region, and the U.S. Air Force. Available online at: <http://www.epa.gov/superfund/sites/iag/i90-09007.pdf>.
47. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2008a. Draft species list web page http://www.fws.gov/pacific/carlsbad/CFWO_Species_List. Accessed on December 11, 2008. USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office.

48. USFWS. 2008b. USFWS southwestern willow flycatcher web site
<http://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/TEspecies.html>. Updated September 30, 2008.
Accessed on December 11, 2008. USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office.
49. USFWS. 2008c. USFWS coastal California gnatcatcher web page
<http://www.fws.gov/pacific/news/gnatcatcher/faqtext.htm>. Accessed on February 4, 2008. USFWS Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office.
50. USFWS. 2008d. California tiger salamander web site
http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/animal_spp_acct/california_tiger_salamander_kf.htm. Accessed December 11, 2008.
51. USFWS. 2008e. Quino checkerspot butterfly web site
<http://www.fws.gov/pacific/news/2001/2001-35.htm>. Accessed on February 4, 2008.
52. USFWS. 2008f. USFWS Quino checkerspot butterfly critical habitat portal web site
<http://criticalhabitat.fws.gov/>. Map generated December 10, 2008.
53. USFWS. 2005a. Southwestern willow flycatcher critical habitat designation web site
http://www.fws.gov/nevada/protected_species/birds/documents/swwf/swwfnl_ch_q&as_asfwf.pdf. Accessed December 11, 2008. USFWS Public Affairs Office, Albuquerque, NM.
54. USFWS. 2005b. California tiger salamander critical habitat designation web site
http://www.fws.gov/sacramento/es/maps/CTS_central_pop_final_crithab_maps/central_CTS_fCH_units.htm. Accessed December 11, 2008.
55. Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC). 2008a. Lake Perris, California COOP 046816. Accessed: December 9, 2008. Updated, June 11, 2008.
Available online at: <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/index.html>.
56. Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities. 1995.
Seismic Hazards in Southern California: Probable Earthquakes, 1994-2024.
57. WRCC. 2008b. March Field, California COOP 045326. Accessed: December 9, 2008. Updated, June 11, 2008. Available online at:
<http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/index.html>.
58. Zipcode Zoo. 2008. Coastal cactus wren web site
http://zipcodezoo.com/Animals/C/Campylorhynchus_brunneicapillus_cousei/.
Accessed December 11, 2008.

This page left intentionally blank.

7.0 ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AFB	Air Force Base
ARB	Air Reserve Base
AICUZ	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone
AMO	Air & Marine Operations
AMOC	Air & Marine Operations Center
AMSL	Above mean sea level
AOR	Areas of Responsibility
ARB	Air Reserve Base
BG	Block Group
Bgs	Below ground surface
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAA	Clean Air Act
CARB	California Environmental Protection Agency Air Resources Board
CBP	U.S. Customs and Border Protection
OAM	CBP Air & Marine
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDO	Command Duty Officer
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CNDDB	California National Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CPR	Cathodic Protection Rectifier
CSC	California Species of Special Concern
C3ISR	Command, Control, Communications, Intelligence, and Reconnaissance
CWA	Clean Water Act
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DHS	Department of Homeland Security

EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EJ	Environmental Justice
EOs	Executive Orders
ESA	Endangered Species Act of 1973
FCS	Federal Candidate
FE	Federally Endangered
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FR	Federal Register
FT	Federally Threatened
GOV's	Government Owned Vehicles
GSA	U.S. General Services Administration
HAP	Hazardous Air Pollutant
Ldn	day-night level
LEED®	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
MAFB	March Air Force Base
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MDAQMD	Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District
MD	Management Directive
MJPA	March Joint Powers Authority
MJPUA	March Joint Powers Utility Authority
MSHCP	Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MWD	Municipal Water District
NAGPRA	Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NSR	New Source Review

OAM	Office of Air and Marine
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OU1	Operable Unit
PCE	Perchloroethylene
POC	Predator Operations Center
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976
RI/FS	Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986
SBI	Secure Border Initiative
SCMP	South Coast Management District
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SE	State Endangered
SHPO	California State Historic Preservation Office
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SKR	Stephen's kangaroo rat
SPCCP	Spill Prevention, Containment, and Countermeasures Plan
ST	State Threatened
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
tpy	tons per year
UAS	Unmanned Aircraft Systems
UASNATC	Unmanned Aircraft Systems National Aviation Training Center
UASNOC	Unmanned Aircraft Systems National Operations Center
UAVs	Unmanned aerial vehicles
UFAS	Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards
UPS	Uninterruptible Power Supply
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
OAM	U. S. Border Patrol
ug/L	micrograms per liter
USC	United States Code
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
V/C	Volume to Daily Capacity

WMWD Western Municipal Water District
WQA Water Quality Act of 1987

8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

This EA has been prepared under the direction of the CBP. The individuals who assisted in resolving issues and providing agency guidance for this document are:

Charles Parsons
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Customs and Border Protection
Laguna Facilities Center

This EA has been prepared by R₂H Engineering, Inc., under the direction of CBP. The individual contractors who contributed to the preparation of this document are listed below.

Kyra Povirk
Degree: M.S., Rangeland Ecology and Watershed Management
Years of Experience: 10

Craig L. Reese
Degree: BS, MS Civil Engineering
Years of Experience: 18

Brian Martinson
Degree: BS, Environmental Science
Years of Experience: 14

Douglas Halford
Degree: MS, Wildlife Ecology; MS Radiation Ecology
Years of Experience: 33

Jackie Hafla
Degree: BS, Land Rehabilitation; Emphasis, Water Resources; Minor, Soils
Years of Experience: 7

Sue Miller
Degree: BA, Biology and Chemistry; MS Anthropology and Archeology
Years of Experience: 37

APPENDIX A
SECTION 106 COORDINATION & RESPONSES

This page left intentionally blank.

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
Office of Historic Preservation
California Department of Parks and Recreation
1416 9th Street, Room 1442-7
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Subject: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Mr. Donaldson:

CBP previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,



Charles H. Parsons
Environmental Program Manager

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2008

The Honorable Richard M. Milanovich, Chairman
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California
5401 Dinah Shore Dr.
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Milanovich:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,



102

Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

Richard M. Begay
Director of Historic Preservation
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California
5401 Dinah Shore Dr.
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine facility March Air Force Base,
Moreno Valley, California

Dear Mr. Begay:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 5, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


for Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Mary Ann Martin, Chairperson
Augustine Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Augustine Reservation, California
P.O. Box 846
Coachella, CA 92236

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairperson Martin:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Rhonda Welch-Scalco, Chairwoman
Barona Band of Mission Indians
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairwoman Welch-Scalco:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable John James, Chairman
Cabazon Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Cabazon Reservation, California
94-245 Indio Springs Parkway
Indio, CA 92203

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman James:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Eugene Nogales, Chairperson
Cahuilla Band of Mission Indians of the Cahuilla Reservation, California
P. O. Box 391760
Anza, CA 92539-1760

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairperson Nogales:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,

for Charles Parsons

Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Matthew Franklin, Chairman
Ione Band of Miwok Indians of California
P. O. Box 1190
Ione, CA 95640

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Franklin:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Tracy Nelson, Chairman
La Jolla Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the La Jolla Reservation, California
22000 Highway 76
Pauma Valley, CA 92061

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Nelson:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


cor Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Catherine Saubel, Spokeswoman
Los Coyotes Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Los Coyotes Reservation, California
2300 Camino San Ignacio
Warner Springs, CA 92086

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Spokeswoman Saubel:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,



Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Robert Martin, Chairman
Morongo Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Morongo Reservation, California
11581 Potrero Road
Banning, CA 92220

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Martin:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


cc Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Robert Smith, Chairman
Pala Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pala Reservation, California
12196 Pala Mission Road
Pala, CA 92059

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Smith:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,



Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Mark A. Macarro, Chairman
Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation, California
P.O. Box 1477
Temecula, CA 92593

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Macarro:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


for

Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

David Largo, Cultural Resources Manager
Santa Rosa Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of the Santa Rosa Reservation, California
325 N. Western Ave.
Hemet, CA 92543

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Mr. Largo:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,

for Charles Parsons

Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Robert Salgado, Chairman
Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, California
P. O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA 92581

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Salgado:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,




Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

January 30, 2009

The Honorable Mary E. Belardo, Chairwoman
Torres-Martinez Band of Cahuilla Mission Indians of California
66-725 Martinez Road
Thermal, CA 92274

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairwoman Belardo:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately 2.75 acres and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately 8.38 acres will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,


Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

P.O. BOX 942896
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001
(916) 653-6624 Fax: (916) 653-9824
calshpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov



January 12, 2009

In Reply Refer To: CBP090108A

Charles H. Parsons
Environmental Program Manager
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, California 92677

Re: Proposed New 11 Acre Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine Facility, March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California.

Dear Mr. Parsons:

Thank you for submitting to our office, on behalf of the United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP), your letter and supporting documentation regarding the proposed undertaking. Pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800 (as amended 8-05-04) regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, you are seeking my comments on your determination of effects that this undertaking will have on historic properties. The proposed project is the construction of a new Customs and Border Protection air and Marine Facility at March Air Force Base in Moreno Valley, Riverside County, California. At this time, in your letter of December 29, 2008, you are requesting my comments on your determination of an Area of Potential Effects (APE).

After reviewing your letter I find that I cannot comment at this time on the adequacy of your APE pursuant to 36 CFR Parts 800.4(a)(1) and 800.16(d). Although you state on page 1 of your letter that a map of the APE is enclosed, there was no map attached to, or enclosed with your letter as received at my office on January 8, 2009. If you wish my comments on your APE determination please submit a map (7.5" USGS quadrangle or equivalent) with the project APE clearly delineated. In addition to the indicated land parcels the APE should incorporate all indirectly affected locations such as staging and access areas and utility corridors if those are located outside of the two project parcels.

If you require further information, please contact William Soule, Associate State Archeologist, at phone 916-654-4614 or email wsoule@parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Susan K Shattou for

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
State Historic Preservation Officer



PALA BAND OF MISSION INDIANS

Tribal Historic Preservation Office

35008 Pala Temecula Rd. PMB 445

Pala, CA 92059

Ph: (760) 891-3591
Fax: (760) 742-4543

February 10, 2009

Hector Montalvo, Director
US Dept. of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Re: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air Force Base, Moreno Valley, CA

Dear Mr. Montalvo:

The Pala Band of Mission Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office has received your notification of the project referenced above. This letter constitutes our response on behalf of Robert Smith, Tribal Chairman.

We have consulted our maps and determined that the project as described is not within the boundaries of the recognized Pala Indian Reservation. The project is also beyond the boundaries of the territory that the tribe considers its Traditional Use Area (TUA). Therefore, we have no objection to the continuation of project activities as currently planned and we defer to the wishes of Tribes in closer proximity to the project area. However, if the project boundaries are modified to extend beyond the currently proposed limits, we do request updated information and the opportunity to respond to your changes.

We appreciate involvement with your initiative and look forward to working with you on future efforts. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone at 760-891-3591 or by e-mail at sgaughen@palatribe.com.

Sincerely,

Shasta C. Gaughen, MA
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Pala Band of Mission Indians

**OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

P.O. BOX 942896
SACRAMENTO, CA 94296-0001
(916) 653-6624 Fax: (916) 653-9824
calshpo@ohp.parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov



RECEIVED
MAR 12 A 6:37
OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION

March 5, 2009

In Reply Refer To: CBP090108A

Charles H. Parsons
Environmental Program Manager
U.S. Customs and Border Protection
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, California 92677

Re: Continued Consultation Proposed New 11 Acre Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine Facility, March Air Force Base, Riverside County, California.

Dear Mr. Parsons:

Thank you for continuing consultation with our office, on behalf of the United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP), with your current letter of January 30, 2009, and supporting documentation regarding the proposed construction of a new Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine Facility at March Air Force Base in Moreno Valley, Riverside County, California. Pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800 (as amended 8-05-04) regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, you are seeking my comments on your determination of effects that this undertaking will have on historic properties. The CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square-foot, two-story office building with an asphalt parking lot on one parcel totaling 2.75 acres; and a warehouse, indoor gun range, armory, secured storage area, and additional parking and office facilities on the second parcel that totals 8.38 acres.

Earlier in this consultation (SHPO letter of January 12, 2009) I requested that you provide additional documentation regarding your determination of an Area of Potential Effects (APE) and your efforts to identify historic properties in the APE. You have now responded with your current letter and the following supporting documentation:

- *Archaeological and Historic Survey Report March Joint Air Reserve Base, AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside County, California* (S.J. Miller, Faunal Analysis and CRM Services, S.M. Stoller Corp., R2H Engineering: undated but completed in November 2008).

The historic property identification efforts described in this report concluded that there are no historic properties in the project APE. However, the APE is located in close proximity to the March Field Historic District (aka March Air Force Base) which was listed (as District #94001420) on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in

1994 under criteria A and C. The CBP has concluded that the proposed facilities, which are not planned to exceed two-stories in height, will not have an adverse effect to the viewshed of the March Field Historic NRHP District. Accordingly, the CBP has determined that a finding of No Adverse Effect is appropriate pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800.5(b). I have no objection to the determination of this finding by the CBP.

Be advised that under certain circumstances, such as unanticipated discovery or a change in project description, the CBP may have additional future responsibilities for this undertaking under 36 CFR Part 800. If you require further information, please contact William Soule, Associate State Archeologist, at phone 916-654-4614 or email wsoule@parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Susan K Stratton for

Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
State Historic Preservation Officer

February 23, 2009

Attn: Charles Parsons
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, Ca 92677



Re: PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF A NEW 11 ACRE CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION (CBP) AIR AND MARINE (A&M) FACILITY MARCH AIR FORCE BASE, MORENO VALLEY, CALIFORNIA

The Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians appreciates your observance of Tribal Cultural Resources and their preservation in your project. The information provided to us on said project has been assessed through our Cultural Resource Department, where it was concluded that although it is outside the existing reservation, the project area does fall within the bounds of our Tribal Traditional Use Areas. This project location is a known village site; it is in close proximity to other known sites and is a shared use area that was used in ongoing trade between the Luiseno and Cahuilla tribes. Therefore it is regarded as highly sensitive to the people of Soboba.

Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians is requesting the following:

1. **Government to government** consultation. Meaning the transfer of information to the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians regarding the progress of this project should be done as soon as new developments occur.
2. Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians be regarded as MLD and the lead consulting tribal entity for this project.
3. Working in and around traditional use areas intensifies the possibility of encountering cultural resources during the construction/excavation phase. For this reason the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians requests that Native American Monitor(s) from the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians Cultural Resource Department to be present during any ground disturbing proceedings. Including surveys and archaeological testing.
4. Request that proper procedures be taken and requests of the tribe be honored (Please see the attachment)

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Ontiveros", is written over a horizontal line.

Joseph Ontiveros
Soboba Cultural Resource Department
P.O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA 92581
Phone (951) 654-5544 ext. 4137
Cell (951) 663-5279
jontiveros@soboba-nsn.gov

Cultural Items (Artifacts). Ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony reflect traditional religious beliefs and practices of the Soboba Band. The Developer should agree to return all Native American ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony that may be found on the project site to the Soboba Band for appropriate treatment. In addition, the Soboba Band requests the return of all other cultural items (artifacts) that are recovered during the course of archaeological investigations. Where appropriate and agreed upon in advance, Developer's archeologist may conduct analyses of certain artifact classes if required by CEQA, Section 106 of NHPA, the mitigation measures or conditions of approval for the Project. This may include but is not limited or restricted to include shell, bone, ceramic, stone or other artifacts.

The Developer should waive any and all claims to ownership of Native American ceremonial and cultural artifacts that may be found on the Project site. Upon completion of authorized and mandatory archeological analysis, the Developer should return said artifacts to the Soboba Band within a reasonable time period agreed to by the Parties and not to exceed (30) days from the initial recovery of the items.

Treatment and Disposition of Remains. Given that Native American human remains have been found during development of the Project and the Soboba Band has been designated the MLD, the following provisions shall apply to the Parties:

A. The Soboba Band shall be allowed, under California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a), to (1) inspect the site of the discovery and (2) make determinations as to how the human remains and grave goods shall be treated and disposed of with appropriate dignity.

B. The Soboba Band, as MLD, shall complete its inspection within twenty-four (24) hours of receiving notification from either the Developer or the NAHC, as required by California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a). The Parties agree to discuss in good faith what constitutes "appropriate dignity" as that term is used in the applicable statutes.

C. Reburial of human remains shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code § 5097.98 (a) and (b). The Soboba Band, as the MLD in consultation with the Developer, shall make the final discretionary determination regarding the appropriate disposition and treatment of human remains.

D. All parties are aware that the Soboba Band may wish to rebury the human remains and associated ceremonial and cultural items (artifacts) on or near, the site of their discovery, in an area that shall not be subject to future subsurface disturbances. The Developer should accommodate on-site reburial in a location mutually agreed upon by the Parties.

E. The term "human remains" encompasses more than human bones because the Soboba Band's traditions periodically necessitated the ceremonial burning of human remains. Grave goods are those artifacts associated with any human remains. These items, and other funerary remnants and their ashes are to be treated in the same manner as human bone fragments or bones that remain intact

Coordination with County Coroner's Office. The Lead Agencies and the Developer should immediately contact both the Coroner and the Soboba Band in the event that any human remains are discovered during implementation of the Project. If the Coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, the Coroner shall ensure that notification is provided to the NAHC within twenty-four (24) hours of the determination, as required by California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 (c).

Non-Disclosure of Location Reburials. It is understood by all parties that unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains or cultural artifacts shall not be disclosed and shall not be governed by public disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act. The Coroner, parties, and Lead Agencies, will be asked to withhold public disclosure information related to such reburial, pursuant to the specific exemption set forth in California Government Code § 6254 (r).

Ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony reflect traditional religious beliefs and practices of the Soboba Band. The Developer agrees to return all Native American ceremonial items and items of cultural patrimony that may be found on the project site to the Soboba Band for appropriate treatment. In addition, the Soboba Band requests the return of all other cultural items (artifacts) that are recovered during the course of archaeological investigations. Where appropriate and agreed upon in advance, Developer's archeologist may conduct analyses of certain artifact classes if required by CEQA, Section 106 of NHPA, the mitigation measures or conditions of approval for the Project. This may include but is not limited or restricted to include shell, bone, ceramic, stone or other artifacts.



PECHANGA CULTURAL RESOURCES

Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians

Post Office, Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92593
Telephone (951) 208-9285 • Fax (951) 506-9491
January 15, 2009

Chairperson:
Germaine Arenas

Vice Chairperson:
Mary Bear Magee

Committee Members:
Evie Gerber
Darlene Miranda
Bridgett Barcello Maxwell

Director:
Gary DuBois

Coordinator:
Paul Macarro

Cultural Analyst:
Anna Hoover

Monitor Supervisor:
Aurelia Marruffo

VIA USPS

Charles Parsons
US Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Nigel, CA 92677

Re: Pechanga Tribe Request for Additional Project Information and Environmental Documents on the Proposed Construction, Maintenance and Operation of a New 11 Acre Customs and Border Protection Air & Marine Facility

Dear Mr. Parsons:

Thank you for notifying us in regards to the above project. This comment letter is written on behalf of the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians (hereinafter, "the Tribe"), a federally recognized Indian tribe and sovereign government, in response to the notification dated December 29, 2008 and received in our office January 12, 2009. The Tribe is formally requesting to be notified and involved in the entire NEPA environmental review process for the duration of the above referenced project (the "Project"). We request that these comments also be incorporated into the record of approval for this Project as well.

If you haven't already done so, please add the Tribe to your distribution list(s) for public notices and circulation of all documents, including environmental review documents, archeological reports, maps and all documents pertaining to this Project. The Tribe further requests to be directly notified of all public hearings and scheduled approvals concerning this Project and requests that these comments be made part of the record of approval for this Project.

TRIBAL INTEREST

It has been the intent of the Federal Government¹ and the State of California² that Indian tribes be consulted with regard to issues which impact cultural and spiritual resources, as well as other governmental concerns. The responsibility to consult with Indian tribes stems from the

¹ See Executive Memorandum of April 29, 1994 on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments and Executive Order of November 6, 2000 on Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments.

² See California Public Resource Code §5097.9 et seq.; California Government Code §§65351, 65352, 65352.3 and 65352.4

unique government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian tribes. This arises when tribal interests are affected by the actions of governmental agencies and departments. In this case, it is undisputed that the project lies within the Pechanga Tribe's traditional territory. Therefore, in order to comply with Federal and California law, it is imperative that the Lead Agency and the Project Applicant consult with the Tribe in order to guarantee an adequate basis of knowledge for an appropriate evaluation of the project effects, as well as generating adequate mitigation measures.

As part of the Section 106 review process, agencies must make a "reasonable and good faith effort" at identification of historic properties within the area affected by the undertaking. (*Id.* at 800.4(b)(1)). The ACHIP and Federal Courts have determined that the process must be completed for not just the "permit area," but for the entire project area (Colorado River Indian Tribes v. Marsh (1985) 605 F. Supp. 1425).

Historic properties are defined to include archaeological sites and areas which have religious or cultural significance to Tribes (*Id.*). Further, such identification efforts should include consultation with Tribes (*Id.*). As discussed herein, the Pechanga Tribe therefore requests that appropriate assessments be made according to the Section 106 review process, and that the Pechanga Tribe, as a consulting party, be included on a government-to-government basis (Executive Order 13175).

At this time, the Tribe is not opposed to this development Project. The Tribe's primary concerns stem from the Project's likely impacts on Native American cultural resources. The Tribe is concerned about both the protection of unique and irreplaceable cultural resources, such as Luiseño village sites and archaeological items which would be displaced by ground disturbing work on the Project, and on the proper and lawful treatment of cultural items, Native American human remains and sacred items likely to be discovered in the course of the work.

PROJECT GENERALLY

We recommend that a thorough archaeological/cultural resources assessment be completed and the existing site records, if any, be updated as part of the environmental review for this project. Additionally, assessments such as surveys and grading activities may reveal significant archaeological/cultural resources and sites which may be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR)/National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and may contain human remains and/or sacred items. Therefore, we request that the Lead Agency commit to evaluating Project environmental impacts both to the known sites and to any cultural sites which are discovered during grading, and to adopt appropriate mitigation for such sites, in consultation with the Pechanga Tribe.

The Tribe will be engaging in further assessment of the Project area, in consultation with tribal elders, to identify more specific concerns and will submit proposed conditions and further comments during the open review periods.

REQUESTED INVOLVEMENT

Since it is possible that cultural resources will be affected by the Project, the Tribe requests to work with the Lead Agency in developing all monitoring and mitigation plans for the duration of the Project. The Tribe would like to point out that the preferred method of treatment for archeological/cultural sites is avoidance, and that this is in agreement with the Tribe's practices and policies concerning cultural resources. Further, if archeological/cultural resources are to be impacted by the Project, it is the position of the Tribe that Pechanga tribal monitors should be required to be present during all ground-disturbing activities conducted in connection with the Project, including all archeological subsurface excavations.

Further, the Pechanga Tribe believes that if human remains are discovered, Federal law would apply and the mitigation measures for the Project must account for this. Given the Project's location in Pechanga territory, the Pechanga Tribe intends to assert its right with regard to any remains or items discovered in the course of this Project.

PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES

Below are the Tribe's preliminary comments on the proposed mitigation measures for this Project. Currently, the Tribe requests all copies of Project environmental documentation as well as a map of the Project (not previously included). Further, as the Tribe has not had the opportunity to review the environmental documents for this Project, we reserve the right to submit additional mitigation measures for consideration by the Lead Agency.

1. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant/Developer is required to enter into a Treatment Agreement with the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians. This Agreement will address the treatment and disposition of cultural resources and human remains that may be uncovered during construction as well as provisions for tribal monitors.

2. Tribal monitors from the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians shall be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and ground-breaking activities, including further surveys, to be compensated by the Project Applicant/Developer. The Pechanga Tribal monitors will have the authority to temporarily stop and redirect grading activities to evaluate the significance of any archeological resources discovered on the property, in conjunction with the archeologist and the Lead Agency.

3. If human remains are encountered, all activity shall stop and the County Coroner must be notified immediately. All activity must cease until the County Coroner has determined the origin and disposition of said remains. The Coroner shall determine if the remains are prehistoric, and shall notify the State Native American Heritage Commission if applicable. Further actions shall be determined by the desires of the Most Likely Descendent.

4. The landowner agrees to relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including all Luiseño sacred items, burial goods and all archeological artifacts that are found on the Project area to the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians for proper treatment and disposition.

*Pechanga Cultural Resources • Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians
Post Office Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92592*

Sacred Is The Duty Trusted Unto Our Care And With Honor We Rise To The Need

5. All sacred sites within the Project area are to be avoided and preserved.

The Pechanga Tribe looks forward to working together with the Lead Agency in protecting the invaluable Pechanga cultural resources found in the Project area. Please contact us once you have had a chance to review these comments so that we might address the issues concerning the mitigation language. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 951-308-9295 X8104. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

Sincerely,



Anna M. Hoover
Cultural Analyst



PECHANGA CULTURAL RESOURCES
Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians

Post Office, Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92593
Telephone (951) 308-9295 • Fax (951) 506-9491

March 9, 2009

Chairperson:
Germaine Arenas

Vice Chairperson:
Mary Bear Magee

Committee Members:
Evie Gerber
Darlene Miranda
Bridgett Barcello Maxwell

Director:
Gary DuBois

Coordinator:
Paul Macarro

Cultural Analyst:
Anna Hoover

Monitor Supervisor:
Aurelia Maruffo

VIA E-Mail and USPS

Charles Parsons
US Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Nigel, CA 92677

Re: Pechanga Tribe Comments on the Section 106 Consultation for the Proposed Construction, Maintenance and Operation of a New 11 Acre Customs and Border Protection Air & Marine Facility

Dear Mr. Parsons:

This comment letter is submitted by the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians (hereinafter, "the Tribe"), a federally recognized Indian tribe and sovereign government, in response to the notice for Section 106 Consultation and concurrence of findings for the above named Project. The Tribe is formally requesting to be notified and involved in the entire environmental review process for the duration of the above referenced project (the "Project"), and requests that these comments be part of the record of approval for this Project.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY MUST INCLUDE INVOLVEMENT OF AND CONSULTATION WITH THE PECHANGA TRIBE IN ITS ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

It has been the intent of the Federal Government¹ and the State of California² that Indian tribes be consulted with regard to issues which impact cultural and spiritual resources, as well as other governmental concerns. The responsibility to consult with Indian tribes stems from the unique government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian tribes. This arises when tribal interests are affected by the actions of governmental agencies and departments. In this case, it is undisputed that the project lies within the Pechanga Tribe's traditional territory. Therefore, in order to comply with Federal and California law, it is imperative that the Lead Agency and the Project Applicant consult with the Tribe in order to guarantee an adequate basis

¹ See Executive Memorandum of April 29, 1994 on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments and Executive Order of November 6, 2000 on Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments.

² See California Public Resource Code §5097.9 et seq.; California Government Code §§65351, 65352, 65352.3 and 65352.4

of knowledge for an appropriate evaluation of the project effects, as well as generating adequate mitigation measures.

As part of the Section 106 review process, agencies must make a “reasonable and good faith effort” at identification of historic properties within the area affected by the undertaking. (*Id.* at 800.4(b)(1)). Historic properties are defined to include archaeological sites and areas which have religious or cultural significance to Tribes (*Id.*). Further, such identification efforts should include consultation with Tribes (*Id.*).

For the reasons set forth herein, the Tribe does not concur with the Department’s determination of “no effect.”

PECHANGA CULTURAL AFFILIATION TO PROJECT AREA

The Tribe asserts that the Project area is part of the Tribe’s aboriginal territory, as evidenced by the existence of Luiseño place names, *tóota eskánishtum* (rock art, pictographs, petroglyphs, cupules), and an extensive Luiseño artifact record in the vicinity of the Project. The Tribe further asserts that this culturally sensitive area is affiliated specifically with the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians because of the Tribe’s specific cultural ties to this area. The Tribe was designated as the affiliated Tribe by LSA Associates for the March Joint Powers Authority and the March Air Reserve Base (Schroth 1999)³. Therefore, the Tribe considers any resources located on this Project property to be Pechanga cultural resources.

The Tribe’s knowledge of our ancestral boundaries is based on reliable information passed down to us from our elders; published academic works in the areas of anthropology, history and ethno-history; and through recorded ethnographic and linguistic accounts. Many anthropologists and historians who have presented boundaries of the Luiseño traditional territory have included the Project area in their descriptions (Drucker 1937; Heiser and Whipple 1957; Kroeber 1925; Smith and Freers 1994), and such territory descriptions correspond with what was communicated to the Pechanga people by our elders.

While historic accounts, anthropological and linguistic theories are important in determining traditional Luiseño territory; the Tribe asserts that the most critical sources of information used to define our traditional territories are our songs, creation accounts and oral traditions. Luiseño history originates with the creation of all things at *‘éxva Teméeku*, known today as the City of Temecula, and dispersing out to all corners of creation (what is today known as Luiseño territory). It was at Temecula that the Luiseño god *Wuyóot* lived and taught the people and here that he became sick. Many Luiseño songs relate the tale of the people taking the dying *Wuyóot* to the many hot springs, including Lake Elsinore where he died. He was cremated at *‘éxva Teméeku*.

³ *Consultations with Native Americans on Sphere of Influence of the Area Previously Known as March Air Force Base*; LSA Associates, 1999

One of the Luiseño songs recounts the travels of the people to Elsinore after a great flood (DuBois 1908). From here, they again spread out to the north, south, east and west. Three songs, called *Moníivol*, are songs of the places and landmarks that were destinations of the Luiseño ancestors, several of which are located near to the Project. They describe the exact route of the Temecula (Pechanga) people and the landmarks made by each to claim title to places in their migrations (DuBois 1908:110). Another song recounts the travels of eagle, as he searches for a place where there was no death. His travels begin at Temecula, flying north to San Bernardino, to the east, south, and west through Julian, Cuyamaca, and Palomar, and returning to Temecula (DuBois 1908). His path most likely passed over the current Project and the March Air Reserve Base (MARB).

Tóota eskánishtum (rock art) is also an important element in the determination of Luiseño territorial boundaries. *Tóota eskánishtum* can consist of petroglyphs (incised) elements, or pictographs (painted) elements. The science of archaeology tells us that places can be described through these rock art elements. Riverside and Northern San Diego Counties are home to red-pigmented pictograph panels. Archaeologists have adopted the name for these pictograph-versions, as defined by Ken Hedges of the Museum of Man, as the San Luis Rey style. Gerald Smith and Steve Freers book "Fading Images" describes this style of *tóota eskánishtum* as being, "Generally associated with late prehistoric and historic Luiseño populations, with extensions into neighboring territories. This type of site is the major locus of the style, on the San Luis Rey River, San Diego County" (Smith and Freers 26). The San Luis Rey style incorporates elements which include chevrons, zig-zags, dot patterns, sunbursts, handprints, net/chain, anthropomorphic (human-like) and zoomorphic (animal-like) designs. Tribal historians and photographs inform us that some design elements are reminiscent of Luiseño ground paintings. A few of these design elements, particularly the flower motifs, the net/chain and zig-zags, were sometimes depicted in Luiseño basket designs and can be observed in remaining baskets and textiles today. The Tribe is aware of several *tóota eskánishtum* within a few miles surrounding the Project. These are primarily located in a village near Lake Perris to the southeast, and to the southwest and west within a known village however, multiple other *tóota eskánishtum* are located within the City of Riverside and the former March Air Force Base area.

An additional type of *tóota eskánishtum*, identified by archaeologists also as rock art or petroglyphs, is known as cupules. Throughout Luiseño territory, there are certain types of large boulders, taking the shape of mushrooms or waves, which contain numerous small pecked and ground indentations, also called cupules. We know that cupules occur throughout the world although, throughout Riverside and Northern San Diego Counties, we have observed that these cupule boulders are located at permanent Luiseño villages. Tribal knowledge reflects that cupules can be located on either vertical "wave-shaped" boulders or horizontal "ridge-back" boulders. According to historian Constance DuBois:

When the people scattered from Ekvo Temeko, Temecula, they were very powerful. When they got to a place, they would sing a song to make water come there, and would call that place theirs; or they would scoop out a hollow in a rock

with their hands to have that for their mark as a claim upon the land. The different parties of people had their own marks. For instance, Albañas's ancestors had theirs, and Lucario's people had theirs, and their own songs of Munival to tell how they traveled from Temecula, of the spots where they stopped and about the different places they claimed (1908:158).

Additionally, numerous ethnographers make mention of the fact that the Luiseño were highly territorial, and that territories were marked and jealously guarded. Trespassing was cause for conflict and at times outright warfare between groups. The young were taught never to trespass on the land of others in pursuit of game or the gathering of food without permission (Sparkman 1908:190).

Thus, our songs and stories, as well as academic works and recorded archaeological/cultural sites, demonstrate that the Luiseño people who occupied the Project area, including the MARB, are ancestors of the present-day Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians, and as such, Pechanga is the appropriate culturally affiliated tribe for projects that impact this geographic area.

As described above, the Tribe knows the region containing the current Project to be highly culturally sensitive and significant. The identification of such a large number of cupule rocks and San Luis Rey-style *tóota eskánishtum*, as well as the high number of recorded domestic and sacred activity areas proves that Luiseño ancestors were extremely active within the region.

The Tribe would welcome to opportunity to meet with the Department of Homeland Security, US Customs and Border Protection to further explain and provide documentation concerning our specific cultural affiliation and concerns to lands within the geographical region.

PROJECT IMPACTS TO CULTURAL RESOURCES

The proposed Project is on land that is within the traditional territory of the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians. The Tribe is not opposed to this development Project. The Tribe's primary concerns stem from the Project's likely impacts on Native American cultural resources. The Tribe is concerned about both the protection of unique and irreplaceable cultural resources, such as Luiseño village sites and archaeological items which would be displaced by ground disturbing work on the Project, and on the proper and lawful treatment of cultural items, Native American human remains and sacred items likely to be discovered in the course of the work.

The Tribe knows this culturally sensitive area to be connected to a larger network of extensively used habitation, ceremonial and subsistence areas that extends for many miles in every direction. As described above, the Project is located between two villages (described in more detail below). Because there a number of culturally significant areas surrounding this property, the Tribe believes that the potential for inadvertent discoveries during grading

operations is high. In order to understand the full impacts of the Project to cultural resources, the adjacent resources must be taken into account not only from a scientific, archaeological perspective, but a cultural one as well. It is well known that traditional trade and travel routes existed between the surrounding villages and activity areas, so that resources are likely to be found on such routes and areas that were traversed by the Tribes ancestors. In addition, many of these areas are of differing ages and there could be older sites buried subsurface on the Project property. As such, the Tribe asserts that any analysis of impacts to cultural resources for this Project area must necessarily include all cultural resources in the vicinity, even if such complexes exist adjacent to or nearby the Project area.

Current records define the southern portion of the Luiseño village complex known as *Qaxáalku* as beginning less than two (2) miles to the west of the Project. The larger portion of this village (located more to the northwest) was identified by archaeologists in the 1980's and recorded as 40+ separate sites. Additional archaeological and cultural studies were conducted in 2004-2006 and the individual sites were combined, with other recently identified sites in the area and named the Cajalco Creek Complex or, as we know this area to be, *Qaxáalku*. Current studies with the Mid-County Parkway Project (FHWA, Caltrans, RCTC) have identified an additional part of this village including the known ceremonial sites within Motte Reserve. For our ancestors, this village served as a mid-way point on their trail east to *Paa'va*/Mystic Lake, located to the north of the Project, and points along the San Jacinto River, which has changed its course at least four (4) known times.

The etymology of the Spanish word Cajalco derives from the Luiseño word for "place of quail". The suffix "ku" is considered a more archaic form of the suffix "anga," which means place of (as in Pechanga...place of dripping water). Not only is the village itself very important to the Tribe but the vegetation and wildlife contains importance as well. Throughout the region containing *Qaxáalku* there are still quail but almost as important are the *kukúulam*, or burrowing owl, that once lived there in large amounts. The areas separated by low-lying bedrock boulders provide an ideal habitat for the owls. J.P. Harrington's/Pechanga informant Celestine Ahuayo relates: "*the (that type of) area was known as kukúulam pomki, which means where the ground owl houses.*" *Kukúul*/burrowing owl is important for the Luiseño because of his status in our Creation Story. Father Boscana wrote of the burrowing owl's role in the Story: '*It was determined by (the lower animals) that Father Wuyóot should received his death by means of poison. Kukúulmal (the small burrowing owl) perceived this and immediately gave the information to Wuyóot.*' Eventually, *Wuyóot* did succumb to poison but the burrowing owl gained a distinction in our Luiseño songs as a good messenger. The *Payómkawichum* (Luiseño people) would have revered the area where this "good apostle" lived by living there as well.

Within the *Qaxáalku* complex, there are at least seven (7) recorded cupule boulders and many others with painted markings (pictographs). Additionally, beyond the numerous bedrock mortars and slicks, are four (4) ancestral quartz quarries. Quartz points were important to the *Payómkawichum* because it is taught that *Suukat* (deer), who gave his life for the starving People in our Creation Story, could only be taken by a point made of quartz.

To the south and east, is another well-studied Luiseño village, located within the Lake Perris Reservoir area. At this time, we do not have a specific place name for this area but research is ongoing. The area had been archaeologically surveyed multiple times prior to 1970 however; formal project studies began in 1970 in response to the Perris Reservoir Project. Well over 50 sites were recorded at that time and included such resources as *tóota eskánishtum*, milling and tool production areas, as well as ceramics, numerous projectile points, bone tools, trade items, rock walls possibly used for animal traps, earthen ovens and much more.

As such, the Tribe does not agree with the finding of “no effect.” The Tribe is in receipt of the 2008 Archaeological and Historic Survey Report⁴. While the Tribe understands that the Property has been subjected to previous disturbances, i.e. Tyson field, fencing, drainage, etc. (p. 3), because the project site lies within such a culturally-sensitive area, we believe that the possibility still exists for the recovery of subsurface resources during earthmoving activities. The Tribe has over thirty-five (35) years of experience in working with various types of construction projects throughout its territory. The combination of this knowledge and experience, along with the knowledge of the culturally-sensitive areas, is what the Tribe relies on to make fairly accurate predictions regarding the likelihood of subsurface resources in a particular location.

It is important to have appropriate mitigation measures that integrate tribal consultation and monitoring as part of the planning for inadvertent discoveries. Therefore, such inadvertent discoveries are foreseeable impacts and thus need to be appropriately mitigated for within the confines of the Project. The identification of surface resources during an archaeological survey should not be the sole determining factor in deciding whether mitigation measures for inadvertent discoveries are required. The cultural significance of the area should play a large part in determining whether specifications concerning unanticipated discoveries should be included. Additionally, the Tribe believes that the potential for inadvertent discoveries increases because the MARB was constructed prior to cultural resources studies occurring in the area (1918). Therefore, we do not know if indicator resources were present in the area that have long since been destroyed.

The Tribe believes that adequate cultural resources assessments and management must always include a component which addresses inadvertent discoveries. Every major State and Federal law dealing with cultural resources includes provisions addressing inadvertent discoveries (See e.g.: CEQA (Cal. Pub. Resources Code §210S3.2(i); 14 CCR §1506a.5(f)); Section 106 (36 CFR §800.13); NAGPRA (43 CFR §10.4). Moreover, most state and federal agencies have guidelines or provisions for addressing inadvertent discoveries (,See e.g.: FHWA, Section 4(f) Regulations - 771.135(g); CALTRANS, Standard Environmental Reference - 5-10.2 and 5-10.3). Because of the extensive presence of the Tribe's ancestors within the Project area, it is not unreasonable to expect to find vestiges of that presence. Such cultural resources

⁴ *Archaeological and Historic Survey Report, March Joint Air Reserve Base, AMOC Facility Expansion, Riverside California.* S. J. Miller, Faunal Analysis and CRM Services, S.M. Stoller Corp, R2H Engineering, 2008.
Pechanga Cultural Resources • Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians
Post Office Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92592

Pechanga Comment Letter to the US Customs and Border Protection
Re: Pechanga Tribe Comments on the New CBP A&M Facility
March 5, 2009
Page 8

The Pechanga Tribe looks forward to working together with the Department of Homeland Security in protecting the invaluable Pechanga cultural resources found in the Project area. Please contact myself at 951-308-9295 X8104 or Deputy General Counsel Laura Miranda at 951-676-2768 X2138 once you have had a chance to review these comments so that we might address the issues concerning the mitigation language. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

Sincerely,



Anna M. Hoover
Cultural Analyst

cc: Pechanga Office of the General Counsel
Brenda Tomaras, Tomaras & Ogas

*Pechanga Cultural Resources • Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians
Post Office Box 2183 • Temecula, CA 92592*

Sacred Is The Duty Trusted Unto Our Care And With Honor We Rise To The Need

AGUA CALIENTE BAND OF CAHUILLA INDIANS

TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION



March 11, 2009

Hector Montalvo
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
2400 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Nigel, CA 92677

RE: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air Marine (A&M) facility March Air Force Base, Moreno Valley, CA

Dear Mr. Montalvo:

The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians appreciates your efforts to include the Agua Caliente Tribal Historic Preservation Office in your project. The project area is beyond both Agua Caliente Indian Reservation lands and the Traditional Use Area of the Tribe. We currently have no concerns regarding this project. This letter shall conclude our consultation efforts.

Again, we appreciate your interest in our tribal resources and heritage. If you have questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to call me at (760)699-6907. You may also email me at ptuck@aguacaliente-nsn.gov.

Yours truly,

Patricia Garcia-Tuck, THPO
Director of Historic Preservation
**AGUA CALIENTE BAND
OF CAHUILLA INDIANS**

c: Agua Caliente Cultural Register

X:\CONSULTATIONS Letters\2009\External\Off Reservation\UScustoms_MarchAFB_3_11_09.doc

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



U.S. Customs and
Border Protection

Sm

03-02-09P02:01 RCVD

*C. Tom Dames
Patty Trude*

January 30, 2008

The Honorable Richard M. Milanovich, Chairman
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation, California
5401 Dinah Shore Dr.
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11 acre
Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Air and Marine (A&M) facility March Air
Force Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Chairman Milanovich:

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) previously sent correspondence to you dated December 29, 2008 in regards to the above referenced proposed project. CBP is preparing an Environmental Assessment to address the potential environmental impacts of the construction, maintenance, and operation of new CBP Air and Marine (A&M) facilities on 2 parcels of land located adjacent to the existing CBP A&M Operations Center on March Air Reserve Base (MARB) in Moreno Valley, California.

The first parcel is approximately **2.75 acres** and is located directly north and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. CBP currently has an agreement with MARB for use of this parcel. CBP proposes to construct a 60,000 square foot, two-story office building and asphalt parking space on this parcel.

The second parcel consisting of approximately **8.38 acres** will be acquired from the City of Moreno Valley and is located directly east and adjacent to the existing CBP A&M facility. This parcel will initially be used to extend the security perimeter on the eastern side of the existing CBP A&M facility and will consist of the installation of fencing and lighting along the north, east, and south perimeters of the parcel. Expansion of this parcel for use as parking

facilities, additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, armory, and secured storage area may also occur in the future and is dependent on appropriations.

In compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, S.M. Stoller Corp. (Stoller) completed a Class I (literature search) and Class III (pedestrian) cultural resources inventories for this proposed undertaking. In November 2008 Stoller completed a Class III cultural resources survey of approximately 11.13 acres of land, as part of the proposed expansion of the CBP A&M facilities. Based on the literature search and pedestrian survey completed for the area of potential effect (APE), Stoller concluded there would be no affect expected to architectural or other cultural resources at the proposed action site. In addition, no buildings listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are located in the proposed project area. A copy of the Archaeological and Historic Survey Report prepared by Stoller is enclosed.

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act and Department of Homeland Security Management Directive 023-01, CBP will comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations, 36 CFR Part 800. This letter serves as our project coordination in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.3. CBP requests your input and concurrence with the determination of "no affect" to the APE from the proposed action.

Your prompt attention to this request would be greatly appreciated. Please provide any comments or questions regarding the results of the cultural resources survey to Charles Parsons at the above address or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov within 30 days of receipt of this correspondence. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,



for Hector Montalvo
Director
Laguna Facility Center

Enclosure

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

May 29, 2009

The Honorable Mark A. Macarro, Chairman
Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians of the Pechanga Reservation, California
P.O. Box 1477
Temecula, CA 92593

Attn: Ms. Anna M. Hoover

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of an 11-acre expansion of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Facility at March Joint Air Reserve Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Ms. Hoover:

This letter serves as the response by U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to your letters dated January 15, 2009 and March 9, 2009, wherein the Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians (the "Pechanga Band") sets out its concerns with the above-referenced project. In the following paragraphs, I will endeavor to summarize CBP's consultation efforts to date, summarize your concerns and mitigation requests, respond to said concerns and requests, and explain how CBP intends to address not only your concerns, but the related concerns of other tribes. CBP firmly believes that these additional measures, although not legally required, should serve to fairly address conflicting tribal concerns and ensure that any Native American cultural resources unearthed or otherwise discovered during the project's ground-disturbing activities are properly handled.

As you know, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act ("NHPA"), CBP has consulted with numerous tribal entities, including the Pechanga Band, regarding this project. On or about February 4, 2009, CBP submitted its archaeological survey to the California State Historic Preservation Officer ("SHPO"), which included a "no effects" determination for the proposed project. Copies of the archaeological survey were sent to interested tribal entities, including the Pechanga Band. By letter, dated March 5, 2009, the

SHPO responded that he had no objection to CBP's determination regarding this project. Therefore, CBP has completed the consultation process under Section 106 of the NHPA.

However, while the consultation process is complete and no mitigation is necessary at this time, CBP recognizes that unexpected cultural resources could be discovered during the project's ground-disturbing activities. As a result, CBP plans to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor any ground-disturbing activities during the project. Below, CBP has paraphrased each of the mitigation requests made by the Pechanga Band for this undertaking and offers the following responses:

1. Request that CBP enter into a Treatment Agreement with the Pechanga Band. This Agreement would address the treatment and disposition of cultural resources and human remains that may be uncovered during construction.

CBP's response: At this time, CBP respectfully declines to enter into a Treatment Agreement with the Pechanga Band or any other tribal entity. CBP is cognizant that items of cultural significance could be discovered in the project area and respects the concerns of the Pechanga Band on the proposed undertaking. In the event any items of potential cultural significance are discovered during ground-disturbing activities CBP intends to protect and handle such items in accordance with federal law. CBP will also notify all appropriate persons of any such discovery. To make any future consultation more efficient, CBP requests that the Pechanga Band meet with all other interested tribes to agree upon which tribe (or representative) will serve as the "lead" for purposes of any future consultation for this undertaking. Please notify this office of any agreement reached on that subject matter.

2. Request that tribal monitors from the Pechanga Band be allowed to monitor all grading, excavation and ground-breaking activities, including further surveys, and that monitors be compensated by CBP. Request that monitors have the authority to temporarily stop and re-direct grading activities to evaluate the significance of any archaeological resources discovered on the property, in conjunction with CBP.

CBP's response: For several reasons, CBP respectfully declines to allow separate tribal monitoring. First, CBP has serious safety concerns with allowing tribal monitors to be on-site during construction activities. Second, you should know that as many as fourteen different tribes have a potential interest in this project area. If CBP were to grant one tribe's request to monitor on-site activities, it would likely lead to others expecting the same treatment. To be sure, this is simply not a workable accommodation. With this said, as mentioned, CBP plans to have a qualified archaeologist on site during ground-disturbing activities to monitor for cultural resources, who will have authority to temporarily suspend construction activity if necessary.

3. Request that if human remains are encountered that the Riverside County Coroner be given the opportunity to make the necessary findings as to origin and, if Native American, that other "consultation obligations" occur.

CBP's response: Again, CBP plans to have a qualified archaeologist on-site during ground-disturbing activities, who will have the authority to temporarily halt construction activity, as necessary to comply with federal law. Specifically, in the event that human remains or covered artifacts under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act ("NAGPRA") are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, all work will stop and CBP will make any required notifications to all appropriate persons and take any additional measures required by applicable law.

4. Request that the landowner agree to relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including all Luiseño sacred items, burial goods and archaeological artifacts that are found on the Project area to the Pechanga Band for proper treatment and disposition.

CBP's response: In accordance with NAGPRA, CBP cannot repatriate any artifacts uncovered on government-controlled property until it independently determines the appropriate tribal affiliation for any recovered artifacts. As a result, CBP may not lawfully agree to relinquish all ownership of cultural resources encountered on the project site to any particular tribe, especially in advance of any discovery of such items.

In conclusion, CBP will continue to appropriately coordinate, with the interested tribes on the above-referenced project. In the foreseeable future, as an initial task to the proposed undertaking, CBP intends to erect security fencing and lighting along the eastern side of the eastern 8.38 acre parcel (the "eastern parcel") where a running track and exercise areas currently exist. In the Spring of 2010, CBP's present plans are to begin construction of the 60,000 square foot office building and an asphalt parking space on the 2.75 acre northern parcel. Depending on available funding, CBP would eventually like to construct additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, an armory and a secured storage area on the eastern parcel.

CBP plans to require its project archaeologist to prepare a cultural report at the completion of construction activities. The report will be submitted to the California SHPO. Upon request, CBP will also provide a copy to the Pechanga Band. Should you have any further concerns regarding this matter, please contact the undersigned at the address shown on the letterhead or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,



Charles H. Parsons, P.G.
Environmental Program Manager

CC. California State Historic Preservation Officer

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

May 29, 2009

The Honorable Robert Salgado, Chairman
Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, California
P. O. Box 487
San Jacinto, CA 92581

Attn: Mr. Joseph Ontiveros

Reference: Proposed Construction, Maintenance, and Operation of a new 11-acre expansion of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Facility at March Joint Air Reserve Base, Moreno Valley, California

Dear Mr. Ontiveros:

This letter serves as the response by U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") to your letters dated February 23, 2009 and March 10, 2009, wherein the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians (the "Soboba Band") sets out its concerns with the above-referenced project. In the following paragraphs, I will endeavor to summarize CBP's consultation efforts to date, summarize your concerns and mitigation requests, respond to those concerns and requests, and explain how CBP intends to address not only your concerns, but the related concerns of other tribes. CBP firmly believes that these additional measures, although not legally required, should serve to fairly address conflicting tribal concerns and ensure that any Native American cultural resources unearthed or otherwise discovered during the project's ground-disturbing activities are properly handled.

As you know, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act ("NHPA"), CBP has consulted with numerous tribal entities, including the Soboba Band, regarding this project. On or about February 4, 2009, CBP submitted its archaeological survey to the California State Historic Preservation Officer ("SHPO"), which included a "no effects" determination for the proposed project. Copies of the archaeological survey were sent to interested tribal entities, including the Soboba Band. By letter, dated March 5, 2009, the SHPO responded that he had no objection to CBP's determination regarding this project. Therefore, CBP has completed the consultation process under Section 106 of the NHPA.

However, while the consultation process is complete and no mitigation is necessary at this time, CBP recognizes that unexpected cultural resources could be discovered during the project's ground-disturbing activities. As a result, CBP plans to retain a qualified archaeologist to monitor any ground-disturbing activities during the project. Below, CBP has paraphrased each of the mitigation requests made by the Soboba Band for this undertaking and offers the following responses:

1. Request that CBP enter into a Treatment Agreement with the Soboba Band. This Agreement would address the treatment and disposition of cultural resources and human remains that may be uncovered during construction.

CBP's response: At this time, CBP respectfully declines to enter into a Treatment Agreement with the Soboba Band or any other tribal entity. CBP is cognizant that items of cultural significance could be discovered in the project area and respects the concerns of the Soboba Band on the proposed undertaking. In the event any items of potential cultural significance are discovered during ground-disturbing activities CBP intends to protect and handle such items in accordance with federal law. CBP will also notify all appropriate persons of any such discovery. To make any future consultation more efficient, CBP requests that the Soboba Band meet with all other interested tribes to agree upon which tribe (or representative) will serve as the "lead" for purposes of any future consultation for this undertaking. Please notify this office of any agreement reached on that subject matter.

2. Request that tribal monitors from the Soboba Band be allowed to monitor all project ground-disturbing activities.

CBP's response: For several reasons, CBP respectfully declines to allow separate tribal monitoring. First, CBP has serious safety concerns with allowing tribal monitors to be on-site during construction activities. Second, you should know that as many as fourteen different tribes have a potential interest in this project area. If CBP were to grant one tribe's request to monitor on-site activities, it would likely lead to others expecting the same treatment. To be sure, this is simply not a workable accommodation. With this said, as mentioned, CBP plans to have a qualified archaeologist on site during ground-disturbing activities to monitor for cultural resources, who will have authority to temporarily suspend construction activity if necessary.

3. Request that if human remains are encountered that the Riverside County Coroner be given the opportunity to make the necessary findings as to origin and, if Native American, that other "consultation obligations" occur.

CBP's response: Again, CBP plans to have a qualified archaeologist on-site during ground-disturbing activities, who will have the authority to temporarily halt construction activity, as necessary to comply with federal law. Specifically, in the event that human remains or covered artifacts under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act ("NAGPRA") are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, all

work will stop and CBP will make any required notifications to all appropriate persons and take any additional measures required by applicable law.

4. Request that the landowner agree to relinquish ownership of all cultural resources, including all Luiseño sacred items, burial goods and archaeological artifacts that are found on the Project area to the Soboba Band for proper treatment and disposition.

CBP's response: In accordance with NAGPRA, CBP cannot repatriate any artifacts uncovered on government-controlled property until it independently determines the appropriate tribal affiliation for any recovered artifacts. As a result, CBP may not lawfully agree to relinquish all ownership of cultural resources encountered on the project site to any particular tribe, especially in advance of any discovery of such items.

In conclusion, CBP will continue to appropriately coordinate, with the interested tribes on the above-referenced project. In the foreseeable future, as an initial task to the proposed undertaking, CBP intends to erect security fencing and lighting along the eastern side of the eastern 8.38 acre parcel (the "eastern parcel") where a running track and exercise areas currently exist. In the Spring of 2010, CBP's present plans are to begin construction of the 60,000 square foot office building and an asphalt parking space on the 2.75 acre northern parcel. Depending on available funding, CBP would eventually like to construct additional office space, a warehouse, an indoor gun range, an armory and a secured storage area on the eastern parcel.

CBP plans to require its project archaeologist to prepare a cultural report at the completion of construction activities. The report will be submitted to the California SHPO. Upon request, CBP will also provide a copy to the Soboba Band. Should you have any further concerns regarding this matter, please contact the undersigned at the address shown on the letterhead or by email at charles.parsons@dhs.gov. Thank you for your time and input on this important project.

Sincerely,



Charles H. Parsons, P.G.
Environmental Program Manager

CC: California State Historic Preservation Officer

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Laguna Facility Center
24000 Avila Road, Room 5020
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677



**U.S. Customs and
Border Protection**

June 2, 2009

Mr. Milford Wayne Donaldson, FAIA
State Historic Preservation Officer
Department of Parks and Recreation
P.O. Box 942896
Sacramento, California 94296-0001

Attn: Mr. William Soule
Associate State Archeologist

Reference: Continued Consultation on Proposed New 11 Acre Customs and Border
Protection Air and Marine Facility, March Air Force Base, Riverside County,
California

Dear Mr. Soule,

United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and CBP Air and Marine (A&M) have consulted with your office twice this year on the referenced proposed project. Your office responded to your coordination letters on January 12, 2009 and March 5, 2009. CBP considers the State Historic Preservation Officer's (SHPO) determination of no adverse effect to historic properties to be the determination for our proposed action.

Within our consultation period with the SHPO, CBP also coordinated the proposed action with federally recognized tribes. We received response letters (attached) from the following tribes:

- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians,
- Pala Band Of Mission Indians,
- Pechanga – Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians, and
- Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians

The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians and Pala Band of Mission Indians indicated that the proposed site is out side of their Traditional Use Area and had no concerns about the project. The Pechanga – Temecula Band of Luiseño Mission Indians (Pechanga) and Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians (Soboba) both had concerns about the proposed action

and made essentially the same requests. On May 29, 2009, CBP has formally responded to the Pechanga and Soboba letters (attached).

CBP decided that since there has been more than the standard response in the proposed project by tribes we would provide the SHPO with copies of the correspondence for their files.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned at the address on the letterhead or by e-mail at charles.parsons@dhs.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Charles H. Parsons". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C".

Charles H. Parsons, P.G.
Environmental Program Manager

Enclosures

APPENDIX B
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMMENTS

This page left intentionally blank.

Comment/Response Matrix

Draft EA for AMOC Expansion March Air Reserve Base (March ARB) Riverside County, California

#	Page	Section/ Line	Reviewer	Comment	Response
1.	57-58,83	3.8.2.2, 3.13.1.3, 3.13.2.2.4	WS	The treatment of stormwater and impacts to waters is lacking. The document concludes “no impacts” to waters, yet the project seeks to add impervious areas which would both decrease storage and increase runoff. Both the Heacock channel and downstream sections of the storm drain system (such as Lake Elsinore) are waters of the US and the stormwater from this site would presumably flow to these waters adding some measure of pollutants regardless of whether BMPs are used and regulations are followed. Part of this impervious would be parking lot, obvious collectors of oils/grease and metals. A small or minimal impact is not “no” impact. Further, the document does not address capacity within the Cactus ditch where there are existing erosion issues from high flow events. Sec 3.8.2.2 states the amount of impervious added on the eastern parcel hasn’t been determined, which begs the question of how one would know what impacts would occur. Sec 3.8.2.2. states that there would be a slight increase of stormwater runoff and that the storm drain system is designed to prevent flooding by carrying stormwater away from streets, but again does not address capacity of this system and in 3.13.1.3 and 3.13.2.2.4 it states that there is “no storm drain line located on or near the site”. Without knowing how much impervious, where stormwater flows, and that regardless it will eventually flow through the Perris Valley storm drain system and eventually to Lake Elsinore, the claim of “no impacts” is questionable. In 3.13.2.2.4 it states a storm sewer system may be required and that EMWD regs, BMPs etc would be followed “if required”. The lack of specifics of how stormwater will be dealt with, lack of considerations of existing capacity and added flows in potential receiving waters, and half hearted treatment of this area in general, all while reaching conclusions of “no impacts” reflects poorly on the document.	<p>Comment Incorporated:</p> <p>The EA was modified to reflect that Negligible/Minor long-term adverse impact to surface waters and waters of the United States due to the increased impervious area on the property.</p> <p>The EA was modified on the following pages to reflect this change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table ES-1 page ES-7and ES-8 - Section 3.8.2.2 on pages 56 and 57 - Section 3.13.2.2.4 on page 87
2.	25,75, 96	3.12	WS	A “large stone memorial” is mentioned as existing on the site on pages 25 and 96, but no specifics are given. Sec 3.12 Cultural Resources does not address this memorial, but claims “no historic features or cultural artifacts or significance were observed”. What is the memorial, and why is it not a cultural artifact or historic feature?	<p>Comment Noted:</p> <p>There are no historic features on the property. The Large Stone Memorial is referring to the brick/concrete sign that has “Tyson Field” on it. The wording in the document was changed on pages 25 and 95 to “... , and a large stone sign identify “Tyson Field” on the property.”</p>
3.	93, 5	Fig 3-3	WS	This figures shows “current and future access to AMOC facility” that is neither current, nor possible. The route depicted takes Riverside Dr south to Y Street when Riverside Dr. is in fact barricaded south of W Street. Additionally, on p.5 it states the eastern proper can be accessed via “Riverside Drive to M Street to 6th Avenue”	<p>Comment Incorporated:</p> <p>A new figure FIGURE 3-3 on page 92 was inserted showing the correct access.</p>
4.	83	3.13	WS	Document refers to Eastern Municipal Water District. Should this be Western Municipal?	Comment Incorporated.