



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Draft Negative Declaration

WARD: 1

1. **Case Number:** P10-0212 (Conditional Use Permit) & P10-0213 (Design Review)
2. **Project Title:** Student Transportation of America, Inc. Bus Yard expansion legalization
3. **Hearing Date:** October 3, 2013
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Kyle Smith, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-5220
Email: kjsmith@riversideca.gov
6. **Project Location:** 1989 & 2069 Massachusetts Avenue, situated on the northeasterly corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Kansas Avenue in the I-General Industrial Zone, in Ward 1
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

<u>Applicant:</u> Santa Barbara Transportation Corporation (dba Student Transportation of America, Inc.) 6414 Hollister Ave. Golita, CA 93117	<u>Property Owner Representative:</u> William S. Messenger, Jr. Messenger Investment Company 270 Newport Center Dr., suite 100 Newport Beach, CA 92660
---	--
8. **General Plan Designation:** I-Industrial
9. **Zoning:** I-General Industrial

10. Description of Project:

The approximately 8.5 acre, two-parcel project site is generally situated on the northeasterly corner of Massachusetts Avenue and Kansas Avenue. The 4.1 acre parcel at 1989 Massachusetts Avenue has been developed as a school bus storage, repair and dispatch facility since its original construction in 1986 under Planning Case DR-178-856. The facility contains paved surface parking areas for approximately 58 buses of varying sizes in the rear of the site, a bus wash and approximately 7,500 foot repair garage and office, and approximately 165 surface parking spaces for employees. The existing site contains dilapidated landscaping along the street frontage. The current operator, "Student Transportation of America, Inc." holds a contract with local school districts to transport students and & from school and special events on a regular basis. As a matter of

information, operations at 1989 Massachusetts Avenue were permitted under a Design Review Case, which was the appropriate mechanism for land use approval in 1986. Under today's Zoning Regulations, bus yards require approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, this use is considered "legal non-conforming".

Around March 2009, the adjacent approximately 4.3 acre parcel at 2069 Massachusetts Avenue became vacant of the outdoor contractor storage and equipment yard which previously occupied the site. As this parcel is under the same ownership as the existing bus yard at 1989 Massachusetts Avenue, the adjacent bus yard operators took advantage of the available space and began using the unpaved parcel as additional storage for up to 140 busses of varying sizes. This parcel is bounded by chain link fencing on all sides, and contains little to no landscaping along street frontages aside from street trees along the Kansas Avenue frontage only. As appropriate approvals and permits were not obtained, the expansion of bus parking onto the 4.3 acre parcel was subject to a Code Enforcement violation (CE09-01780).

The applicant submitted a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review application on March 31, 2010 and has been working with City Staff since then on application completeness and clarity. The request is to legalize and improve the existing 4.3 acre parcel at 2069 Massachusetts Avenue to allow bus parking in conjunction with the existing facility at 1989 Massachusetts Avenue. While the existing facility at 1989 Massachusetts Avenue is part of this project site in that its status as a "conforming" use is requested to be considered, the applicant is not proposing any improvements to the existing site. On the 2069 Massachusetts Avenue site, the applicant proposes installation of six-foot high tubular steel fencing with vines along the Kansas Avenue and Massachusetts Avenue frontages to replace the existing chain link fencing. Further, the applicant proposes to plant a total of 22 Chinese Fringe Trees, as well as a variety of shrubs and ground covers within the landscape setback on both frontages. The applicant does not proposed to pave the bus parking areas on the 2069 Massachusetts Avenue and request to retain the existing gravel surface.

To accommodate this project, the following variances are required:

- a. To allow a bus yard facility on a site which exceeds 5 acres
- b. To allow the use of tubular steel fencing to screen the storage of vehicles in lieu of required masonry walls.
- c. To allow a wall/fence to be located within the 20 foot front setback.

These variances are discussed in greater detail in the Staff Report.

Pursuant to the operational details provided by the applicant, the facility operates form 4:30 am to 10:30 pm to accommodate the morning and afternoon school transportation services, and evening maintenance on busses. A total of 205 people are employed at the facility; including 180 part-time drivers, and 25 full-time staff and mechanics. The applicant estimates that no more than 205 people will be on site at a given time during typical operations. Due to the nature of the use and shift scheduling, the available 165 on-site surface parking spaces for employees, staff and visitors should be sufficient. Vacant bus parking areas can be utilized as "overflow" employee parking if needed. Additional details regarding operations are contained in the Staff Report.

11. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project’s surroundings:

	Existing Land Use	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation
Project Site	Bus Yard	I-Industrial	I-General Industrial
North	Industrial	I-Industrial	I-General Industrial
East	Industrial, Business Office Park and City Homeless Shelter	I-Industrial	I-General Industrial and I-ES- General Industrial and Emergency Shelter Overlay Zones
South (Across Mass. Ave.)	Industrial	I-Industrial	I-General Industrial
West (Across Kansas Ave.)	Industrial	B/OP – Business Office Park	I-General Industrial

12. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financial approval, or participation agreement):

None

13. Other Environmental Reviews Incorporated by Reference in this Review:

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR
- c. Air Quality Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated March 2011
- d. Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Keller Consulting, Inc, dated December 2011

14. Acronyms

- AICUZ - Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study
- AQMP - Air Quality Management Plan
- AUSD - Alvord Unified School District
- CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act
- CMP - Congestion Management Plan
- EIR - Environmental Impact Report
- EMWD - Eastern Municipal Water District
- EOP - Emergency Operations Plan
- FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency
- FPEIR - GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
- GIS - Geographic Information System
- GhG - Green House Gas
- GP 2025 - General Plan 2025
- IS - Initial Study
- LHMP - Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
- MARB/MIP - March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
- MJPA-JLUS - March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study

MSHCP -	Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MVUSD -	Moreno Valley Unified School District
NCCP -	Natural Communities Conservation Plan
OEM -	Office of Emergency Services
OPR -	Office of Planning & Research, State
PEIR -	Program Environmental Impact Report
PW -	Public Works, Riverside
RCALUC -	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
RCALUCP -	Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
RCP -	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RCTC -	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RMC -	Riverside Municipal Code
RPD -	Riverside Police Department
RPU -	Riverside Public Utilities
RTIP -	Regional Transportation Improvement Plan
RTP -	Regional Transportation Plan
RUSD -	Riverside Unified School District
SCAG -	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD -	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCH -	State Clearinghouse
SKR-HCP -	Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan
SWPPP -	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
USGS -	United States Geologic Survey
WMWD -	Western Municipal Water District
WQMP -	Water Quality Management Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture & Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Service
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation which reflects the independent judgment of the City of Riverside, it is recommended that:

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

The City of Riverside finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

The City of Riverside finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature _____

Date _____

Printed Name & Title _____

For City of Riverside



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Environmental Initial Study

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. **Earlier Analysis Used.** Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measure which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

DRAFT

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, and Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways)</i></p> <p>The project consists of an infill project within an urbanized area completely surrounded by existing development where there are no scenic vistas and where direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas are less than significant impacts. The project will serve to enhance the aesthetic qualities of the surrounding area by providing additional streetscape landscaping where minimal to no landscaping currently exists, and providing appropriate landscaping and architectural screening of an unsightly outdoor surface bus yard.</p>				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, Title 20 – Cultural Resources and, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone)</i></p> <p>There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. In addition the project is not located along or within view of a scenic boulevard, parkway or special boulevard as designated by the City’s General Plan 2025 and therefore will not have any effect on any scenic resources within a scenic roadway. As well, there are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings within view of this project so no impacts to these resources are expected. With implementation of the appropriate General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with the conditions of approval, <i>Citywide Design Guidelines</i>, and the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, scenic resources will be protected and even enhanced. Lastly, the Zoning Code regulates location criteria, setbacks, landscaping, parking and other development standards for use and development of all properties. This project complies with a majority of these standards. Where variances are required, they can be justified based on the findings contained in the case record. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from this project will be less than significant impact.</p>				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>The project consists of an infill project within an urbanized area completely surrounded by existing development. The project has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding area. Therefore, it will not degrade the existing visual character of the area and less than significant directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the visual character or quality of the Planning Area will occur. The project will serve to enhance the aesthetic qualities of the surrounding area by providing additional streetscape landscaping where minimal to no landscaping currently exists, and providing appropriate landscaping and architectural screening of an unsightly outdoor surface bus yard.</p>				
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>1d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-2 – Mount Palomar Lighting Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>The site is not within the Mount Palomar Lighting Area and no new lighting is proposed under this project. No impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur as a result of this project which would adversely affect day or nighttime views.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability & General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)</p>				
<p>The Project is located within an urbanized area. A review of Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability of the General Plan 2025 reveals that the project site is not designated as, and is not adjacent to or in proximity to any land classified as, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to agricultural uses.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)</p>				
<p>A review of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR reveals that the project site is not located within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act Preserve or under a Williamson Act Contract. Moreover, the project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not next to land zoned for agricultural use; therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</p>				
<p>The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data) The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones – RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data) The project site is identified as urban/built out land and therefore does not support agricultural resources or operations. The project will not result in the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. In addition, there are no agricultural resources or operations, including farmlands within proximity of the subject site. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land.</p>				
<p>3. AIR QUALITY.</p>				
<p>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)) Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD’s AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TRIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.</p>				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

3b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 AQMP, URBEMIS 2007 Model or CalEEMod, EMFAC 2007 Model and Air Quality Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated March 2011)

Per General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM Air 1 and 7, a SCAQMD CalEEMod computer model analyzed both short-term construction related and long-term operational impacts. Additionally, an Air Quality Analysis was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated March 2011. The results of the Air Quality Analysis and computer model determined that the project would result in the following emission levels:

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS SHORT-TERM IMPACTS						
Activity	Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Construction	75	100	550	150	150	55
Daily Project - Emissions Construction	11	90	52	0.08	23	15
Exceeds Y/N Threshold?	N	N	N	N	N	N

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS LONG-TERM IMPACTS						
Activity	Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Operation	55	55	550	150	150	55
Daily Project - Emissions Operational	2.4	20	30	0.05	3.6	0.78
Exceeds Y/N Threshold?	N	N	N	N	N	N

The above tables compare the project emissions (short-term and long-term) to the SCAQMD daily thresholds and shows that established thresholds will not be exceeded. Therefore, because the project will not violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and will be subject to further mitigation the impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively will be **less than significant impacts** to ambient air quality and to contributing to an existing air quality violation.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, URBEMIS 2007 Model, and Air Quality Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated March 2011)</p> <p>Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, AQMP thresholds indicate future construction activities under the General Plan are projected to result in significant levels of NOx and ROG, both ozone precursors, PM-10, PM-2.5 and CO. Although long-term emissions are expected to decrease by 2025, all criteria pollutants remain above the SCAQMD thresholds.</p> <p>The portion of the Basin within which the City is located is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM-10 and PM-2.5 under State standards, and as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, PM-10, and PM-2.5 under Federal standards.</p> <p>Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants as a result of the project were previously evaluated as part of the cumulative analysis of build out anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Program. As a result, the project does not result in any new significant impacts that were not previously evaluated and for which a statement of overriding considerations was adopted as part of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR. Therefore, cumulative air quality emissions impacts are less than significant.</p>				
<p>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod, and Air Quality Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated March 2011)</p> <p>The project will not be located in proximity to any sensitive receptors (i.e. residential areas, day care centers, etc.) because the nearest sensitive receptors will be located in excess of 1,000 feet away from the project site. This portion of the Hunter Industrial park Neighborhood is predominantly industrial with no residential uses or day care centers, schools, or other sensitive receptors in the general area. Therefore, no direct, indirect or cumulative impact to the sensitive receptor will occur.</p>				
<p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3e. Response: (Source: Air Quality Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., dated March 2011)</p> <p>While the use may potentially expose people to objectionable odors, industrial and commercial uses that could generate objectionable odors are subject to SCAQMD Rule 402 governing odor emissions. Through compliance with SCAQMD Rule 402, the project is not anticipated to cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur.</p>				
<p>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area)</p> <p>The project site is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area and a search of the MSHCP</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>database and other appropriate databases identified no potential for candidate, sensitive or special status species, suitable habitat for such species on site. Federal Species of Concern, California Species of Special Concern, and California Species Animal or Plants on lists 1-4 of the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively on habitat modifications, species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, and policies or regulations of the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>				
<p>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools)</p> <p>No wetland or riparian vegetation exists on the project site as it is fully developed. Furthermore, the project site is located within an urban built-up area, contains existing development. Generally, the surrounding area has been developed for many years and a long history of severe disturbance exists in the area, such that there is little chance that any riparian habitat could have persisted. Therefore, no impact to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with implementation of the project will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4c. Response: (Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)</p> <p>The project is located within an urbanized area where no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) exist on site or within proximity to the project site. The project site does not contain any discernible drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils and thus does not include USACOE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the project would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4d. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage)</p> <p>The project site is not located within any MSHCP Criteria Cells, Cores, or Linkages. Further, the project site is significantly degraded and does not facilitate the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The project site is not used as a migratory wildlife corridor, nor does it qualify for use as a native wildlife nursery site. The project will result in no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>				
<p>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4e. Response: (Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)</i></p>				
<p>Implementation of the Project is subject to all applicable Federal, State, and local policies and regulations related to the protection of biological resources and tree preservation. In addition, the project is required to comply with Riverside Municipal Code Section 16.72.040 establishing the MSHCP mitigation fee and Section 16.40.040 establishing the Threatened and Endangered Species Fees.</p>				
<p>Any project within the City of Riverside’s boundaries that proposes planting a street tree within a City right-of-way must follow the Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual. The Manual documents guidelines for the planting, pruning, preservation, and removal of all trees in City rights-of-way. The specifications in the Manual are based on national standards for tree care established by the International Society of Arboriculture, the National Arborists Association, and the American National Standards Institute. Any future project will be in compliance with the Tree Policy Manual when planting a tree within a City right-of-way, and therefore, impacts will be less than significant.</p>				
<p>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4f. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan, Lake Mathews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, and El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan)</p>				
<p>The project site is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area and will not impact an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan directly, indirectly and cumulatively. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>				
<p>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</p>				
<p>The project site has been developed for many years. No earthwork or building demolition is proposed in collaboration with the use. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. As such, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively on historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>				
<p>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5b. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study)</p>				
<p>The project is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area where no activities, such as new development involving grading/ground disturbance, are proposed that would create potential for disturbance or archeological resources. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. . Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3) The project is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area where no activities, such as new development involving grading/ground disturbance, are proposed that would create a potential for disturbance of paleontological resources or site or unique geologic features. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly or indirectly on a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</p>				
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5d. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity) The project is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area where no activities, such as new development involving grading/ground disturbance, are proposed that would create potential for disturbance of human remains. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>				
<p>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</p>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report) Seismic activity is to be expected in Southern California. In the City of Riverside, there are no Alquist-Priolo zones. The project site does not contain any known fault lines and the potential for fault rupture or seismic shaking is low. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that no impacts related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report) The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City’s Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed project complies with California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report) The project site is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction as depicted in the General Plan 2025 Liquefaction</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Zones Map – Figure PS-2. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No new development is proposed with this project. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>iv. Landslides?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iv. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP)) The project site and its surroundings have generally flat topography and are not located in an area prone to landslides per Figure 5.6-1 of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Therefore, there will be no impact related to landslides directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and SWPPP) The project does not involve development, grading activities, or structures that would result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. As such, the project will have no impact resulting in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report) The project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and will not cause soil to become unstable, as the project does not involve development, grading activities, or structures. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. As such, the project will have no impact resulting in a geologic unit or soil becoming unstable resulting in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code) The project is located on a site that does not have expansive soils and therefore there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Further, the project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations.</p>				
<p>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types) The proposed project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7a. Response: Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the RTP, the SCAQMD’s AQMP, RTIP, and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” However, due to the size and scope of the proposed project, a Climate Change Analysis was commissioned by the applicant to determine if the project related impacts (both construction and operational) would produce GhG emissions that would have a significant direct, indirect or cumulative impact on the environment. Thus, a less than significant impact is expected directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7b. Response: The SCAQMD supports State, Federal and international policies to reduce levels of ozone depleting gases through its Global Warming Policy and rules and has established an interim Greenhouse Gas (GhG) threshold. As indicated in Question A, above, the project would comply with the City’s General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GhG emissions. In addition, the project would comply with all SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations as demonstrated in the Climate Change Analysis, will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing GhG emission to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Based upon the prepared Climate Change Analysis for this project and the discussion above, the project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction in the emissions of GhG and thus a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively in this regard.</p>				
8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i> The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material because the project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. As such, the project will have no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7 A – D, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s</i></p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Strategic Plan</i></p> <p>The project does not involve the use of any hazardous materials. As such the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively for creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations.</p>				
<p>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code)</i></p> <p>The project does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school because the project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface with No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Additionally, the project site is located 0.4 miles from the nearest existing or proposed school (North High School). Therefore, the project will have no impact regarding emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)</i></p> <p>A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the project site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have no impact to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8e. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005)</i></p> <p>The project site is not located within any airport land use plan area or compatibility zone. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8f. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP)</i></p> <p>Because the project is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8g. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, and OEM’s Strategic Plan)</p> <p>The project will be served by existing, fully improved streets (Kansas and Massachusetts Avenues) All streets have been designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments’ specifications. All adjacent streets are designed to accommodate the school bus traffic originating from the project site. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan.</p>				
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 http://intranet/Portal/uploads/Riv_City_EOP_complete.pdf, Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and OEM’s Strategic Plan)</p> <p>The project is located in an urbanized area where no wildlands exist and the property is no located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a VHFSZ; therefore no impact regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.</p>				
<p>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</p>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Keller Consulting, Inc, dated December 2011)</p> <p>The project is located within the Santa Ana River Watershed (see GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.8-1). The project will not directly or indirectly result in physical alterations to the project site (i.e. grading, ground disturbance, structure or paving) and does not involve any use that would have any effect on water quality or be affected by water quality standards or waste discharge requirements because the project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.</p>				
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan, WMWD Urban Water Management Plan)</p> <p>The project is located within the Riverside South Water Supply Basin. The project will not directly or indirectly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with ground water recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level as no physical alterations to the project site (i.e. grading, ground disturbance, structures or paving) are proposed because the project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to groundwater supplies.</p>				
<p>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9c. Response: <i>(Source: Preliminary grading plan, Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Keller Consulting, Inc, dated December 2011)</i></p>				
<p>The project will not directly or indirectly result in physical alterations to the project site (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or paving) that would alter the existing drainage patterns of the site because the project consists of the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore no erosion or siltation on- or off-site will occur. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9d. Response: <i>(Source: Preliminary grading plan Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Keller Consulting, Inc, dated December 2011)</i></p>				
<p>The project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area, (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, alter the course of stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project consists of the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore no flooding on or off-site as a result of the project will occur and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.</p>				
<p>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9e. Response: <i>(Source: Preliminary Grading Plan, and Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Keller Consulting, Inc, dated December 2011)</i></p>				
<p>The project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff because the project consists of the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore, the project will not create or contribute runoff water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9f. Response: <i>(Source: Project Specific – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Keller Consulting, Inc, dated December 2011)</i></p>				
<p>The project is over one are in size and is required to have coverage under the State’s General Permit for Construction Activities (SWPPP). As stated in the Permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. Furthermore, the City has</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>ensured that the development does not cause adverse water quality impacts, pursuant to its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit through the project’s WQMP. This development has been required to prepare preliminary BMP’s that have been reviewed and approved by Public Works. Final BMP’s will be required prior to grading permit issuance. The purpose of this requirement is to insure treatment BMP’s are installed/constructed as part of the project so that the pollutants generated by the project will be treated in perpetuity. Therefore, impacts related to degrading water quality are less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0726G Effective Date August 28, 2088) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the project is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area and the project does not involve the construction of housing. There will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p>				
<p>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) The project site is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0726G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and no impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) The project site is not located within or near a flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0726G Effective Date August 28, 2008) or subject to dam inundation as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas. Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a flood hazard or dam inundation area that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam and therefore no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.</p>				
<p>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9j. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality) Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, no impacts due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p> </p>				
<p>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Physically divide an established community?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers) The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. The project is an infill project currently served by fully improved public streets and other infrastructure and does not involve the subdivision of land or the creation of streets that could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development or an established community. Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an established community will occur.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				
<p>10b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</p>				
<p>The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Although the project is located within the boundaries of the MSHCP it has been designed to be consistent with these plans. The project is consistent or will be conditioned to be consistent with the General Plan 2025 and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. The Zoning Code regulates location criteria, setbacks, landscaping, parking and other development standards for use and development of all properties. This project complies with a majority of these standards. Where variances are required, they can be justified based on the findings contained in the case record. Further, the project is not of Statewide, Regional or Areawide Significance. As such, this project will have a less than significant impact on the MSHCP directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 – Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, enter appropriate Specific Plan if one, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</p>				
<p>The project site is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area and will not impact an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan directly, indirectly and cumulatively. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>				
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</p>				
<p>The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources or grading activity. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. No mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. The project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the General Plan 2025, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the project will have no impact on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</p>				
<p>The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas with the City of Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is no</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
impact.				
12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p> <p>The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Per Implementation Tool N-1 of the General Plan 2025 Noise Element, this project has been reviewed to ensure that noise standards and compatibility issues have been addressed. The project meets the City’s noise standards as set forth in Title 7 of the Municipal Code, is compliant with the Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria Matrix (Figure N-10) of the Noise Element, is not within the 60 dB CNEL and (if residential project) is not within the vicinity of commercial and industrial areas and therefore does not require an acoustical analysis. Therefore, impacts are less than significant on the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of established City standards either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</p> <p>Since this project is located next to railroad tracks, there is a potential for noise and ground-borne vibration impact. However, as the project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface, and as no development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations, the project can be found to be in compliance with the City’s noise standards. Impacts related to groundborne vibration and groundborne noise levels as a result of the project to be less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p> <p>The project does not involve uses or activities that would result in a substantial permanent increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project because the project consists of the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore, this project will have no impact on existing noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</p> <p>The primary source of temporary or periodic noise associated with this project is from operational characteristics of the use and maintenance work. The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Considering the short-term nature of noise resulting from bus circulation, the temporary and periodic increase in noise levels which may result from the project are considered less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p> <p>The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport of public use airport and as such will have no impact on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999) and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p> <p>Per the GP 2025 Program FPEIR, there are no private airstrips within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Because the project consists of development anticipated under the General Plan 2025, is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG’s RCP and RTP)</p> <p>The project is in an urbanized area and does not propose new homes or businesses that would directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth because the project consists of the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Therefore, this project will have no impact on population growth either directly</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or indirectly.				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13b. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer) The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is a previously improved site that has no existing housing that will be removed or affected by the project. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13c. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer) The project will not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is a previously improved site that has no existing housing or residents that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, this project will have no impact on people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
14. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1) Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by Station 4 located at 3510 Cranford to serve this project. Therefore, this project will not result in the intensification of land use and there will be no impact on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers) Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the North Neighborhood Policing Center to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be no impact on the demand for additional police facilities of services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries) The project is non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase numbers of school age children. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The project is a non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Other public facilities?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – Riverside Public Library Service Standards)</p> <p>Adequate public facilities and service such as libraries and communities centers and are provided in Hunter Industrial Park Neighborhood to serve this project. Therefore, this project will not result in the intensification of land use and there will be no impact on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>15. RECREATION.</p>				
<p>a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>15a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)</p> <p>The project will not result in an intensification of land use and therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional recreational facilities either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>15b. Response:</p> <p>The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in:</p>				
<p>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP)</p>				
<p>The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. Roadway capacity is adequate to accommodate traffic volumes, of the project. Therefore, the increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is less than significant directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP)</i></p> <p>The project site does not include a state highway or principal arterial within Riverside County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) and the project is consistent with the Transportation Demand Management/Air Quality components of the Program; therefore, there is no impact either directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the CMP.</p>				
<p>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999)and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</i></p> <p>The project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or change the location of air traffic patterns. It is not located within an airport influence area. As such, this project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on air traffic patterns.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16d. Response: <i>(Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans)</i></p> <p>The project has been designed or will be conditioned as to not cause any incompatible use or additional or any hazards to the surrounding area or general public. As such, the project will have a less than significant impact on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16e. Response: <i>(Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code)</i></p> <p>The project has been developed in compliance with Title 18, Section 18.210.030 and the City’s Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007); therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.</p>				
<p>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16f. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!)</i></p> <p>The project, as designed, does not create conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). As such, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES. Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD , Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p> <p>All development is required to comply with all provisions of the NPDES program and the City’s Municipal Separate Sewer Permit (MS4), as enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, the project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB with respect to discharges to the sewer system or stormwater system within the City. Because the project is required to adhere to the above regulations related to wastewater treatment the project will have a less than significant impact.</p>				
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-I - Current and Projected Water Use WMWD, Table 5.16-J - General Plan Projected Water Demand for WMWD Including Water Reliability 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area & Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)</p> <p>The project will not result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is consistent with the Typical Growth Scenario of the General Plan 2025 where future water and wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I, 5.16-J and 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</p> <p>The project involves the legalization of an existing/permitted bus yard facility and the permitting of an expanded bus parking area on an unpaved surface. No development is proposed with this project aside from landscaping and fence installations. There is no increase in imperious surfaces or construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities as a result of this project. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service Areas, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities, Table 5.16-E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, Table 5.16-F – Projected Water Demand, Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-H – Current and Projected Domestic Water Supply (acre-ft/year) WMWD Table 5.16-I Current and Projected Water Use WMWD, Table 5.16-J – General Plan Projected Water Demand for WMWD Including Water Reliability 2025, RPU Master Plan, EMWD Master Plan, WMWD Master Plan, and Highgrove Water District Master Plan)</p> <p>The project will not exceed expected water supplies. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Scenario where future water supplies were determined to be adequate (see Tables t.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I and 5.16-J of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the insufficient water supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p> <p>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, no impact to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.</p>				
<p>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)</p> <p>The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Build-out Project level where future landfill capacity was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, no impact to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)</p> <p>The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% diversion rate, well above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building Code requires all developments to divert 50% of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for all projects and 100% of excavated soil and land clearing debris for all non-residential projects beginning January 1, 2011. The project must comply with the City’s waste disposal requirements as well as the California Green Building Code and as such would not conflict with any Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impacts related to solid waste statutes will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</p>				
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, and FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity, Figure 5.5-</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p align="center">2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</p> <p>Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to be less than significant. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside’s history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)</p> <p>Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated and therefore cumulative impacts of the project beyond those previously considered in the GP 2025 FPEIR are less than significant.</p>				
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)</p> <p>Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the project are less than significant.</p>				

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code. Reference: Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151, Public Resources Code; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).