



City of Arts & Innovation

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division

### Draft Negative Declaration

1. **Case Numbers:** P11-0311 (CUP) & P11-0313 (DR)
2. **Project Title:** ARCO - Construction of Vehicle Wash Facility
3. **Hearing Date:** June 7, 2012
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside  
Community Development Department  
Planning Division  
3900 Main Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Yvette Sennewald, Senior Planner  
**Phone Number:** (951) 826-5168  
**Email:** [YSennewald@RiversideCa.gov](mailto:YSennewald@RiversideCa.gov)
6. **Project Location:** 6287 Day Street
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

<u>Owner:</u> Shazar Pazooky 305 E. 9 <sup>th</sup> Street Suite 222 Los Angeles, CA 90015	<u>Applicant:</u> Gregory Hann Empire Design Group, Inc. 24861 Washington Avenue Murrieta, CA 92562
--	---
8. **General Plan Designation:** C-Commercial
9. **Current Zoning:** CR-SP-Commercial Retail - Specific Plan (Canyon Springs Specific Plan)
10. **Description of Project:**

The applicant is requesting a revision a Conditional Use Permit to facilitate the construction of a vehicle wash facility on a site currently developed with a fuel station and a 2,700 square foot convenience store. The 858 square foot wash facility is proposed to be situated near the northwest corner of the site, behind the existing convenience store, approximately two feet from the westerly side property line. The vehicle wash facility is proposed to be painted in a two-tone beige color with a majority of the building being the lighter color (Indian Legend), while the darker color (Desert Valley) will be utilized as an accent color. A stone veneer that matches the existing building is proposed at the base of the columns.

#### 11. Existing Land Use and Setting

The subject 0.91 acre site is currently developed with a vehicle fueling station and a 2,700 square foot convenience store. The vehicle fueling station and convenience market were established in 1990 and approved under Conditional Use Permit case CU-031-889. The facility currently operates as an ARCO fueling station and an AM/PM convenience store.

The fueling station was approved for and originally constructed with 4 double-sided multi-product fuel dispensers. In 2003, two additional double-sided multi-product dispensers were added beyond the limits of the existing fuel island canopy without approval of a revised Conditional Use Permit or Design Review approval. In 2010, the two additional fuel dispensers were legalized under Planning Cases P10-0090 and P10-0091.

The site is accessed via two driveways, one off of Day Street, the other off of Campus Parkway.

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

	<b>Existing Land Use</b>	<b>General Plan Designation</b>	<b>Zoning Designation</b>
<b>Project Site</b>	Fuel Station/Convenience Store	C-Commercial	CR-SP-Commercial Retail and Specific Plan (Canyon Springs) Overlay Zones
<b>North</b>	Fast Food Restaurant	C-Commercial	CR-SP-Commercial Retail and Specific Plan (Canyon Springs) Overlay Zones
<b>East</b>	Commercial Shopping Center (across Day Street)	City of Moreno Valley	City of Moreno Valley
<b>South</b>	Office Building	C-Commercial	O-SP – Office and Specific Plan (Canyon Springs) Overlay Zones
<b>West</b>	Commercial Shopping Center	C-Commercial	CR-SP-Commercial Retail and Specific Plan (Canyon Springs) Overlay Zones

**13. Other Public Agencies whose Approval is Required (e.g., permits, financial approval, or participation agreement.):**

None

**14. Documents Used And/Or Referenced In This Review:**

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR
- c. Health Risk Assessment prepared by LSA, dated March 2010

**15. Acronyms**

AICUZ - Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study

AQMP -	Air Quality Management Plan
AUSD -	Alvord Unified School District
CDG -	Citywide Design Guidelines
CEQA -	California Environmental Quality Act
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
GP 2025 -	General Plan 2025
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
RCALUC -	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
RCALUCP -	Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
RCP -	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RMC -	Riverside Municipal Code
RPD -	Riverside Police Department
RPU -	Riverside Public Utilities
RPW -	Riverside Public Works
RTP -	Regional Transportation Plan
RUSD -	Riverside Unified School District
SCAG -	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD -	South Coast Air Quality Management District
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.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources              | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality            | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems     | <input type="checkbox"/> 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.

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> 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"/>
<b>1a. Response:</b> <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> The proposed project includes the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a service station, 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 <b>less than significant impacts</b> .				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>1b. Response:</b> <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, &amp; Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone)</i> There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> would result from this project.				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>1c. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i> The proposal includes the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station. The proposed wash facility will be of similar architecture and finishes and will be painted to match the existing convenience store. The proposal will not degrade the appearance of the site. Although approximately 11 feet of landscaping will be removed along the northerly property line to construct the drive aisle for the wash facility, a landscape planter with a minimum 7 foot width will be provided along the northerly and westerly property lines. As the site is already developed with an existing vehicle fuel station and convenience store, and the proposed wash facility does not require major on site modifications that would aesthetically impact the surrounding area; <b>no impacts</b> would result from this project.				
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"/>
<b>1d. Response:</b> <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> The site is not within the Mount Palomar Lighting Area and no new lighting is proposed under this project. <b>No impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur as a result of this project which would adversely affect day or nighttime views.				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</b>				
<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 effect, 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>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2a. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability &amp; General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)</i></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 <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to agricultural uses.</p>				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2b. Response:</b> <i>(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)</i></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 <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2c. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</i></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, <b>no impacts</b> will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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><b>2d. Response:</b> (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, <b>no impacts</b> 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><b>2e. Response:</b> (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)</p> <p>The 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. Also, 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, <b>no impacts</b> 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>				
<b>3. AIR QUALITY.</b>				
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:				
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><b>3a. Response:</b> (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP))</p> <p>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 (RTIP), 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) which 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 <b>less than significant impact</b> 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"/>
<p><b>3b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2003 AQMP)</p> <p>The proposal includes the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and a convenience store and will not result in the violation of any ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because the project site is an already developed site. As such the project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to ambient air quality or contribute to an existing air quality violation.</p>				
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"/>
<p><b>3c. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance</p>				



<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b><i>Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan</i></b></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 NO<sub>x</sub> 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 <b>less than significant</b>.</p>				
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>3d. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2003 Air Quality Management Plan, URBEMIS 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Mode)</i></p> <p>The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the project is proposed on a previously developed site and does not involve and major site modifications, grading or earthmoving activities that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial short-term pollutant concentrations. The proposal includes the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station. The site is surrounded by existing commercial development. As such, <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to a sensitive receptor will occur.</p>				
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>3e. Response:</b> <i>(Source: Project Description)</i></p> <p>The project would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors because no additional odors are anticipated to be generated by the proposed project as previously described. Therefore, <b>no impact</b> to creating objectionable odors will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p><b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b></p> <p>Would the project:</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4a. Response:</b> <i>(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 – MSHC)</i></p> <p>The project site is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area and a search of the MSHCP 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 <b>no impact</b> 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>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<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><b>4b. Response:</b> (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, Burrowing Owl Survey Area)</p> <p>The project is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area where no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community exists on site or within proximity to the project site. Therefore the project will have <b>no impact</b> on 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 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><b>4c. Response:</b> (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 discernable drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils and thus does not include USACOE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have <b>no impact</b> 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><b>4d. Response:</b> (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage)</p> <p>The project is within an urbanized area and will not result in a barrier 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. Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> to wildlife movement directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4e. Response:</b> (Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed 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>In addition, the General Plan 2025 includes policies to ensure that project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies. This project has been reviewed against these policies and found to be in compliance with the policies. For these reasons, the project will have <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and tree preservation.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4f. Response:</b> <i>(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 &amp; Natural Community Conservation Plan, &amp; El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan)</i></p> <p>The project site is a 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 <b>no impact</b> on the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>				
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b>				
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>5a. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas &amp; Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</i></p> <p>The proposal includes the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station. The proposed wash facility will be of similar architecture and finishes and will be painted to match the existing convenience store. No major physical improvements are proposed as part of this project. Further, the subject site is located in an area where no historic resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.</p>				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>5b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study)</i></p> <p>The proposal includes the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. No major physical improvements are proposed as part of this project. Thus, the proposed use will not disturb the site anymore than it has already been disturbed. As the project does not involve construction, <b>no adverse impacts</b> to archeological resources and sites containing Native American human remains are anticipated as a result of this project.</p>				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site of unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>5c. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)</i></p> <p>Please refer to Response 5b. above.</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><b>5d. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)</i></p> <p>Please refer to Response 5b. above.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b> Would the project:				
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><b>6i. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones &amp; General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>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 <b>no impacts</b> related to strong seismic ground will occur <b>directly</b>, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6ii. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>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 will be required to comply with the California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking are reduced to <b>less than significant impact</b> levels directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>b. 6iii. Response:</b> (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, &amp; Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>The project site is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction as depicted in the General Plan 2025 Liquefaction Zones Map - Figure PS-2. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that any impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction are reduced to <b>less than significant impact</b> levels directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6iv. Response:</b> (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)</p> <p>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 <b>no impact</b> related to landslides directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6b. Response:</b> (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, &amp; SWPPP)</p> <p>The project does not involve development, grading activities, or structures that would result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. As such, the project will have <b>no impact</b> resulting in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6c. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones,</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>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, &amp; Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></p> <p>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. As such, the project will have <b>no impact</b> resulting in a geologic unit or soil becoming unstable resulting in an in 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><b>6d. Response:</b> <i>(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, &amp; California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside)</i></p> <p>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. As such, the project will have <b>no impact</b> resulting in a geologic unit or soil becoming unstable resulting in an in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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><b>6e. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)</i></p> <p>The subject site is currently served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore the project will have <b>no impact</b> related to soils incapable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative water disposal systems either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> 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"/>
<b>7a. Response:</b> The proposed project consists of a conditional use permit and design review to facilitate the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. 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 Green House Gas (GHG) threshold; however, there are currently no established guidelines or regulations issued on significance thresholds or methodologies for assessing impacts of global warming. The project would comply with all SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations during construction of the car wash will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in the AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. As the proposed improvements are minimal in nature, emissions resulting from construction are expected to be far lower than the SCAQMD thresholds for significance. Therefore, a <b>less than significant</b> impact is expected with respect to climate change.				
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"/>
<b>7b. Response:</b> 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 (RTIP), 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) which 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 <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.				
<b>8. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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"/>
<b>8a. Response:</b> <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 as it consists of a conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. As such, the project will have <b>no impact</b> related to the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
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"/>
<b>8b. Response:</b> <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 Strategic Plan)</i>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
The proposed use does not involve the release of any hazardous materials into the environment. As such the project will have <b>no impact</b> 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.				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8c. Response:</b> <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 proposed conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store revision will not emit any hazardous materials, substances or waste. Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> 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>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8d. Response:</b> <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 <b>no impact</b> to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8e. Response:</b> <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>All airports, public and private, with influence area over the City have a valid airport land use plan. A review of the safety and/or airport compatibility zones as depicted on Figure 5.7-2 of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR found that the project site is located within the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Zone. The subject property is within the “Other Airport Environs” zone and is compatible with the RCALUCP. No other requirements or special conditions are required. The project was reviewed by Planning staff to ensure that the project is consistent with the compatibility zone as well as in compliance with the land use standards in the RCALUP. Therefore, the project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8f. Response:</b> <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>There are no private airstrips within the City. Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> resulting in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
plan?				
<p><b>8g. Response:</b> <i>(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)</i></p> <p>The project will not directly or indirectly result in physical alterations to the project site that would impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan. Thus, <b>no impacts</b> would result from this project.</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><b>8h. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002, Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i></p> <p>The proposed project is located in an urbanized area where no wildlands exist and the property is not located within a Very High Fire Severity Zones (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a VHFSZ; therefore <b>no impact</b> regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.</p>				
<b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b>				
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9a. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water)</i></p> <p>The proposed project is located within the Santa Ana River Watershed (see GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.8-1). The project will result in minor physical alterations to the project site (construction of a vehicle wash facility) on a site already developed and operating as a fuel station. Given compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws regulating surface water quality and the fact that the project will not result in a net increase of surface water runoff, the proposed project as designed is anticipated to result in a <b>less than significant impact</b> 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><b>9b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan)</i></p> <p>The proposed project is located within the Riverside South Water Supply Basin (see CADME layer Water Supply Basins under Water Data Layers). The project will not directly or indirectly 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 as no physical alterations to the project site (i.e. grading, ground disturbance, structures or paving) are proposed because the project involves occupancy of an existing building. Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to groundwater supplies.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9c. Response:</b></p> <p>The proposed project consists of a conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot</p>				



<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. Only minor project physical alterations are proposed as a result of this proposal. The alterations would not alter the existing drainage patterns of the site as the fuel station has been established since 1990. No major physical improvements to the site are proposed in conjunction with this request. Therefore no erosion or siltation on- or off-site will occur. Thus, the project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9d. Response:</b> The proposed project consists of a conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. Only minor project physical alterations are proposed as a result of this proposal. The alterations would not alter the existing drainage patterns of the site as the fuel station has been established since 1990. The project will not directly or indirectly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, alter of 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. No major physical improvements to the site are proposed in conjunction with this request. Therefore no flooding on or off-site as a result of the project will occur and there will be <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9e. Response:</b> Only minor physical alterations are proposed as a result of the request to construct a vehicle wash facility. The alterations would not alter the existing drainage patterns of the site as the fuel station has been established since 1990. The project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. 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 <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9f. Response:</b> The proposed project consists of a conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. Only minor project physical alterations are proposed as a result of this proposal. The alterations would not alter the existing drainage patterns of the site as the fuel station has been established since 1990. Therefore, the project will not degrade water quality and there will be <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Map Panel 06065C0734G Zone X dated 8/28/08)</b> A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Community Panel Number 06065C0734G Zone X dated 8/28/08) and Figure 5.8-2 -- Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the subject site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. The site is fully improved and the project consists of a conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. Since this project does not involve the construction of housing, there will be <b>no impact</b> caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p>				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps</b></p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>06065C0734G Zone X dated 8/28/08)</b>				
Please refer to Response 9g, above.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9i. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Map)</i></p> <p>The project site is not located within 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 (06065C0734G Zone X dated 8/28/08). Therefore, the proposed construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store will not be within a flood hazard area and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.</p> <p>The City Municipal Code &amp; Implementation of National Flood Insurance Program requires structures located within a flood zone to mitigate flood hazards by including onsite drainage, anchoring methods to prevent floating structures, elevating buildings above flood levels, and flood proofing. As the site has been developed with a fuel station since 1990, it has gone through the necessary inspections and certifications. Therefore, the potential to occupy a structure within a flood hazard area which would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding will be <b>less than significant</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9j. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality)</i></p> <p>Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, <b>no impacts</b> due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<b>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</b>				
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>10a. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)</i></p> <p>The project involves a conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store. The site is served by fully improved public streets and other infrastructure. The proposal does not involve the subdivision of land or creation streets that could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development and established community. Thus, <b>less than significant impacts</b> will result from this project.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>10b. Response:</b> <i>(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, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan, and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>The subject site has a C – Commercial General Plan land use designation and is located within the CR-Commercial Retail - Specific Plan (Canyon Springs) which allows for vehicle fuel stations, with the approval of a conditional use permit. A CUP was approved for the establishment of the vehicle fueling station in 1989, and the project now involves a conditional use permit and design review for the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store, which requires a revision to the previously approved CUP. The proposed project complies with all development standards of the Zoning Code and the Specific Plan with the exception of a variance requested for building setback. Therefore, <b>no significant impact</b> is expected.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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><b>10c. Response:</b> (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>In addition to response 4f above, the project does not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan because the project involves the construction of an 858 square foot vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store within an urbanized area. No development activity, ground disturbance, grading, or construction of buildings or structures is proposed. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> would result from this project.</p>				
<b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b>				
Would the project:				
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><b>11a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</p> <p>The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources or grading activity. 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 <b>no impact</b> 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><b>11b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</p> <p>The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas within the City or Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan, therefore there is <b>no impact</b>.</p>				
<b>12. NOISE.</b>				
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><b>12a. Response:</b> (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, Acoustical Analysis prepared by Colia Acoustical Consultants dated January 31, 2012)</p> <p>Through implementation of Tool N-1 of the General Plan 2025 Noise Element, the proposed project will be compatible with the noise environment. Tool N-1 of the Noise Element of the General Plan requires review of development proposals to ensure that the noise standards and compatibility matrix (Figure N-10) set forth in the Noise Element are met to the maximum extent practicable. The project will be required to meet the City’s noise standards and compatibility matrix (Figure N-10) of the Noise Element and does not require an acoustical analysis per Tool N-1. Therefore, the project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan and Noise Ordinance. <b>Less than Significant Impacts</b> are expected.</p>				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
<p><b>12b. Response:</b> <i>(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, Acoustical Analysis prepared by Colia Acoustical Consultants dated January 31, 2012 )</i></p> <p>The proposed project does not involve uses or activities that would result in any exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. Thus, <b>no impacts</b> will result from this project.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>12c. Response:</b> <i>(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, Acoustical Analysis prepared by Colia Acoustical Consultants dated January 31, 2012 )</i></p> <p>Potential ambient noise related to the construction of a vehicle wash facility and continued operation of the fuel station is not likely to exceed the thresholds set forth in Tool N-11 of the General Plan, as the general surrounding area is developed with industrial uses. Therefore, impacts related to the increase in ambient noise levels are expected to be <b>less than significant</b>.</p>				
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><b>12d. Response:</b> <i>(Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</i></p> <p>Both the General Plan and Municipal Code limit construction activities to specific times and days of the week and during those specified times, construction activity is subject to the noise standards provided in the Code. Considering the short term nature of construction for the minor improvements on the property and the provisions of the City’s Noise Ordinance, the temporary and periodic increase in noise levels due construction which may result from the project are considered <b>less than significant</b>.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>12e. Response:</b> <i>(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)</i></p> <p>Although the proposed project is located within an airport land use plan, the proposed project is not located within any of the airport noise contour areas as depicted on Figures N-9 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025. For this reason, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to airport noise. Therefore, impacts will be <b>less than significant</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.</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"/>

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><b>12f. Response:</b> <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>There are no private airstrips within the City limits. <b>No impacts</b> are expected.</p>				
<p><b>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b></p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
<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)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>13a. Response:</b> <i>(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)</i></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. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> will result from this project.</p>				
<p>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>13b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</i></p> <p>The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the subject site is developed with an existing fuel station and convenience store. Thus, there is no housing that could be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> will result from this project.</p>				
<p>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>13c. Response:</b> <i>(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</i></p> <p>The project as previously described will not displace any people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed on a previously improved site that has no existing housing or residents that could be affected by the construction of a vehicle wash facility. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> will result from this project.</p>				
<p><b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b></p> <p>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:</p>				
<p>a. Fire protection?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14a. Response:</b> <i>(Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)</i></p> <p>The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that development and population generated by implementation of the General Plan will increase demand for fire stations, personnel and equipment over time, potentially resulting in the need to provide new or expanded facilities in order to maintain an acceptable level of service. However, the combined effect of the General Plan Policies and the impact fees will reduce impacts on fire protection and emergency services to less than significant levels. Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan, the proposed project will have a <b>less than significant</b> impact on fire facilities.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)</p> <p>The project will result in an incremental additional demand on police facilities; however, the project is consistent with the adopted General Plan. The GP 2025 FPEIR included MM PS 1, as well as General Plan polices related to police services, which reduced impacts related to the need for new police facilities to a less than significant level. Because the proposed project is consistent with the intent of the General Plan, the proposed project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> on police facilities.</p>				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14c. Response:</b> (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)</p> <p>The project consists of a conditional use permit and design review to facilitate the construction of a vehicle wash facility on a site already developed with a fuel station and convenience store. Thus, <b>no impact</b> will result from this project.</p>				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14d. Response:</b> (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> <p>The project is a non-residential use and will not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any increase population. Therefore, <b>no impact</b> related to demand for parks will result from the project.</p>				
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14e. Response:</b> (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>The project is a non-residential use and will not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any increase population. Therefore, <b>no impact</b> related to demand for public facilities will result from the project.</p>				
<b>15. RECREATION.</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>15a. Response:</b> (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 would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. <b>No impact</b> is expected as a result of the proposed project.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>15b. Response:</b></p> <p>The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b> Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>16a. Response:</b> <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 is located on an already developed/improved site and is with the General Plan 2025 Typical densities and the traffic model prepared for the General Plan 2025. On site circulation is anticipated to intensify during peak hours. However, the site has a large enough parking area to accommodate any traffic that occurs as a result of the wash facility. The site provides efficient and adequate circulation, with a combination of directional signage, directional arrows, decorative hardscape, bollards and enlarged planters. Therefore, the increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load, on site circulation, capacity of the street system will be <b>less than significant</b>.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>16b. Response:</b> <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>Please refer to Response 15a. above. Additionally, the proposed project will be consistent with the 2007 Riverside County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Therefore, increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is <b>less than significant</b>.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>16c. Response:</b> <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 proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan is not expected to significantly increase the number of individuals using the airport facilities at Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport or March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port, which is a joint civilian and military airport. The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with the MARB CLUP/JLUS Plan. Therefore, impacts associated with air traffic patterns are <b>less than significant</b>.</p>				
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><b>16d. Response:</b> <i>(Source: Project Site Plans)</i></p> <p>The project site is located on a site which is currently developed with a vehicle fuel station and convenience store, with all site improvements in place and where no site modifications will occur that would result in hazards due to a design feature such as a driveway, intersection improvement, etc. Therefore, there would be <b>no impacts</b>.</p>				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>16e. Response:</b> <i>(Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire 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). <b>No impact</b> will result from this project.</p>				
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>16f. Response:</b> <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 site is currently developed with all site improvements in place, and where no site modifications will occur that would result in conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). Thus, <b>no impacts</b> will result from this project.</p>				
<p><b>17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.</b></p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17a. Response:</b> <i>(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 , and Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds)</i></p> <p>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (RWQCB). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Thus, <b>no impacts</b> will result from this project.</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><b>17b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure.)</i></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 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). As part of the General Plan 2025 Program, to mitigate potential impacts related to the need for expanded entitlements for water and wastewater treatment plant capacity if population growth exceeds the Typical Project level, the City will review population and development trends with respect to water sources and supply and wastewater treatment plant capacity in 2015 and 2020 to assure growth is occurring as expected under the Typical Project development scenario. <b>No impacts</b> will result from this project.</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"/>



<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><b>17c. Response:</b> <i>(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</i></p> <p>The project is located on an already developed/improved site within an urbanized area where no increase in impervious surfaces will occur that would require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. <b>No impacts</b> will result from this project.</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><b>17d. Response:</b> <i>(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, RPU Master Plan)</i></p> <p>The project will not exceed expected water supplies. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 where future water supplies were determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I and 5.16-J of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). As part of the General Plan 2025 Program, to mitigate potential impacts related to the need for expanded entitlements for water if population growth exceeds the Typical Project level, the City will review population and development trends with respect to water sources and supply in 2015 and 2020 to assure growth is occurring as expected under the Typical Project development scenario. <b>No impacts</b> will result from this project.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17e. Response:</b> <i>(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)</i></p> <p>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (RWQCB). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). <b>No impacts</b> will result from this project.</p>				
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17f. Response:</b> <i>(Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)</i></p> <p>The project will not exceed the landfill capacity. 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).</p>				
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17g. Response:</b> <i>(Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)</i></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 (Based on GP 2025 FPEIR at the time of its adoption). The City remains committed to continuing its existing waste reduction and minimization efforts with the programs that are available through the City. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with any Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste as the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> are anticipated.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>18a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Section 5.4 - Biological Resources and Section 5.5 - Cultural Resources)</b> See responses in Sections 4 (Biological Resources) and 5 (Cultural Resources). Information contained in this initial study supports the conclusion that the proposed project will not result in the degradation of environmental resources. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> will result from this project.				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)</b> No adverse cumulative impacts were identified in the Initial Study analysis.				
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>18c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)</b> See responses in Section 8 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials). No environmental impacts were identified in the initial analysis.				

**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).