



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division

Draft Negative Declaration

WARD: 7

1. **Case Number:** P11-0459 (Rezoning)
2. **Project Title:** Rezoning R-1-8500 to RC
3. **Hearing Date:** June 7, 2012
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Kyle Smith, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-5220
Email: kjsmith@riversideca.gov
6. **Project Location:** 11865 Ann Arbor Court, situated on the northerly side of Ann Arbor Court, westerly of Circle View Drive
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Owner / Applicant
Linda Hudson
11865 Ann Arbor Ct.
Riverside, CA 92505
8. **General Plan Designation:** HR – Hillside Residential
9. **Zoning:** R-1-8500 – Single Family Residential Zone

10. **Description of Project:**

The applicant is requesting an amendment to the Zoning Code to rezone the subject property from the R-1-8500 – Single Family Residential Zone to the RC – Residential Conservation Zone. The subject property is approximately two acres in size and located on the northerly side of Ann Arbor Court, westerly of Circle View Drive with an existing single family residence, is eligible for this request as it meets the minimum lot size of the requested RC Zone. The subject site contains an average natural slope (ANS) of 25%, which is the minimum ANS for parcels of two acres in size in the requested RC Zone. The underlying General Plan Designation land use designation for the subject site is HR – Hillside Residential, which is the appropriate designation for the requested RC Zone.

The applicant has indicated a desire to pursue the keeping of horses on the property in conjunction with this request. The current R-1-8500 Zone does not allow horse keeping; however the requested RC Zone would allow the keeping of up to three horses on the subject property, in addition to compliance with specific locational criteria for ancillary structures. The request does not involve any alterations to the existing single family residence of the project site in any way. However, the applicant has indicated a desire to construct horse keeping areas should this request be approved. Should horse keeping areas be proposed, they will be reviewed under a separate Design Review process as required by the RC Zone.

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

The approximately 2 acre subject site consists of an approximately 2,230 square foot two-story single family residence which was constructed in 1986. The residence is located on the easterly side of the generally rectangular shaped lot. The westerly half (rear) of the lot consists of a steep undeveloped hillside area. The westerly side of the subject site is surrounded by the Norco Hills. The remainder surrounding area has been developed with single family residences.

	Existing Land Use	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation
Project Site	Single Family Residential	HR – Hillside Residential	R-1-8500 – Single Family Residential
North	Single Family Residential	MDR – Medium Density Residential	R-1-8500 – Single Family Residential
East	Single Family Residential	MDR – Medium Density Residential	R-1-8500 – Single Family Residential
South	Single Family Residential	HR – Hillside Residential, MDR – Medium Density Residential	R-1-8500 – Single Family Residential, RC – Residential Conservation
West	Vacant / slope	HR – Hillside Residential	RC – Residential Conservation

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

- a. None

13. Documents used and/or referenced in this review:

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR

14. 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
- CMP - Congestion Management Plan
- 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
RCTC -	Riverside County Transportation Commission
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 & Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <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 Service | <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 “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” 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: Potentially Significant Unless 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.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, and Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways)</i></p> <p>The subject site is not bounded by scenic boulevards or parkways. The closest scenic boulevard is La Sierra Avenue, located approximately 0.6 miles east of the project site. Further, this site is not visually prominent from the larger community and would therefore not impact the nearest designated scenic vista. Lastly, as the proposed rezoning does not involve the construction of additional residential dwellings, rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone, will not result in a significant impact to a scenic vista. Future development or construction facilitated by this zone change will be required to comply with the Zoning Code, Grading Code, and Citywide Design Guidelines. Therefore, this proposal will have less than significant impacts.</p>				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>1b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, Title 20 – Cultural Resources and, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone)</i></p> <p>No officially designated State scenic highways or any eligible State scenic highways traverse the City or its Sphere of Influence. Additionally, the project site does not contain any designated scenic resources and no historic buildings are located on-site. However, the rear of the site consists of a hillside area in excess of 10 percent where rock outcroppings exist. As this proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone, which is intended to facilitate preservation of hillsides, ridgelines, arroyos and wildlife, the natural features of the subject will be protected from future disturbance. Further, this proposal will not only serve to protect the existing natural features of the subject site, but it will also be consistent with the intent of Proposition R and Measure C, which is to protect hillside areas through application of the RC Zone. Therefore, this proposal will not adversely affect any scenic resources including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Any construction on the subject site will be subject to the provisions of the RC Zone and Grading Code. Therefore, proposed project will have no impact on scenic resources within a state scenic highway.</p>				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>While the approximately two acre project site contains an approximately 25% average natural slope, the proposal does not involve the construction of additional residential dwellings or alteration to the site in any way as the request consist of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. Future construction on the subject site will be subject to the provisions of the RC Zone. Therefore, the proposed rezoning will have less than significant impact to the visual character and quality of the area.</p>				
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>1d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-2 – Mount Palomar Lighting Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>The site is not within the Mount Palomar Lighting Area and no new lighting is proposed under this project. No impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur as a result of this project which would adversely affect day or nighttime views</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental 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>				
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability)</p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. No new development or additional land disturbances is proposed. Additionally, a review of Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability of the General Plan 2025 identifies the area developed with the single family residence as “urban/built out land” and the hillside area in the rear of the site as “other land”. The site is not adjacent to or in proximity to any land classified as, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Therefore, the site does not support agricultural resources or operations. Thus, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on agricultural uses.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)</p> <p>A review of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR reveals that the project site is not located within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act Preserve or under a Williamson Act Contract. Moreover, the proposed zoning would facilitate agricultural use on the subject site; therefore, the proposal will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. Furthermore, the project is located within an urbanized area where the location of the project site is not located within proximity of any forest land. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data) The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones – RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data) The proposed project consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. Additionally, the area developed with the single family residence is identified as “urban/built out land” and the hillside in the rear of the site is designated as “other land”. The proposal will continue to support agricultural use, particularly in the rear of the site. The project will not result in the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. In addition, the City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land.</p>				
3. AIR QUALITY.				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2003 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)) The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. No construction has been proposed in conjunction with this request. The proposed rezoning request constitutes a map change and is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program “Typical Growth Scenario” in all aspects. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the SCAB into compliance with all Federal and State air quality standards. The City of Riverside is located within the Riverside County sub region of the SCAG projections. The General Plan 2025 FPEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan 2025 would generally meet attainment forecasts and attainment of the standards of the AQMP. Because the proposed project is consistent with air quality policies within the General Plan 2025 and the GP 2025 FPEIR determined the General Plan 2025 to be consistent with the 2003 AQMP, the proposed project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan - AQMP and therefore this project will have no impact directly, indirectly or 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2003 AQMP, EMFAC 2007 Model) The proposal to rezone the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone will not result in the violation of any ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation as it does not involve new construction nor does not it involve grading, construction or earthmoving activities. As such, the project will have no impacts 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
<p>3c. Response: <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, EMFAC 2007 Model)</i></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_x 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 proposal to rezone the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone does not result in any new significant impacts that were not previously evaluated and for which a statement of overriding considerations was adopted as part of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR. Therefore, cumulative air quality emissions impacts are less than significant.</p>				
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: <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 Model)</i></p> <p>The project 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 proposal consists of rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. No grading or earthmoving activities are proposed in conjunction with this project. Therefore, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and no impacts will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project.</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>3e. Response:</p> <p>The project would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors because the proposal constitutes a map change. Therefore, no impact to creating objectionable odors will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4a. Response: <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 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area)</i></p> <p>The subject site is located within an urban built-up area, surrounded by existing development. A search of the MSHCP database and other appropriate databases identified a portion of the rear of the site as suitable habitat for the burrowing owl.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The proposal to rezone the subject property from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone constitutes a map change only. However, it should be noted that application of the RC Zone to the subject property would also serve to protect the hillside in the rear of the site; and thus, protect the potential any suitable habitat. Any future construction in the general area where the burrowing owl habitat has been identified will require the preparation of a Habitat Assessment. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively on habitat modifications, species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, and policies or regulations of the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p>				
<p>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools)</p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity. Any future construction in the general hillside area, which has not been disturbed, will required the preparation of a Habitat Assessment. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts 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>4c. Response: (Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)</p> <p>The subject site is located within an urbanized area where no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) exist on site or within proximity to the project site. The project site does not contain any discernible drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils and thus does not include USACOE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed rezoning would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4d. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage)</p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity. Any future construction in the general area of the hillside, which has not been disturbed, will require the preparation of a Habitat Assessment. Therefore, the proposed rezoning 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 proposal will have less than significant impacts on 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>4e. Response: <i>(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)</i></p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity. Any future construction in the general hillside area, which has not been disturbed, will require the preparation of a Habitat Assessment. Further, the General Plan 2025 includes policies to ensure that future development would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation polices. The proposed rezoning has been reviewed against these policies and found to be in compliance with the policies. For these reasons, this proposal will have less than significant impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</p>				
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4f. Response: <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 and Natural Community Conservation Plan, and El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan)</i></p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity. Any future construction in the general hillside area, which has not been disturbed, will require the preparation of a Habitat Assessment. As proposed the rezoning of the subject site 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 proposal will have less than significant impacts on the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>				
<p>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
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>5a. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</i></p> <p>The City of Riverside has a variety of Historic Resources, including Federal, State, and local resources. As of 2004, through an inventory conducted by the City, the City has recorded 110 City Landmarks, more than 1,000 Structures of Merit, 10 Historic Districts, 20 National Register of Historic Places properties and 4 Neighborhood Conservation Areas. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. Therefore, there will be no impact or disruption of cultural resources.</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>5b. Response: <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>This proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone; and thus, it constitutes a map change only. Therefore, there will be no impact or disruption of archeological resources.</p>				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)</i></p> <p>This proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Zone to the RC Zone; and thus, it constitutes a map change only. Therefore, there will be no impact or disruption of paleontological resources.				
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5d. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)</i></p> <p>No known cemetery occurs within the project area. The recovery of human remains during construction is not expected. However, if human remains are found during the excavation of future construction facilitated by this rezoning request, the Native American Graves Protection Act Guidelines and State law require that construction personnel: halt work in the immediate area; Leave the remains in place; Contact the Project Manager, the City Historic Preservation Officer, and the Riverside County Coroner. Until a representative from the Coroner’s office reviews the remains in the field, they must not be removed. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, the Coroner contacts the Native American Heritage Commission and the most likely descendent from the Native American community is informed. The final disposition of remains is coordinated by representatives of the property owner and the most likely descendent and perhaps assisted by the City’s Historic Preservation Officer and/or the project archaeologist. As the Native American Graves Protection Act Guidelines and State Law are in place, the project will have a less than significant impact to potential human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</p>				
6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6i. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></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. Future construction facilitated by this rezoning request will be required to comply with the California Building Code regulations. Therefore, a less than significant impact related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6ii. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></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 any future construction facilitated by this rezoning request will be required to comply with California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have a less than significant impact 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>6iii. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></p> <p>The project site is located in an area with high potential for liquefaction as depicted in the General Plan 2025 Liquefaction Zones Map - Figure PS-2. The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone; and thus, it constitutes a map change only. Future construction facilitated by this rezoning request will be required to comply with the California Building Code regulations. Therefore,</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.				
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iv. Response: <i>(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)</i></p> <p>The project site is located in an urbanized area of the City and has an average natural slope of 25%. Strong ground shaking can worsen existing unstable slope conditions. However, as the proposed project consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and no new construction is proposed, impacts are considered less than significant.</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>6b. Response: <i>(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)</i></p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction and grading activities, or structures that would result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. As such, the project will have no impact 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>6c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and does not involve development, grading activities, or new structures. As such, the project will have no impact 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>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6d. Response: <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, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</i></p> <p>Expansive soil is defined under <i>California Building Code</i>. The soil types of the subject area are Cieneba, Vista & Delhi (See Figure 5.6-4 – Soils of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Future construction facilitated by this rezoning request will be required to comply with the applicable provisions of the City’s Subdivision Code – Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard to soil hazards related to the expansive soils. Therefore, impacts will be reduced to a less than significant impact level for this proposal directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6e. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)</i></p> <p>The proposal does not need to dispose waste water as it consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. As this site is currently served by an existing sewer system, the project will have no impact.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>7a. Response: The proposed project will not result in a net increase in GhG emissions as it consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone; thus, no emissions would result from this proposal. The existing residence will continue to comply with the City’s General Plan policies and statewide Building Code requirements designed to reduce GhG emissions. Since the proposal will not result in a net increase in GhG emissions, it will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Therefore, this project will have no impact with respect to GhG emissions.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7b. Response: The SCAQMD supports State, Federal and international policies to reduce levels of ozone depleting gases through its Global Warming Policy and rules and has established an interim Greenhouse Gas (GhG) threshold. As indicated in Question A, above, the proposed rezoning request would comply with the City’s General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GhG emissions. In addition, the proposed rezoning would comply with all SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations during any construction and, as demonstrated in the Climate Change Analysis, will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing GhG 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. Based upon the prepared Climate Change Analysis for this project and the discussion above, the proposed rezoning will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction in the emissions of GhG and thus a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively in this regard.</p>				
8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i> The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous materials because the proposal involves rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. Thus, this proposal constitutes a map change only. As such, the project will have no impact related to the transport, use or disposal of any hazardous materials either direct, indirectly, or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7 A – D, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i> The proposed project consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. Thus, this proposal constitutes a map change only and does not involve emitting hazardous</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. There are no impacts which would result from this project.				
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"/>
8c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code)</i>				
The proposal to rezone the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, does not involve emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste as it constitutes a map change only. Therefore, no impacts would result from this project.				
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"/>
8d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)</i>				
A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the subject site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have no impact to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8e. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas)</i>				
The subject site is not located within any airport land use plan area or compatibility zone. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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"/>
8f. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas)</i>				
Because the subject site is not located within proximity of a private airstrip and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing on the subject site to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8g. Response: <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>				
The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone; and thus, it constitutes a map change only. As such, it will not impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan. Therefore, no impact , either directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan will occur.				
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
residences are intermixed with wildlands?				
<p>8h. Response: (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)</p> <p>The subject site is located adjacent to, but not within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ). However, as the proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone, no impact regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.</p>				
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water)</p> <p>The proposed project is located within the Santa Ana River Watershed (see GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.8-1). The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction or grading activity. Further, this proposal will not change the existing residential use and will not involve any use that would have any effect on water quality. Therefore, the proposed rezoning will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.</p>				
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan)</p> <p>The subject site is located within the Arlington Water Supply Basin. The proposal 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 proposal constitutes a map change only as it involves rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. Therefore, the proposal will have no impact 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9c. Response: (Source:)</p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity. Thus, the proposal would not alter the existing drainage patterns of the site. Therefore, the project will have no impact 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>9d. Response: (Source:)</p> <p>The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity; thus, it will not 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. Therefore, no flooding on or off-site as a result of the project will occur and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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"/>
9e. Response: (Source:) The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity; thus, it will not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide 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 no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9f. Response: The proposal consists of rezoning the subject site, currently developed with a single family residence, from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. This proposal constitutes a map change only as it does not involve any construction activity; and thus, it will not significantly create or contribute runoff water which would substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, the project will not degrade water quality and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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"/>
9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0692G Effective Date August 28, 2008) and Figure 5.8-2 -- Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the subject site is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area. Further, the proposal does not involve the construction of housing. Therefore, there will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.				
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"/>
9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) The subject site is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0692G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Further, this proposal will rezone a site currently developed with a single family residence. Therefore, the proposal will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and no impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps) The subject site is not located within or near a flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0692G Effective Date August 28, 2008) or subject to dam inundation as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas. Further the proposal constitutes a map change only and does not propose to construct additional single family residences. Therefore, the proposal will not place a structure within a flood hazard or dam inundation area that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam and therefore no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>9j. Response: <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, no impacts due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Additionally, the proposed project site and its surroundings have generally flat topography and are within an urbanized area, not within proximity to Lake Mathews, Lake Evans, the Santa Ana River, Lake Hills, Norco Hills, Box Springs Mountain Area or any of the 9 arroyos which transverse the City and its sphere of influence.</p>				
<p>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)</i></p> <p>The proposal involves rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone; thus it constitutes a map change only. The site is currently developed with a single family residence served by fully improved public streets and other infrastructure and does not involve the subdivision of land or the creation of streets that could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development or affect an established community. Application of the proposed RC Zone will not change the existing use or physically divide an established community, particularly given that the subject site is immediately adjacent to RC Zoned property to the west. In fact, application of the RC Zone, as proposed, will further the goals and policies of the General Plan for the La Sierra Hills Neighborhood, which are intended to ensure the neighborhood’s western hillsides are developed in a sensitive manner consistent with Proposition R and Measure C for the preservation of the landscape’s natural, hilly character to the maximum feasible extent. Lastly, any future improvements to the site will be required to comply with the RC Zoned standards, Grading Code, the General Plan 2025 and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an established community will occur.</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>10b. Response: <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 and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>The subject site is located in an urbanizing area of the City and governed by the provisions of the City of Riverside General Plan and Zoning Code. The site is not located within a specific plan area, and is located in excess of 50 miles from the nearest local coastal program area. Therefore, there are no such Specific Plan or Coastal Program provisions applicable to the project and no conflicts to those provisions are expected. The site, however, is located within the boundaries of the MSHCP, but it has been developed for consistency with the Plan. The proposal to rezone the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone constitutes a map change only as no construction is proposed in conjunction with this request. Further, given the 25 percent average natural slope (ANS) of the property, it would be appropriate to apply the RC Zone to ensure preservation of the hillside area in the rear of the site. Lastly, the underlying General Plan Designation land use designation for the subject site is HR – Hillside Residential, which is designed to limit development of Riverside’s ecologically sensitive and visually prominent hillside areas and application of the RC Zone would be consistent with the General Plan land use designation. Based upon the above discussion and proper implementation of the conditions of approval, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with the General Plan or Zoning Code; therefore impacts are less than significant.</p>				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10c. Response: <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 and Natural Community Conservation Plan, and El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan)</i></p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See Response 4f above.				
11. MINERAL RESOURCES.				
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"/>
11a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</i>				
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 no impact on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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"/>
11b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</i>				
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 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is no impact .				
12. NOISE.				
Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12a. Response: <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)</i>				
The proposed rezoning request does not involve uses or activities that would increase ambient noise levels as the project involves rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. No development or additional land disturbances are proposed in conjunction with this request. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of established City standards either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
12b. Response: <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)</i>				
The proposal 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 as the project involves rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. No development or additional land disturbances are proposed in conjunction with this request. Therefore, the project will have a no impact on the exposure of persons to or the generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p> <p>The proposed project does not involve uses or activities that would result in a substantial permanent increase of ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project because the proposal consists of rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone. No development or additional land disturbances are proposed in conjunction with this request. Therefore, this project will have no impact on existing noise levels directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</p> <p>Both the General Plan 2025 and the Municipal Code Title 7 (Noise 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 Title 7 of the City’s Municipal Code. However, as the proposal involves rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and no development or additional land disturbances are proposed in conjunction with this request, there will be no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively related to temporary and periodic increase in noise levels</p>				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP)</p> <p>The project site is not located within any airport land use plan area or compatibility zone. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in a safety hazard for people residing in the subject area directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP)</p> <p>Per the GP 2025 Program FPEIR, there are no private airstrips within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Because the proposed project is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>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 subject site is in an urbanized area and does not propose new homes or businesses that would directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth because the proposal consists of the rezoning of the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and no development or additional land disturbances are proposed in conjunction with this request. Therefore, this project will have no impact on population growth either directly or indirectly.</p>				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13b. Response: <i>(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</i> The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the proposal consists of the rezoning of the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and no development or additional land disturbances are proposed in conjunction with this request. The site is developed with a single family residence and this proposal will not displace the existing residential structure. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13c. Response: <i>(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</i> The proposal 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 will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, this project will have no impact on people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
14. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14a. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)</i> Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by Station 8 (located at 11076 Hole Ave) to serve this project site. As this proposal consists of rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and no development or construction is proposed, it will not result in the intensification of land use and there will be no impact on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)</i> Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the West Neighborhood Policing Center to serve this project. Therefore, this project will not result in the intensification of land use and there will be no impact on the demand for additional police facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14c. Response: <i>(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)</i> The project is will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase numbers of school age children.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14d. Response: <i>(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)</i> The project will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14e. Response: <i>(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)</i> Adequate public facilities and services, including libraries and community centers, are provided in the existing Neighborhood to serve this project. As the proposal consists of the rezoning of the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and no development or additional land disturbances are proposed, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
15. RECREATION.				
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"/>
15a. Response: <i>(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)</i> The project will not result in an intensification of land use and therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional recreational facilities either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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"/>
15b. Response: The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.				
Would the project result in:				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels)</i>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>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 a previously developed/improved site where no increase in intensity of use resulting in any measureable increase in traffic would occur; and therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the capacity of the existing circulation system will occur.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP)</i></p> <p>The project site does not include a state highway or principal arterial within Riverside County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) and the project is consistent with the Transportation Demand Management/Air Quality components of the Program; therefore, there is no impact either directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the CMP.</p>				
<p>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP)</i></p> <p>The project site is not located within any airport land use plan area or compatibility zone. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in a safety hazard for people residing in the subject area directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16d. Response: <i>(Source:)</i></p> <p>The subject site is currently developed with a single family residence. All on- and off- site improvements are in place. As this proposal consists of rezoning the subject site from the R-1-8500 Zone to the RC Zone and no construction or development is proposed in conjunction with this request, there will be no hazards due to design features or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment). Furthermore, the existing residential use will be consistent with the intent of the proposed RC Zone. As such, the project will have no impact on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16e. Response: <i>(Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)</i></p> <p>The project is located on a site that is currently developed, with all site improvements in place, and where no site modifications are proposed that would affect emergency access; therefore there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.</p>				
<p>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16f. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!)</i></p> <p>The project is located on a site that 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</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). As such, the proposed rezoning will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.				
17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.				
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p> <p>The proposal to rezone the subject site will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The project is located on a site that is currently developed, with all site improvements in place; therefore there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to wastewater treatment.</p>				
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, 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 and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)</p> <p>The proposal to rezone the subject site will not result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is consistent with the Typical Growth Scenario of the General Plan 2025 where future water and wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I, 5.16-J and 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</p> <p>The proposal will rezone a site previously developed/improved 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. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service Areas, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities, Table 5.16-E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, Table 5.16-F – Projected Water Demand, Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU including Water Reliability for 2025, RPU Master Plan, and Highgrove Water District Master Plan)</p> <p>The project will not exceed expected water supplies. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario 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). Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the insufficient water supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p> <p>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, no impact to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.</p>				
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>17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)</p> <p>The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Build-out Project level where future landfill capacity was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, no impact to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
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>17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)</p> <p>The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% diversion rate, well above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building Code requires all developments to divert 50% of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for all projects and 100% of excavated soil and land clearing debris for all non-residential projects beginning January 1, 2011. The proposed project must comply with the City’s waste disposal requirements as well as the California Green Building Code and as such would not conflict with any Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impacts related to solid waste statues will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity, Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</p> <p>Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to have less than significant impacts. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside’s history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to be less than significant.</p>				
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				
<p>18b. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)</i></p> <p>Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated; therefore, cumulative impacts of the proposed project beyond those previously considered in the GP 2025 FPEIR are less than significant.</p>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18c. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)</i></p> <p>Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology & water quality, noise, population and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic sections of this initial study and found to be less than significant for each of the above sections. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the proposed project are less than significant.</p>				

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