



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Draft Negative Declaration

1. **Case Number:** P14-0472, P14-0473, P15-0322, and P15-0321
2. **Project Title:** Planned Residential Development / TM-39534
3. **Hearing Date:** May 21, 2015
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Kyle Smith, AICP, Senior Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-5220
6. **Project Location:** an approximately 13.5 acre two-parcel vacant site, is located at on the northerly side of Grove Community Drive, between Trautwein Road and Worchester Lane, in the R-1-8500-SP – Single Family Residential and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones, in Ward 4
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** John Fitzpatrick
Ridge Crest Cardinal – Riverside, LP
353 E. Angeleno Ave, Ste A
Burbank, CA 91502
8. **General Plan Designation:** MDR (Medium Density Residential)
9. **Zoning:** R-1-8500-SP – Single Family Residential and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones
10. **Description of Project:**

Proposal by Ridge Crest Cardinal – Riverside LP to consider a Tentative Tract Map (TM-39534); a related Planned Residential Development to subdivide an approximately 13.5 acre two-parcel vacant site, into 85 single family residential lots with common open space and shared amenities; the Design Review of the plot plan and building elevations for the proposed residential planned residential development; and variances related to building setback measurements, the project site is located at on the northerly side of Grove Community Drive, between Trautwein Road and Worchester Lane, in the R-1-8500-SP – Single Family Residential and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones, in Ward 4. The project involves revisions to the “Grove Community Church Development Agreement”, to permit the proposed residential development.

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

Adjacent Existing Land Use:

North: MDR - Medium Density Residential
East: MDR - Medium Density Residential
South: MDR - Medium Density Residential
West: MDR - Medium Density Residential, and BOP – Business Office Park

Adjacent zoning:

North: R-1-7000-SP – Single Family Residential and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones
East: R-1-8500-SP – Single Family Residential and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones
South: R-1-7000-SP – Single Family Residential and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones
West: R-1-8500-SP – Single Family Residential and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones and BMP-SP - Business Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Orangecrest) Overlay Zones

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
- c. March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Plan (2014)
- d. Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated February 10, 2015
- e. Noise Existing Conditions Report and Noise Impact Analysis, Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated March 10, 2015

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

DRAFT

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

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

Signature _____

Date _____

Printed Name & Title _____

For City of Riverside



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Environmental Initial Study

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

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

DRAFT

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1a. Response: (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)</p> <p>There are no defined scenic vista potentially be impacted as a result of this project. The project will facilitate the development of a Planned Residential Development (PRD) with 85 detached single family residences. The proposed development is generally consistent with applicable development standards of the PRD provisions contained in the Zoning Code with the exception of three requested setback variances. The aesthetic view of the proposed built environment will be consistent, or conditioned to be consistent, with the <i>Citywide Design Guidelines</i>, therefore the project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista and impacts are less than significant.</p>				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1b. Response: (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)</p> <p>There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. In addition the project is not located along or within view of a scenic boulevard, parkway or special boulevard as designated by the City’s General Plan 2025 and therefore will not have any effect on any scenic resources within a scenic roadway. As well, there are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings within view of this project so no impacts to these resources are expected. With implementation of the appropriate General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with the conditions of approval, Citywide Design Guidelines , and the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, scenic resources will be protected and even enhanced. Lastly, the Zoning Code regulates location criteria, setbacks, landscaping, parking and other development standards for use and development of all properties. This project complies with a majority of these standards. Where variances are required, they can be justified based on the findings contained in the case record. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from this project will be less than significant impact.</p>				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</p> <p>The project consists of an infill project within an urbanized area completely surrounded by existing development. The project has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding area. Therefore, it will not degrade the existing visual character of the area and less than significant directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the visual character or quality of the Planning Area will occur. The project will serve to enhance the aesthetic qualities of the surrounding area by providing additional streetscape landscaping where minimal to no landscaping currently exists,</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1d. Response: (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)</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability & General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)</p> <p>The Project is located within an urbanized area. A review of Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability of the General Plan 2025 reveals that the project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance. However, it is not adjacent to or in proximity to any land classified as, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to agricultural uses.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)</p> <p>A review of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR reveals that the project site is not located within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act Preserve or under a Williamson Act Contract. Moreover, the project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not next to land zoned for agricultural use; therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</p> <p>The City of Riverside has no forestland that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data) The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones – RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data) The project site is identified as urban/built out land and therefore does not support agricultural resources or operations. The project will not result in the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. In addition, there are no agricultural resources or operations, including farmlands within proximity of the subject site. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land.</p>				
<p>3. AIR QUALITY.</p>				
<p>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)); Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated February 10, 2015) Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD’s AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TRIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.</p>				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

3b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 AMP, CalEEMod, EMFAC 2007 Model and Air Quality Analysis prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc on May 1, 2014)

An Air Quality Model was conducted using CalEEMod. The results of the air quality model showed that the proposed project would generate emissions far lower than the SCAQMD thresholds for significance for air quality emissions and it was determined to be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to ambient air quality and will not contribute to an existing air quality violation.

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS						
CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS						
Activity	Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG/VOC	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
2016 Construction Activity (unmitigated)	65.6	31.3	26.5	0.00	3.1	2.2
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Construction	75	100	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold? Y/N	N	N	N	N	N	N

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS						
OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS						
Source	Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG/VOC	NOx	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
Area	6.7	0.1	7.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
Energy	0.1	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mobile	2.9	8.3	33.8	0.1	6.0	1.7
TOTAL	9.7	9.1	41.2	0.1	6.2	1.9
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Construction	55	55	550	150	150	55
Exceeds Threshold? Y/N	N	N	N	N	N	N

The above tables compare the project emissions (short-term and long-term) to the SCAQMD daily thresholds and shows that established thresholds will not be exceeded. To ensure short term emissions are further reduced the General Plan 2025 Program required mitigation measures that have been applied to this project, MM AIR 1 – 2. Therefore, because the project will not violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and will be subject to further mitigation the impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively will be **less than significant impacts with mitigation** to ambient air quality and to contributing to an existing air quality violation.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>MM Air 1: To reduce diesel emissions associated with construction, construction contractors shall provide temporary electricity to eliminate the need for diesel powered generators, or provide evidence that electrical hook ups at construction sites are not cost effective or feasible.</p> <p>MM Air 2: To reduce construction related particulate matter air quality impacts of projects the following measures shall be required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the generation of dust shall be controlled as required by the AQMD; 2. grading activities shall cease during period of high winds (greater than 25mph); 3. trucks hauling soil, dirt or other emissive materials shall have their loads covered with a tarp or other protective cover as determined by the City Engineer; and 4. the contractor shall prepare and maintain a traffic control plan, prepared, stamped and signed by either a licensed Traffic Engineer or a Civil Engineer. The preparation of the plan shall be in accordance with Chapter 5 of the latest edition of the Caltrans Traffic Manual and the State Standard Specifications. The plan shall be submitted for approval, by the engineer, at the preconstruction meeting. Work shall not commence without an approval traffic control plan. 				
<p>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model and Air Quality Analysis prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc on May 1, 2014)</p> <p>Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants as a result of the project were previously evaluated as part of the cumulative analysis of build out anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Program. As a result, the proposed project does not result in any new significant impacts that were not previously evaluated and for which a statement of overriding considerations was adopted as part of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR. Therefore, cumulative air quality emissions impacts are less than significant.</p>				
<p>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod 2007 Model, EMFAC 2007 Model Supplemental Guidelines for AB 2588 Air Toxics "Hot Spots" and Air Quality Analysis prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc on May 1, 2014)</p> <p>Short-term impacts associated with construction from General Plan 2025 typical build out will result in increased air emissions from grading, earthmoving, and construction activities. Mitigation Measures of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR requires individual development to employ construction approaches that minimize pollutant emissions (General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM AIR 1- MM AIR 5, e.g., watering for dust control, tuning equipment, limiting truck idling times). In conformance with the General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM AIR 1 and MM AIR 7 a CalEEMod computer model analyzed short-term construction and long-term operational related impacts of the project and determined that the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for short-term construction and long-term operational impacts. Therefore, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively for this project.</p>				
<p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number</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
of people?				
<p>3e. Response: (Source: Air Quality Analysis prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc on May 1, 2014)</p> <p>While exact quantification of objectionable odors cannot be determined due to the subjective nature of what is considered “objectionable,” the nature of the residential development, associated infrastructure and related off-site improvements present a potential for the generation of objectionable odors associated with construction activities. The operation of subdivision is not typically associated with the generation of objectionable odors. However, the construction activities associated with the expected build out of the project site will generate airborne odors like diesel exhaust emissions, architectural coating applications, and on- and off-site improvement installations. However, said emissions would occur only during daylight hours, be short-term in duration, and would be isolated to the immediate vicinity of the construction site. Therefore, they would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors on a permanent basis. Therefore, the project will not cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur.</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
<p>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, Tentative Tract Map 369534 PA08-0281 by Paul A. Principe dated February 4, 2015)</p>				
<p>The project site is undeveloped. A search of the MSHCP database and other appropriate databases identified no potential for candidate, sensitive or special status species, suitable habitat for such species on site. The viable Southern Cottonwood/Willow Riparian Forest growing along the east bank of a blue line stream in the southwest portion of the site could provide habitat for candidate, sensitive or special status migratory bird species. It will be located in Open Space Lot “A”, and preserved on the site. It will become an addition to the existing wetlands preserve. Based on a number of factors, a low abundance and diversity of wildlife species was observed at the site. Factors include (1) the location of the site in a highly developed area, (2) altered physical environment at the site (the site was previously mass graded), (3) lack of viable native habitats on the majority of the site and surrounding areas, and (4) poor vegetative characteristics (i.e., species composition, stature, condition and vigor, etc.). The wildlife observed inhabiting and foraging at the site consists of common and opportunistic species that are adapted to exploit available habitats or resources in close proximity to man. There are not enough natural food sources, water resources or places to take refuge on this site to provide suitable live-in habitats for candidate, sensitive or special status species. The site is not occupied by the burrowing owl and also does not provide suitable habitat for this species. It also appears that the site is not providing suitable foraging opportunities for burrowing owls outside of the nesting season. The native soils mapped at the site do not provide required growing habitats for candidate, sensitive or special status plant species that are restricted to clay and/or saline-alkali soils. Seasonal aquatic features that could provide suitable habitats for candidate, sensitive or special status species of fairy shrimp are not present on the site.</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</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
Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
<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 and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, Tentative Tract Map 369534 PA08-0281 by Paul A. Principe dated February 4, 2015)</p>				
<p>The viable Southern Cottonwood/Willow Riparian Forest growing along the east bank of a blue line stream in the southwest portion of the site will be located in Open Space Lot “A”, and preserved on the site (100 percent avoidance). It will become an addition to the existing wetlands preserve. Remnant Southern Cottonwood/Willow Riparian Forest is present in the northwest corner of the site. The biological functions and values of Riparian/Riverine Areas only exist by definition in this portion of the site. As such, the protection of associated amphibian, bird, fish, invertebrate-crustacean, and plant species listed under ‘Purpose’ in this Section of the MSHCP is required. The project will not however result in impacts to this Riparian/Riverine Areas. Federally protected wetlands were present on the site when it was owned by the Grove Community Church. The Conditions of Approval for the original Grove Community Church project included obtaining permits and certifications from the ACOE, Santa Ana RWQCB and CDFW. The church project resulted in 0.045 acres of permanent impacts to wetlands and 1,476 linear feet of permanent impacts to wetlands (jurisdictional waters). The take of this Riparian/Riverine Area was included in those Conditions of Approval. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, ACOE Nationwide Permit No. 1999 15206-RRS, Santa Ana RWQCB Clean water Act Section 401 Water Quality Standards Certification and CDFW Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 5-005-98 were obtained. Mitigation included the dedication of 11.8 acres of wetlands and waters at the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4c. Response: (Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)</p> <p>Three agencies generally regulate activities within streams, wetlands and riparian areas in California: (1) the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) regulates activities under Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act that would result in a discharge of dredge or fill material into Waters of the United States or adjacent Wetlands and associated habitat, (2) the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Santa Ana RWQCB) regulates all activities under Section 401 of the Federal Clean Water Act that would result in a discharge of dredge or fill material into Waters of the United States or adjacent Wetlands and associated habitat and (3) the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) regulates activities within Waters of the State and wetlands under the California Fish and Game Code Sections 1600-1607 that would adversely affect wildlife habitat associated with any river, stream or lake edges. Evidence of one ephemeral drainage is still present in the western portion of the site. The majority of the banks and channel had been previously removed by grading and the construction of Grove Community Drive (previously named Siegel Avenue). Other kinds of perennial or seasonal aquatic features that could be classified as federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act are not present on the site (i.e., open waters, swamps, wet marshes, bogs, fens, vernal pools or swales, vernal pool-like ephemeral ponds, etc.). Federally protected wetlands were present on the site when it was owned by the Grove Community Church. An ephemeral drainage was present in the western portion of the site. The church project resulted in 0.045 acres of permanent impacts to wetlands and 1,476 linear feet of permanent impacts to wetlands (jurisdictional waters). The permanent impacts to wetlands (= jurisdictional waters) on this site was included in those calculations. The Conditions of Approval for the original Grove Community Church project included obtaining permits and certifications from the ACOE, Santa Ana RWQCB and CDFW. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, ACOE Nationwide Permit No. 1999 15206- RRS, Santa Ana RWQCB Clean water Act Section 401 Water Quality Standards Certification and CDFW Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 5-005-98 were obtained. Mitigation included the dedication of 11.8 acres of wetlands and waters at the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park. The current project will not result in impacts to ACOE, Santa Ana RWQCB or CDFW jurisdictional wetlands and waters. Permit authorizations or certifications from these governing regulatory agencies will not</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
be required to construct the project. Pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, the project proponent will however be required to obtain Santa Ana RWQCB certification that any water discharged from the site will comply with applicable effluent limitations and water quality and erosion control standards.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4d. Response: <i>(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, Tentative Tract Map 369534 PA08-0281 by Paul A. Principe dated February 4, 2015)</i>				
<p>The site is not providing an urban wildlife movement corridor for migrations, foraging movements or for finding a mate through this portion of Riverside. It does not connect two or more larger core habitat areas that would otherwise be fragmented or isolated from one another. It does not contain suitable cover, food or water to support species and facilitate movement within a corridor. The portion of the wetlands preserve established by the Grove Community Church that extends onto the site will be located in Open Space Lot “A”, and preserved on the site. It will become an addition to the existing wetlands preserve.</p>				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, Tentative Tract Map 369534 PA08-0281 by Paul A. Principe dated February 4, 2015)</i>				
<p>Implementation of the Project is subject to all applicable Federal, State, and local policies and regulations related to the protection of biological resources and tree preservation. In addition, the project is required to comply with Riverside Municipal Code Section 16.72.040 establishing the MSHCP mitigation fee and Section 16.40.040 establishing the Threatened and Endangered Species Fees.</p> <p>The viable Southern Cottonwood/Willow Riparian Forest growing along the east bank of a blue line stream in the southwest portion of the site. It will become an addition to the existing wetlands preserve. There are no biological resources present on the remainder of this site meeting the criteria for protection and/or preservation in any local policies or ordinances.</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"/>
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 and Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, Tentative Tract Map 369534 PA08-0281 by Paul A. Principe dated February 4, 2015)</i>				
<p>The project will not conflict with the provisions of the MSHCP: Based on the final Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) (adopted June 17, 2003), the parcel of land comprising the project site is ‘Not A Part’ of proposed Conservation Planning (MSHCP) Criteria Areas. As such, the site is not located within a Cell, designated Cell Group or Sub Unit of the Cities of Riverside and Norco Area Plan. Conservation has not then been described in the MSHCP for this parcel of land. In addition, the site is not located within or along the boundaries of Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Agency (RCA) Conserved Lands or MSHCP lands with Pre-existing Conservation Agreements. The northeast corner of the site however coincides with the southwest corner of Public/Quasi-public Conserved Lands. The site is located approximately 3.6 miles south of the most proximate MSHCP Conservation Area (Cell #719 of an Independent Cell Group of the Sycamore Canyon West Sub Unit (2) of the Cities of Riverside and Norco Area Plan). Conservation within Cell #719 will contribute to the assembly of Proposed Constrained Linkage 7 (upland Habitat in the</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>vicinity of Central Avenue. It is the only connection from Sycamore Canyon Park to Box Springs Reserve). The site then has no direct physical relationship to reserve assembly. The biological functions and values of Riparian/Riverine Areas exist in the southwest portion of the site. This area will be located in Open Space Lot "A", and be preserved (100 percent avoidance). The biological functions and values of Riparian/Riverine Areas exist by definition in the northwest corner of the site. The project will not however result in impacts to this Riparian/Riverine Area. The take of this Riparian/Riverine Area was included in the permits and certifications obtained for the original Grove Community Church project. The biological functions and values of Vernal Pools do not exist on the site. The site no longer has a relationship to existing wetland regulations. Required habitats for Narrow Endemic Plant Species are not present on the site. As stated above, the site is located approximately 3.6 miles south of the closest proposed MSHCP Conservation Planning Criteria Area. Future development at the site will not result in edge effects that will adversely affect biological resources within the MSHCP Conservation Planning Criteria Area. The project will not be subject to Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlands Interface for the treatment and management of edge factors such as lighting, urban runoff, toxics, and domestic predators as presented in Section 6.1.4 of the MSHCP. Based on Figures 6-2 (Criteria Area Species), 6-3 (Amphibian Species Survey Areas) and 6-5 (Mammal Species Survey Areas) of the MSHCP, the site is not located in an area where additional surveys are needed for certain species in conjunction with MSHCP implementation in order to achieve coverage for these species. Based on Figure 6-4 of the MSHCP, the site is located within the Burrowing Owl Survey Area. As such, an independent assessment was made of the presence of suitable burrowing owl habitats on the site and in a 150-meter buffer zone around the project boundary. The site is not occupied by the burrowing owl and also does not provide suitable and critical habitats for this species. The presence of burrows on the site does not justify conducting focused surveys in this case. The proposed project site is consistent with Species Conservation Objective 5 of the MSHCP that was developed for the burrowing owl.</p>				
<p>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</p>				
<p>Based on a review of the project site, it can be concluded that no historic resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, no impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.</p>				
<p>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5b. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study)</p>				
<p>The project is located on a previously improved site within an urbanized area that has previously been graded. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>				
<p>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)</p>				
<p>The project is located on a previously improved site within an urbanized area that has previously been graded. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>				
<p>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5d. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)</p>				
<p>The project is located on a previously improved site within an urbanized area that has previously been graded. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>Seismic activity is to be expected in Southern California. In the City of Riverside, there are no Alquist-Priolo zones. The project site does not contain any known fault lines and the potential for fault rupture or seismic shaking is low. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that no impacts related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City’s Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed project complies with California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>The project involves the construction of 85 residential units, along with residential streets, landscaping, and other ancillary activities. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iv. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code)</p> <p>The project site and its surroundings have generally flat topography and are not located in an area prone to landslides per Figure 5.6-1 of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Therefore, there will be no impact related to landslides directly, indirectly and cumulative.</p>				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code)</p> <p>Erosion and loss of topsoil could occur as a result of the project. State and Federal requirements call for the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) establishing erosion and sediment controls for construction activities. The project must also comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations. In addition, with the erosion control standards for which all development activity must comply (Title 18), the Grading Code (Title 17) also requires the implementation of measures designed to minimize soil erosion. Compliance with State and Federal requirements as well as with Titles 18 and 17 will ensure that soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be less than significant impact directly, indirectly and 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	<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																		
spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?																						
<p>6c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p>																						
<p>Compliance with the California Building Code, and the City’s existing codes and the policies contained in the General Plan 2025 help to ensure that impacts related to geologic conditions are reduced to less than significant impacts level directly, indirectly and 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: (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)</p>																						
<p>Compliance 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 will be reduced to a less than significant impact level for this project 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: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types) The proposed project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have no impact.</p>																						
<p>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</p>																						
<p>Would the project:</p>																						
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																		
<p>a. 7a. Response: (Source: Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated February 10, 2015)</p>																						
<p>Construction Emissions</p>																						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 80%;"></th> <th style="text-align: right;">CO_{2e}</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Year 2015</td> <td style="text-align: right;">532.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Year 2016</td> <td style="text-align: right;">185.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: right;">718.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Amortized</td> <td style="text-align: right;">23.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						CO _{2e}	Year 2015	532.7	Year 2016	185.8	Total	718.5	Amortized	23.9								
	CO _{2e}																					
Year 2015	532.7																					
Year 2016	185.8																					
Total	718.5																					
Amortized	23.9																					
<p>Operational Emissions</p>																						
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%; text-align: center;">Consumption Source</th> <th style="text-align: center;">MT CO₂(e) tons/year</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Area Sources</td> <td style="text-align: center;">19.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Energy Utilization</td> <td style="text-align: center;">547.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mobile Source</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,171.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Solid Waste Generation</td> <td style="text-align: center;">45.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Consumption</td> <td style="text-align: center;">73.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Annualized Construction</td> <td style="text-align: center;">23.9 (see above)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1,881.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Guideline Threshold</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Consumption Source	MT CO ₂ (e) tons/year	Area Sources	19.9	Energy Utilization	547.3	Mobile Source	1,171.0	Solid Waste Generation	45.3	Water Consumption	73.7	Annualized Construction	23.9 (see above)	Total	1,881.2	Guideline Threshold	3,500
Consumption Source	MT CO ₂ (e) tons/year																					
Area Sources	19.9																					
Energy Utilization	547.3																					
Mobile Source	1,171.0																					
Solid Waste Generation	45.3																					
Water Consumption	73.7																					
Annualized Construction	23.9 (see above)																					
Total	1,881.2																					
Guideline Threshold	3,500																					

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

Total project GHG emissions are less than the proposed significance threshold of 3,500 MT without taking credit for the previously approved site uses. The previously approved uses, consisting of senior housing, and elementary and pre-school uses, would have generated more trips than the proposed project. As seen in Table 12, mobile source emissions contributions dominate the GHG burden. The proposed project generates 809 trips as compared to the 2,069 daily trips generated by the previously approved uses. In this respect, the project is air quality positive and would generate a net of 1,260 fewer trips than those previously approved.

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the RTP, the SCAQMD’s AQMP, RTIP, and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” However, due to the size and scope of the proposed project, a Climate Change Analysis was commissioned by the applicant to determine if the project related impacts (both construction and operational) would produce GhG emissions that would have a significant direct, indirect or cumulative impact on the environment. Thus, a **less than significant impact** is expected directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

a. **7b. Response:** (Source: Air Quality and GHG Impact Analyses Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated February 10, 2015)

Construction Emissions

	CO_{2e}
Year 2015	532.7
Year 2016	185.8
Total	718.5
Amortized	23.9

Operational Emissions

Consumption Source	MT CO₂(e) tons/year
Area Sources	19.9
Energy Utilization	547.3
Mobile Source	1,171.0
Solid Waste Generation	45.3
Water Consumption	73.7
Annualized Construction	23.9 (see above)
Total	1,881.2
Guideline Threshold	3,500

Total project GHG emissions are less than the proposed significance threshold of 3,500 MT without taking credit for the previously approved site uses. The previously approved uses, consisting of senior housing, and elementary and pre-school uses, would have generated more trips than the proposed project. As seen in Table 12, mobile source emissions contributions dominate the GHG burden. The proposed project generates 809 trips as compared to the 2,069 daily trips generated by the previously approved uses. In this respect, the project is air quality positive and would generate a net of 1,260 fewer trips than those previously approved.

The SCAQMD supports State, Federal and international policies to reduce levels of ozone depleting gases through its Global

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Warming Policy and rules and has established an interim Greenhouse Gas (GhG) threshold. As indicated in Question A, above, the project would comply with the City’s General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GhG emissions. In addition, the project would comply with all SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations during construction of the operational phase and will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing GhG emission to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Based upon the prepared Climate Change Analysis for this project and the discussion above, the project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction in the emissions of GhG and thus a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively in this regard.</p>				
<p>8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p>	<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 as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i></p>				
<p>The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material because the use is a residential subdivision. As such, the project will have no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<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?</p>	<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 as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i></p>				
<p>The proposed project does not involve the use of any hazardous materials. As such the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively for creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</p>				
<p>c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</i></p>				
<p>The proposed project does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school because the proposed use is a residential subdivision. There are two public educational institutions that are longer than ¼ mile but within a ½ mile of the project site: JFK Elementary and Ben Franklin Elementary. Therefore, the project will have no impact regarding emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one- quarter mile of an existing or proposed school directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code</p>	<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
Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				
<p>8d. Response: (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 and Supplemental Guidelines AB 2588 Air Toxics “Hot Spots”)</p>				
<p>A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the project site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have no impact to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Plan (2014), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p>				
<p>The proposed project is located within Safety and/or Airport Compatibility Zone C2 for March ARB as noted in the Riverside County Airport Land use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP). The project was reviewed by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) under case ZAP1103MA14 and deemed to be conditionally consistent with the RCALUCP. Because the project has been found to be consistent with the RCALUCP, impacts related to hazards from airports are less than significant impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Plan (2014), and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p>				
<p>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>				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8g. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, and OEM’s Strategic Plan)</p>				
<p>The project will be served by an existing, fully improved street (Grove Community Drive). All streets have been designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments’ specifications. All adjacent streets are designed to accommodate the traffic originating from the project site. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan.</p>				
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, 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 project is located in an urbanized area where no wildlands exist and the property is no located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a VHFSZ; therefore no impact regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A)				
During the construction phase, a final approved WQMP will be required for the project, as well as coverage under the State's General Permit for Construction Activities, administered by the Santa Ana RWQCB. Storm water management measures will be required to be implemented to effectively control erosion and sedimentation and other construction-related pollutants during construction. Given compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws regulating surface water quality and the fact that the project will not result in a net increase of surface water runoff, the proposed project as designed is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.				
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"/>
9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan, WMWD Urban Water Management Plan)				
The proposed project is located within the Riverside South Water Supply Basin. This proposed project involves a residential subdivision. The project is required to connect to the City's sewer system and comply with all NPDES and WQMP requirements that will ensure the proposed project will not 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. Therefore, there will be no impact to groundwater supplies and recharge either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9c. Response: (Source: Preliminary grading plan)				
The project is subject to NPDES requirements; areas of one acre or more of disturbance are subject to preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the prevention of runoff during construction. Erosion, siltation and other possible pollutants associated with long-term implementation of projects are addressed as part of the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and grading permit process. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.				
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"/>
9d. Response: (Source: Preliminary grading plan)				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area, (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, alter the course of stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project consists of a residential subdivision. Therefore no flooding on or off-site as a result of the project will occur and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.</p>				
<p>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9e. Response: (Source: Preliminary Grading Plan)</p>				
<p>Within the scope of the project is the installation of storm water drainage system. As the storm water drainage system will be installed concurrently with the construction of this project, the storm water drainage system will be adequately sized to accommodate the drainage created by this project. The project is expected to generate the following pollutants: sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, bacteria and viruses, oil & grease, and pesticides. These expected pollutants will be treated through the incorporation of the site design, source control and treatment control measures specified in the project specific WQMP. Therefore, as the expected pollutants will be mitigated through the project site design, source control, and treatment controls already integrated into the project design, 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 a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9f. Response: (Source: Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan)</p>				
<p>The project is over one are in size and is required to have coverage under the State’s General Permit for Construction Activities (SWPPP). As stated in the Permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. Furthermore, the City has ensured that the development does not cause adverse water quality impacts, pursuant to its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit through the project’s WQMP.</p>				
<p>The proposed development will increase the amount of impervious surface area in the City. This impervious area includes paved parking areas, sidewalks, roadways, and building rooftops; all sources of runoff that may carry pollutants and therefore has the potential to degrade water quality. This development has been required to prepare preliminary BMP’s that have been reviewed and approved by Public Works. Final BMP’s will be required prior to grading permit issuance. The purpose of this requirement is to insure treatment BMP’s are installed/constructed as part of the project so that the pollutants generated by the project will be treated in perpetuity. Therefore, impacts related to degrading water quality are less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Map No. 06065C0740G, Zone X)</p>				
<p>A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0740G Effective Date August 28, 2008) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the project is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area. There will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p>				
<p>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Map No. 06065C0740G, Zone X)</p>				
<p>The project site is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0740G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and no impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and Flood Hazard Map No. 06065C0729G, Zone X)</p>				
<p>The project site is not located within a Flood Hazard Area. Therefore, there are no impacts from risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</p>				
<p>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9j. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality)</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</p>				
<p>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Physically divide an established community?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)</p>				
<p>The project involves the construction of a residential development surrounded by urbanized areas. The project is an infill project currently served by fully improved public streets and other infrastructure and does not involve the creation of streets that could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development or an established community. Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to an established community will occur.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</p>				
<p>Although the project is located within the boundaries of the MSHCP & RCALUCP it has been designed to be consistent with these plans. As well, the project is with the General Plan 2025 and it is not a project of Statewide, Regional or Areawide Significance. The proposed development is generally consistent with applicable development standards of the PRD provisions contained in the Zoning Code with the exception of three requested setback variances. Requested variances can be supported based on the findings contained in the case record. As such, this project will have a less than significant impact on the MSHCP & RCALUCP directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10c. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>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 proposed project is consistent with the guidelines of MSHCP, including Section 6.1.4, Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlife Interface and related policies in the General Plan 2025, including Policy LU-7.4. As well, the project is consistent with the SKR HCP and with General Plan Policy OS-5.3. Impacts will be less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>				
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</i></p>				
<p>The proposed project is within Mineral Resources area MRZ-3. The quarrying of mineral resources within the City Limits have not been active for decades and most extraction sites are now beyond the urban periphery. Therefore, the project as proposed will have no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively in the loss of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.</p>				
<p>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</i></p>				
<p>The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas with the City of Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is no impact.</p>				
<p>12. NOISE.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in:</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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-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, and Noise Impact Analysis, Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated March 10, 2015)</i></p>				
<p>The future development of up to 85 residential units has the potential to cause long-term increases in ambient noise levels. Accordingly, this project is outside the 60-CNEL noise contours projected by the General Plan. Additionally, the project site is located outside of the 60 dBA CNEL contour of the MARB. Aircraft operations noise from occasional flyovers can occasionally be heard. Although the aviation-related noise exposure is not expected to be more than 20 dB above the interior standard the City of Riverside may require an acoustical sound study when final site plans are available. Therefore, it is anticipated that, a less than significant impact would occur.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report and Noise Impact Analysis, Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated March 10, 2015)</p> <p>A temporary increase in noise and vibration levels may be noticed during project construction. The on-site construction equipment that will create the maximum potential vibration is a large bulldozer. The stated vibration source level in the FTA Handbook for such equipment is 81 VdB at 50 feet from the source. With typical vibrational energy spreading loss, the vibration annoyance standard second is met at 56 feet. The nearest sensitive use to the project site is more than 75 feet from any construction envelope boundary and it is not likely that large bulldozers will operate directly at the edge of property. Construction activity vibration impacts are judged as less-than significant.</p>				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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, Noise Impact Analysis, Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated March 10, 2015)</p> <p>See response to 12a, above</p>				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report and Noise Impact Analysis, Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated March 10, 2015)</p> <p>See response to 12b, above</p>				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005) Noise Impact Analysis, Orangecrest Residential Project, City of Riverside, California by Giroux & Associates dated March 10, 2015)</p> <p>Although the proposed project is located within an airport land use plan, the proposed project is not located within any of the airport noise contour areas as depicted on Figures N-8 and N-9 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025. For this reason, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to airport noise. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project	<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
area to excessive noise levels?				
<p>12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999) and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p>				
<p>Per the GP 2025 Program FPEIR, there are no private airstrips within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Because the proposed project consists of development anticipated under the General Plan 2025, is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively</p>				
<p>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</p>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG’s RCP and RTP)</p>				
<p>The project involves new residences that may directly induce population growth, and may involve additional infrastructure that could indirectly induce population growth. However, the project is consistent with the HDR land use designation established under the General Plan 2025 Program and the additional infrastructure is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program. The General Plan 2025 Final PEIR determined that Citywide, future development anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Typical scenario would not have significant population growth impacts. Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical growth scenario and population growth impacts were previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR the project does not result in new impacts beyond those previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR; therefore, the impacts will be less than significant both directly and 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: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</p> <p>The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed on vacant land that has no existing housing that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13c. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</p> <p>The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed on vacant land that has no existing housing that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
<p>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p>				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)</p>				
<p>Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by Station 11 located at 19595 Orange Terrace Parkway to serve this project. Therefore, this project will not result in the intensification of land use and there will be less than significant 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)</p> <p>Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the East Neighborhood Policing Center to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be less than significant impact on the demand for additional police facilities of services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries)</p> <p>The project is serviced by the Riverside Unified School District (RUSD). The project will be conditioned to pay fees to the school district in accordance with state law. Therefore, these impacts are viewed as less than significant.</p>				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)</p> <p>The project will introduce new residents in the area. However, since the project is a residential project consistent with the site’s zoning, the impacts to parks in the local area are viewed as less than significant.</p>				
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – Riverside Public Library Service Standards)</p> <p>Adequate public facilities and service such as libraries and communities centers and are provided in Orange Terrace Park Neighborhood to serve this project. Therefore, this project will not result in the intensification of land use and there will be no impact on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
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"/>
<p>15a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>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></p>				
<p>The General Plan 2025 analyzed the HDR – High Density Residential General Plan Land Use for this property. The project is consistent with the adopted General Plan 2025 and will pay applicable Park Development Impact Fees to the City of Riverside Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department therefore this project will have a no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>15b. Response:</p>				
<p>The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in:</p>				
<p>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16a. Response: <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 Project Trip Generation Comparison)</i></p>				
<p>The project involves the construction of 85 new residential units in six buildings and thus will result in an increase in vehicular trips onto existing local streets both during and after construction. However, the current project is a modification of a previously-approved entitlement for 76 dwelling units, an elementary school, and a pre-school. As can be seen in the following table, there is a reduction in vehicular trips for the current project compared to the prior entitlement. Since there is a reduction in traffic from what was considered previously, the project is considered to have a less than significant impact to traffic.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):			Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact			
Land Use	Quantity	Units ¹	Peak Hour						Daily
			Morning			Evening			
			Inbound	Outbound	Total	Inbound	Outbound	Total	
Trip Generation Rates									
Senior Housing		DU	0.08	0.09	0.17	0.15	0.12	0.27	3.30
Elementary School		ST	0.17	0.12	0.29	0.01	0.01	0.02	1.02
Pre-School		ST	0.43	0.38	0.81	0.40	0.46	0.86	4.52
Single-Family Detached Residential		DU	0.19	0.56	0.75	0.63	0.37	1.00	9.52
Previous Project²									
Senior Housing	76	DU	6	7	13	11	9	20	251
Elementary School	630	ST	107	76	183	6	6	12	643
Pre-School	260	ST	112	99	211	104	120	224	1,175
Subtotal			225	182	407	121	135	256	2,069
Proposed Project³									
Single-Family Detached Residential	85	DU	16	48	64	54	31	85	809
Difference			-209	-134	-343	-67	-104	-171	-1,260
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
16b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP, and Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by RK Engineering Group, Inc. on October 21, 2014)									
See response to 16a, above									
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
16c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999) and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005)									
The project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or change the location of air traffic patterns. It is not located within an airport influence area. As such, this project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on air traffic patterns.									
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible			<input type="checkbox"/>	<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
uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
<p>16d. Response: (Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans and RK Engineering Group, Inc. on October 21, 2014)</p>				
<p>The project has been designed or will be conditioned as to not cause any incompatible use or additional or any hazards to the surrounding area or general public. As such, the project will have a less than significant impact on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16e. Response: (Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code and RK Engineering Group, Inc. on October 21, 2014)</p>				
<p>The project has been developed in compliance with Title 18, Section 18.210.030 and the City's Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007); therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.</p>				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16f. Response: (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!)</p>				
<p>The project, as designed, does not create conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). As such, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.</p>				
<p>17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside's Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p>				
<p>All new development is required to comply with all provisions of the NPDES program and the City's Municipal Separate Sewer Permit (MS4), as enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB with respect to discharges to the sewer system or stormwater system within the City. Because the proposed project is required to adhere to the above regulations related to wastewater treatment the project will have a less than significant impact.</p>				
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, 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 & Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)</p>				
<p>The project will not result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is consistent with the Typical Growth Scenario of the General Plan 2025 where future water and wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I, 5.16-J and 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</p> <p>The increase in impervious surface area resulting from construction of the 66 apartments in 9 buildings facilitated by this project will generate increased storm water flows with potential to impact drainage facilities and require the provision of additional facilities. However, the Subdivision Code (Title 18, Section 18.48.020) requires drainage fees to be paid to the City for new construction. Fees are transferred into a drainage facilities fund that is maintained by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. This Section also complies with the California Government Code (section 66483), which provides for the payment of fees for construction of drainage facilities. Fees are required to be paid as part of the conditions of approval/waiver for filing of a final map or parcel map.</p> <p>General Plan 2025 Policies PF 4.1 and PF 4.3 require the City to continue to routinely monitor its storm drain system and to fund and improve those systems as identified in the City’s Capital Improvement plan. Implementation of these policies will ensure that the City is adequately served by drainage systems. The General Plan 2025 also includes policies and programs that will minimize the environmental effects of the development of such facilities. Therefore, the project will have less than significant on existing storm water drainage facilities that would not require the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service Areas, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities, Table 5.16-E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, Table 5.16-F – Projected Water Demand, Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-H)</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"/>
<p>17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L)</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>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)				
<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 statutes 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"/>
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>Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to be less than significant. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside’s history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to be less than significant.</p>				
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)				
<p>Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated and 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"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)				
<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).

DRAFT

Staff Recommended Mitigation Measures

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party ¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Air Quality	<p>MM Air 1: To reduce diesel emissions associated with construction, construction contractors shall provide temporary electricity to the site to eliminate the need for diesel-powered electric generators, or provide evidence that electrical hook ups at construction sites are not cost effective or feasible.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits.</p>	<p>Building & Safety Division Public Works Department</p>	<p>Proof of power source to be provided from electric service provider.</p>
	<p>MM Air 2: To reduce construction related particulate matter air quality impacts of projects the following measures shall be required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the generation of dust shall be controlled as required by the AQMD; 2. grading activities shall cease during periods of high winds (greater than 25 mph); 3. trucks hauling soil, dirt or other emissive materials shall have their loads covered with a tarp or other protective cover as determined by the City Engineer; and 4. the contractor shall prepare and maintain a traffic control plan, prepared, stamped and signed by either a licensed Traffic Engineer or a Civil Engineer. The preparation of the plan shall be in accordance with Chapter 5 of the latest edition of the Caltrans Traffic Manual and the State Standard Specifications. The plan shall be submitted for approval, by the engineer, at the preconstruction meeting. Work shall not commence without an approved traffic control plan. 	<p>Prior to issuance of individual grading and/or building permit.</p> <p>The plan for traffic control shall be submitted with the grading and/or building plans.</p>	<p>Public Works Department</p>	<p>Construction Inspection.</p>

¹ All agencies are City of Riverside Departments/Divisions unless otherwise noted.

DRAFT