



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Draft Negative Declaration

WARD: 2 (proposed)

1. **Case Number:** P14-0246 (ANX), P14-1059 (GPA), P14-0901 (Pre-Zoning)
2. **Project Title:** Annexation 118: Central/Sycamore Canyon – Strata Equity
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:** David Murray, Senior Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-5773
6. **Project Location:** The annexation area is generally located at the northwest corner of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and Central Avenue, just west of the State Route 60, I-215 freeway and contiguous with the Riverside City Limits on the west. The area to be included in the General Plan and Pre-Zoning request is reflected in attachments, and includes property recently affected by I-215 freeway construction. The site is located within Section 33, Township 2 South, Range 4 West, San Bernardino Base Meridian, on the U.S.G.S. Riverside East, California, 7.5' quadrangle. The affected Assessor Parcel Number is 256-050-012.
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Eric Flodine, Director of Community Development
Strata Equity Group, Inc. Real Estate Investments
4370 La Jolla Village Dr. Suite 960
San Diego, CA 92122
8. **General Plan Designations:**

Riverside County: CR – Commercial Retail
City of Riverside (Sphere of Influence): C – Commercial
9. **Zoning:**

Riverside County: C-P-S – Scenic Highway Commercial
City of Riverside (proposed): CG – Commercial General

Description of Project:

PLANNING CASES P14-0246, P14-1059, P14-0901: Proposal by Eric Flodine of Strata Crest, LLC to consider an Annexation and accompanying Pre-Zoning and General Plan Amendment of an approximately 16.6 acres located at the northwest corner of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and Central Avenue, just west of the State Route 60, I-215 freeway. The annexation includes a vacant 9.7 acre parcel (APN 256-050-012) with an existing City of Riverside General Plan 2025 Land Use Designation of Commercial (C), and the balance of the area is within public ownership, primarily as right-of-way. The area to be included in the General Plan and Pre-Zoning request is reflected in attachments, and includes property recently affected by I-215 freeway construction. This proposal project proposal assumes the ultimate configuration of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and the disposition of residual land currently owned by Caltrans. The proposed annexation and accompanying General Plan Amendment will be a map change only, and will not change the City’s existing General Plan Land Use Designation. The proposed Pre-Zoning for the 9.7 acre parcel is Commercial General (CG), which is consistent with the existing, underlying General Plan designation.

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

	Existing Land Use	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation
Project Site	Vacant	County: CR – Commercial Retail City: C – Commercial	County: C-P-S – Scenic Highway Commercial City (proposed): CG – Commercial General
North	I-215/SR-60 freeway Open space north of freeway	HR – Hillside Residential (north of freeway)	RC – Residential Conservation (north of freeway)
East	I-215/SR-60 freeway Open space east of freeway	HR – Hillside Residential (east of freeway)	(County) A-1-1 – Light Agriculture; SP – Specific Plan Area (Gateway);
South	Open space and single-family residential	P – Park and LDR – Low Density Residential	(County) C-P-S – Scenic Highway Commercial; W-1-9 – Watercourse Conservation; R-1 – Single-Family Residential
West	Open space	OS – Open Space	RC – Residential Conservation

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

- a. Riverside County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)

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

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR
- c. Riverside County Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
- d. Cultural Resources Assessment – November 20, 2014
- e. Habitat Assessment Report, including the results of a Burrowing Owl and a Criteria Area Species Habitat Survey, Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan Consistency Analysis, and HANS Review for the previously proposed Alexan Cityscape project prepared by Michael Brandman Associates dated December 11, 2007 and approved by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority on February 12, 2008.

13. Acronyms

AICUZ -	Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study
AQMP -	Air Quality Management Plan
AUSD -	Alvord Unified School District
CEQA -	California Environmental Quality Act
CMP -	Congestion Management Plan
EIR -	Environmental Impact Report
EMWD -	Eastern Municipal Water District
EOP -	Emergency Operations Plan
FEMA -	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FPEIR -	GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
GIS -	Geographic Information System
GhG -	Green House Gas
GP 2025 -	General Plan 2025
IS -	Initial Study
LHMP -	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
MARB/MIP -	March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
MJPA-JLUS -	March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study
MSHCP -	Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MVUSD -	Moreno Valley Unified School District
NCCP -	Natural Communities Conservation Plan
OEM -	Office of Emergency Services
OPR -	Office of Planning & Research, State
PEIR -	Program Environmental Impact Report
PW -	Public Works, Riverside
RCALUC -	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
RCALUCP -	Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
RCP -	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RCTC -	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RMC -	Riverside Municipal Code
RPD -	Riverside Police Department
RPU -	Riverside Public Utilities
RTIP -	Regional Transportation Improvement Plan
RTP -	Regional Transportation Plan
RUSD -	Riverside Unified School District
SCAG -	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD -	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCH -	State Clearinghouse
SKR-HCP -	Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan
SWPPP -	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
USGS -	United States Geologic Survey
WMWD -	Western Municipal Water District
WQMP -	Water Quality Management Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

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

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

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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>The physical presence of the hillside and open space areas near the annexation area represent a significant scenic vista and create a visual backdrop for the City of Riverside. However, neither a jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City, nor the pre-zoning, will have a direct negative impact on the scenic vista. Indirectly, the existing General Plan land use designation and the pre-zoning of the vacant site will facilitate future development of the site. However, the existing land use and zoning under the County would also currently facilitate a comparable development. Application of the City’s ordinances will ensure that the scenic vista will be developed in an environmentally and aesthetically sensitive manner.</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)</p> <p>There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. In addition the proposed 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.</p> <p>The annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements, therefore the proposal will not substantially damage a scenic resource. The site has largely been disturbed with evidence of significant grading. The proposed CG –Commercial Zone is consistent with the existing General Plan Land Use Designation of C – Commercial and is largely equivalent to the existing Riverside County Zoning of C-P-S – Scenic Highway Commercial. The proposed annexation and pre-zoning, therefore, do not facilitate any development beyond what is already facilitated, nor that which has already been analyzed under the General Plan 2025 FPEIR. There are no trees nor significant rock outcroppings on the site. Implementation of the Zoning Code and Grading Ordinance in the design of any future development will ensure that surrounding scenic resources and open space areas will be protected.</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 jurisdictional transfer (Annexation) from the County to the City, and the Pre-Zoning, will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. Annexation of the single parcel and adjoin right-of-way into the City of Riverside along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements, therefore it will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or its surroundings. The Commercial general (CG) zone was determined to be the most appropriate zone for the privately-owned property based on the proximity to the freeway exit/entrance and the underlying, existing General Plan Land use designation of Commercial (C). Future development of the site will be subject to meeting the standards of the Zoning Code, grading Ordinance, and a Design Review by the City of Riverside Planning Division.</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>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City, or the Pre-Zoning will not create a negative aesthetic effect on the views in the area. Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements, therefore will not create a new source of substantial light or glare. Subsequent developments will be subject to further environmental reviews based on site-specific potential impacts, and the details of the proposal submitted at the time, which is currently unknown. Future environmental review may include, but are not limited to, requiring a photometric study to demonstrate that light incursions would be minimized to the extent possible.</p>				
<p>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</p>				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability & General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)</i></p>				
<p>The project site is designated as urban-built up land by the California Department of Conservation. The subject site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland). As such the project site has not been utilized for agricultural resources or operations within the recent past. Further, the surrounding area has been developed with residential uses and has been impacted by previous grading on-site, as well as recent Caltrans activity both on- and off-site, due to the widening of I-215/SR 60 interchange and relocation of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. Therefore, use of the subject site for agricultural resources and/or operations would not be appropriate. No Williamson Act contracts occur on the subject site, nor do any contracts occur within one-half mile of the subject site. The subject site currently has a General Plan 2025 land use designation of Commercial (C) and is also designated as Commercial Retail by the County of Riverside's General Plan. Both the current City of Riverside and the County of Riverside land use designations are incompatible with agricultural uses.</p> <p>Annexation of the private parcel into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements as a result of the jurisdictional transfer. Therefore, the proposed project will not 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, will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, nor an existing Williamson Act contract. In addition, the project does not involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, would result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. Therefore no impact will occur.</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: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)</i></p>				
<p>The Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements. Therefore it does not conflict with any existing Williamson Act contracts, as no Williamson Act contracts occur on the subject site, nor do any contracts occur within one-half mile of the subject site.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See response 2a above.				
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2c. Response: <i>(Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</i> 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 proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning project, directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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"/>
2d. Response: <i>(Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</i> 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 proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning, project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
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"/>
2e. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, and GIS Map – Forest Data)</i> Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements as a result of the jurisdictional transfer, therefore 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 proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning, directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land. See response 2a above.				
3. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3a. Response: <i>(Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP))</i> A jurisdictional transfer of an area through annexation from the County to a City will not affect air quality. Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements as a result of the jurisdictional transfer, therefore it will not conflict with established air quality standards. The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the SCAB into compliance with all Federal and State air quality standards. The City of Riverside is located within the Riverside County sub region of the SCAG projections. The General Plan 2025 FPEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan 2025 would generally meet attainment forecasts and attainment of the standards of the AQMP. The General Plan 2025 contains policies to promote mixed use, pedestrian-friendly communities that serve to reduce air pollutant emissions over time, and this Annexation and Pre-Zoning is consistent with these policies. Because the				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
proposal is consistent with the existing General Plan 2025 land use designation of Commercial (C), and as a result also consistent with the 2007 AQMP, the proposed project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan – AQMP and therefore this project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 AQMP)</i></p> <p>the jurisdictional transfer of an area through annexation from the County to a City will not affect air quality. Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements as a result of the jurisdictional transfer; therefore it will not conflict with established air quality standards. The project will not result in the violation of any ambient air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because the project is proposed does not involve construction, grading or earthmoving activities. As such, the proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to ambient air quality or contribute to an existing air quality violation.</p>				
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan)</i></p> <p>Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements as a result of the jurisdictional transfer; therefore the project will not exceed any air quality standards.</p>				
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan)</i></p> <p>Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements as a result of the jurisdictional transfer, therefore the Annexation and Pre-Zoning will not expose sensitive receptors to potential hazards.</p>				
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3e. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR)</i></p> <p>Annexation into the City of Riverside, along with the Pre-Zoning, does not authorize the disturbance of land or the construction of any improvements as a result of the jurisdictional transfer, therefore the project will not create any objectionable odors.</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or	<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>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>				
<p>4a. Response: <i>(Source: Western Riverside County MSHCP, 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; California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB); Federal Endangered Species Act; California Endangered Species Act (CESA); Michael Brandman Associates, Alexan Cityscape PRD P06-0845 and DR P06-0846 Habitat Assessment (Burrowing Owl and Criteria Area Species), MSHCP Consistency Analysis, and HANS Review, December 11, 2007, Thomas Leslie Corporation, Habitat Assessment Report, February 13, 2006)</i></p> <p>Resolution No. 20539 adopted by the Riverside City Council on September 23, 2003 establishes the procedures and requirements for implementation of the Western Riverside Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP). Within this resolution, the City of Riverside elected to exempt the adoption or amendment of the City’s General Plan and the adoption or amendment of any land use or zoning ordinance, from the applicability of the MSHCP. As a result, the Annexation action, including the related Pre-Zoning, is exempt from MSHCP compliance requirements.</p> <p>Although the Annexation and Pre-Zoning activity is exempt from MSHCP review, the entire project site is located inside the Western Riverside County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Criteria Cell #721. Therefore, a future development proposal, which is currently unknown, must comply with the <i>Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines</i> and the Habitat Evaluation and Acquisition Negotiation Strategy (HANS) process. This requirement applies regardless of whether a future development occurs within the City or County, and therefore the Annexation and Pre-Zoning has no substantial effect on any identified candidate, sensitive or special status species.</p> <p>Furthermore, there was a previous effort in 2008 that included an annexation, General Plan Amendment and an accompanying residential development proposal that was subject to review by the Western Riverside County Regional Conservation Authority (RCA). The project applicant at that time prepared a Habitat Assessment, MSHCP Consistency Analysis and HANS Review which was evaluated by the City of Riverside and found to be consistent with the MSHCP. This determination together with the related biological studies was circulated to the Regional Conservation Authority (RCA) in January 2008. RCA concurred with the City’s determination on February 12, 2008.</p> <p>The proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning, will have no impact or 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>				
<p>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools)</i></p> <p>The proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning, will have no impact or substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>There currently is no development project associated with the proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning, and any future development proposal would be subject environmental review at the time it is submitted. This proposed jurisdictional transfer from the County to the City, with no substantial change in Land Use designation or Zoning, does not in itself generate any physical change or potential impacts that may otherwise be associated with a future and currently unknown development project.</p>				
<p>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4c. Response: <i>(Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)</i></p> <p>The project is located within an urbanized area where no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) exist on site or within proximity to the project site. The project site does not contain any discernible drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils and thus does not include USACOE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p> <p>Furthermore, there currently is no development project associated with the proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning, and any future development proposal would be subject environmental review at the time it is submitted. This proposed jurisdictional transfer from the County to the City, with no substantial change in Land Use designation or Zoning, does not in itself generate any physical change or potential impacts that may otherwise be associated with a future and currently unknown development project.</p> <p>See response 4a above.</p>				
<p>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4d. Response: <i>(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage)</i></p> <p>The proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning will have no impact or 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. This proposed jurisdictional transfer from the County to the City, with no substantial change in Land Use designation or Zoning, does not in itself generate any physical change or potential impacts that may otherwise be associated with a future and currently unknown development project.</p> <p>See response 4a above.</p>				
<p>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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</i></p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Policy Manual)</i></p> <p>The proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. This proposed jurisdictional transfer from the County to the City, with no substantial change in Land Use designation or Zoning, does not in itself generate any physical change or potential impacts that may otherwise be associated with a future and currently unknown development project.</p> <p>See response 4a above.</p>				
<p>f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4f. Response: <i>(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan, Lake Mathews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, and El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan)</i></p> <p>The proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. This proposed jurisdictional transfer from the County to the City, with no substantial change in Land Use designation or Zoning, does not in itself generate any physical change or potential impacts that may otherwise be associated with a future and currently unknown development project.</p> <p>See response 4a above.</p>				
<p>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5a. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, and Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by BCR Consulting LLC on November 20, 2014)</i></p> <p>The project site is located outside of all identified Historic District, Potential Historic Districts, and Neighborhood Conservation Areas. A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City and the proposed zoning will not cause any physical changes to any historical resources. Furthermore, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on historic resources. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be subject to further environmental reviews based on site-specific potential impacts.</p>				
<p>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5b. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study and Cultural Resources Assessment prepared by BCR Consulting LLC on November 20, 2014)</i></p> <p>Based on the Archaeological Sensitivity Map included in the General Plan FPEIR, the site is in an “Unknown” area of sensitivity. A Phase I Archaeological Assessment of the project site was conducted on November 3, 2014 by BCR</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Consulting, LLC. The evaluation process was conducted to determine whether any archaeological or historical cultural resources are present within the project area that would be affected by the proposed project, and whether these resources are significant according to federal, state, or local criteria. The survey was conducted by walking parallel transects spaced approximately 15 meters apart across 100 percent of the subject property. Soil exposures were carefully inspected for evidence of cultural resources. Boulders were also carefully inspected for evidence of prehistoric cultural utility, including indications for milling, rock art or shelter.</p> <p>During the field survey, BCR Consulting archaeologists did not record any cultural resources within the subject property boundaries. Careful inspection of the two areas that formerly contained the resources designated P-33-6002 and 6003 in previously completed surveys failed to yield any remaining evidence of either resource. The entire eastern portion of the subject property has been subject to grading activities that have completely altered the native landscape. These activities have destroyed both resources. BCR Consulting did relocate the prehistoric milling slick site previously designated P-33-1194, but careful site plotting using hand-held Global Positioning Systems (GPS) and aerial photo review has shown that this resource is adjacent to, but clearly outside, the subject property's western boundary.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the lack of archeological resources identified within the most recent survey, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures. A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City and the proposed zoning will not cause any physical changes to any archeological resources. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on archeological resources. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be subject to further environmental reviews based on site-specific potential impacts.</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: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)</i></p> <p>The project site is located outside of all known paleontological sites. Those areas designated with an unknown sensitivity level are those areas that were urbanized during the early and mid-1900s where the current environmental conditions may not reflect the original environmental conditions. Areas classified as unknown may contain buried paleontological deposits dating to the City's prehistoric and historical periods and it is possible that potentially significant prehistoric remains could be found, since buried artifacts often go undetected during a walkover survey. However, much of the eastern portion of the site has been altered by previous grading and excavation activities and it is therefore very unlikely that such artifacts would be found on the site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would create a potential for disturbance of paleontological resources or site or unique geologic features. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly or indirectly on a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be subject to further environmental reviews based on site-specific potential impacts.</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: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)</i></p> <p>There are no known cemeteries within the project area or within a two-mile radius of the project site. Furthermore, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would create a potential for disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly or indirectly on any human remains. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be subject to further environmental reviews based on site-specific potential impacts.</p> <p>Future development will also be bound by the following requirements that if human remains are found during the</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
excavation, the Native American Graves Protection Act Guidelines and State law require that construction personnel: halt work in the immediate area; leave the remains in place; contact the Manager the City Historic Preservation Officer, and the Riverside County Coroner. Until a representative from the Coroner’s office reviews the remains in the field, they must not be removed. If the Coroner determines that the remains are prehistoric, the Coroner contacts the Native American Heritage Commission and the most likely descendent from the Native American community is informed. The final disposition of remains is coordinated by representatives of the property owner and the most likely descendent and perhaps assisted by the City’s Historic Preservation Officer and/or the project archaeologist. As the Native American Graves Protection Act Guidelines and State Law are in place, the project will have a less than significant impact to potential human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.				
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>6a.i. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></p> <p>There are no known Alquist Priolo Fault Zones within the City and the City’s Sphere of Influence. However, as part of their General Plan update, the County of Riverside has mapped a fault line south of the annexation area. The existing fault line, as depicted in the County of Riverside Highgrove Area Plan, has experienced several earthquakes of moderate magnitude on the Richter Scale since records have been kept. The primary seismic hazards that result are ground-shaking and the potential for ground rupture along the surface trace of the fault. Secondary seismic hazards resulting from the interaction of ground shaking with existing soil and bedrock conditions include liquefaction, settlement, and landslides. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that no impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p> <p>Furthermore, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would expose people or structures to adverse effects related to seismic activity. Therefore, the project will have no impacts.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6a.ii. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></p> <p>The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City’s Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. However, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would expose people or structures to adverse effects related to seismic activity. Therefore the annexation and pre-zoning will have no impact related to seismic activity. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be required to comply with California Building Code (CBC) regulations to meet seismic safety standards.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iii. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</i></p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
See Responses <i>6a.i.</i> and <i>6a.ii.</i> The annexation project area has some areas of low to moderate liquefaction. Upon annexation, any new construction in these areas will be required to mitigate for this occurrence in compliance with the CBC, as adopted by the City of Riverside.				
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 annexation area includes areas with steep slopes that may be vulnerable to landslides; however, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures. A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City and the proposed pre-zoning will have no impact to the potential risk for injury or loss associated with landslides. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for compliance with the City’s Grading Code (Title 17) and the CBC, as adopted by the City of Riverside.</p>				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6b. Response: (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>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would result in soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. As such, the project will have no impact resulting in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for compliance with the City’s Grading Code (Title 17).</p>				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6c. Response: (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>The project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable and will not cause soil to become unstable, as the project does not involve development, grading activities, or structures. As such, the project will have no impact resulting in a geologic unit or soil becoming unstable resulting in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</p>				
<p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in substantial risks to life or property due to expansive soils either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for compliance with the City’s Grading Code (Title 17).</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"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>6e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)</p>				
<p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would require a septic tank or alternative waste water disposal system. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting from soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Any future development of the site will be required to connect to the nearest existing sewer system.</p>				
<p>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>7a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR pages 5.3-1 – pages 5.3-54)</p>				
<p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly. There is no proposal for any such construction or ground disturbance that will result in a net increase in GhG emissions. As such, the annexation and pre-zoning will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Therefore, this project will have no impact with respect to GhG emissions.</p>				
<p>Furthermore, the annexation and pre-zoning are consistent with the underlying General Plan 2025 Land Use Designation. The impact of buildout of the City’s General Plan 2025 related to GhGs was analyzed in the Final PEIR on pages 5.3-1 – pages 5.3-54, and was addressed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the General Plan. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.3, this impact need not be analyzed further, because (1) the proposed project would result in an impact that was previously analyzed in the Final PEIR, which was certified by the City; (2) the proposed project would not result in any GhG impacts that were not addressed in the Final PEIR; (3) no substantial new information shows that impacts of the project will be more significant that described in the Final PEIR; and (4) the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025.</p>				
<p>Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for compliance with the General Plan 2025 and will be analyzed for all potential impacts related to GhG emissions.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7b. Response:</p> <p>Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG's modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD's AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) which are consistent with the General Plan 2025 "Typical Growth Scenario." Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.</p>				
<p>8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</p>				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM's Strategic Plan)</i></p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and as such does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material. Therefore, the project will have no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for potential hazards related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>				
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7 A – D, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, City of Riverside's EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM's Strategic)</i></p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and as such 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. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for potential hazards to the public or the environment involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</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?	<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)</i></p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and as such does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school (the site is approximately 0.56 miles from Riverside STEM Academy.) Therefore, the project will have no impact regarding emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8d. Response: (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)</p> <p>A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the project site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have no impact to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/ Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2014))</p> <p>The subject property is located in excess of five miles east of the Riverside Municipal Runway and is located outside of the Riverside Municipal Airport influence area, as established by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. The proposed project was reviewed by ALUC in December 2014. ALUC determined that the project site is located within Compatibility Zone E of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area based on the current ALUCP. The site is approximately 23,000 feet (4.35 miles) northwest of Runway 16/34. The site is located outside of the 60 CNEL contour. The elevation of the site is 1,397 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and the height of the closest runway point is 1,535 feet AMSL. The ALUC determined that as the project is consistent with the ALUCP will have no impact on the airport operations or result in a safety hazard for people.</p>				
<p>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP)</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 safety hazards related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>	<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>Upon annexation the project area will be incorporated into the City’s Hazard Mitigation Plan and emergency response, evacuation and disaster plans. This annexation will not interfere with the current and ongoing implementation of these</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>emergency-related plans. The City of Riverside has developed an extensive Emergency Operations Plan, created by the Emergency Management Office. The City’s Fire Department promotes a high level of multi-jurisdictional cooperation and communication for emergency planning and response management through activation of the SEMS. The General Plan also provides policies to identify methods of implementing the emergency plan. Upon annexation the project area will be incorporated into the City’s Hazard Mitigation Plan and emergency response, evacuation and disaster plans. This annexation will not interfere with the current and ongoing implementation of these emergency-related plans. With continued use of the SEMS and implementation of general plan policies enforcing compliance with the Emergency Operations Plan, impacts to emergency response plans will be less than significant.</p>				
<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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8h. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002, Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i></p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. However, the northern portion of the site is located within an area designated as a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) as designated by CalFire. Upon annexation the City of Riverside Fire Department will assume fire suppression responsibilities of the project site, however the VHFSZ designation will not change as a result.</p> <p>Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for potential wildfire hazards and will be subject to Title 19 (Zoning Code), Title 18 (Subdivision Code) and the City’s Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007) to ensure minimum street widths and vegetation clear zones are established and maintained. Additionally, any future construction shall be subject to Section 51182 of the California Government Code includes requirements and standards for fuel modification zones and firebreaks near structures in VHFSZ areas within Local Responsibility Areas. Furthermore, the California Building Code, as adopted by the City of Riverside, includes requirements and standards related to appropriate exterior materials and construction methods for properties susceptible to wildfire exposure (Chapter 7A). As well, the City requires fire sprinklers for all new habitable structures per Title 16 of the City’s Municipal Code. Therefore, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies and strict adherence to the California Government Code, the Building Code, and local regulations, the City of Riverside the risk of wildfire hazards to people and property are less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9a. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water)</i></p> <p>The proposed project is located within the Santa Ana River Watershed. The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning of the undeveloped property will not directly or indirectly result in physical alterations to the project site (i.e. grading, ground disturbance, structure or paving) that would have any effect on water quality or be affected by water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge. Any future development or physical alteration of the site will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for potential impacts to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</p>				
<p>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the</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
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)?				
<p>9b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan, WMWD Urban Water Management Plan)</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning will not affect changes in the quantity of ground waters. Any future development will be required to connect to a domestic water system and therefore, will not involve changes to either direct withdrawal or recharge of groundwater, nor does it alter the underlying aquifer. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to groundwater supplies.</p>				
<p>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9c. Response:</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and, as such, will not directly or indirectly alter the existing drainage patterns of the site nor will it result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.</p> <p>Any future development will be evaluated on a case by case basis and shall be subject to NPDES requirements, including the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the prevention of runoff during construction for areas of one acre or more of disturbance. Erosion, siltation and other possible pollutants associated with long-term implementation of projects would be addressed as part of a project-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and through the grading permit process.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9d. Response:</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and, as such, will not directly or indirectly alter the existing drainage pattern of the site nor will it alter the course of a stream or river, nor increase runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.</p> <p>Any future development will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and shall be required to submit grading plans designed and constructed to City of Riverside Public Works Department specifications to ensure that adequate drainage is provided.</p>				
<p>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9e. Response:</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and, as such, will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
physical alteration of the site or surrounding area that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the project will not create or contribute runoff water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9f. Response:</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and, as such, will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area that would create or contribute runoff water which would substantially degrade water quality. Therefore, the project will not degrade water quality and there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9g. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps)</i></p> <p>A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Maps (Map Numbers 06065C0729G and 06065C0733G Effective Date August 28, 2088) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the project is, 1) not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area and/or 2) the project does not involve the construction of housing. There will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p>				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9h. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps)</i></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 Maps (Map Numbers 06065C0729G and 06065C0733G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Furthermore, the jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures and, as such, will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and therefore, no impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9i. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps)</i></p> <p>See response 9g above.</p>				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9j. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality)</i></p> <p>Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, no impacts due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Additionally, there are no open bodies of water that would be subject to seiche hazards within the vicinity of the subject site.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)</i></p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. Additionally, the site is bordered on three sides by existing public streets: Sycamore Canyon Boulevard to the north and east, and Central Avenue to the south. No new public streets are proposed that would further divide the block the project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on physically dividing an existing community.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>The proposed CG –Commercial Zone is consistent with the existing General Plan 2025 Land Use Designation of C – Commercial and is largely equivalent to the existing Riverside County Zoning of C-P-S – Scenic Highway Commercial and the Riverside County General Plan land use designation of CR – Commercial Retail. Upon annexation, the project site will be located within an urbanized area of the City of Riverside. The City of Riverside is governed by the provisions of the General Plan and Municipal Code. The project site is not located within a specific plan area, and is located in excess of 50 miles from the nearest local coastal program area. As such, there are no such Specific Plan or Coastal Program provisions applicable to the project.</p> <p>Although the project is located within the boundaries of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area based on the current ALUCP, the Riverside County ALUC determined that the project is consistent with the ALUCP and will have no impact on the airport operations or result in a safety hazard for people.</p> <p>For these reasons, this project will have no impact on an applicable land use plan, policy or regulation directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 – Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</i></p> <p>The proposed Annexation and Pre-Zoning will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. This proposed jurisdictional transfer from the County to the City, with no substantial change in Land Use designation or Zoning, does not in itself generate any physical change or potential impacts that may otherwise be associated with a future and currently unknown development project.</p> <p>See responses in Section 4, above, for a more detailed response.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</i></p> <p>The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources or grading activity. The formational material that underlies the project site is the MRZ-3 formation. This formation does not contain recoverable mineral resources or economic value. The loss of known mineral resources valuable locally or regionally would not occur as a result of the annexation and pre-zoning, and no further analysis is required. Therefore, the project will have no impact on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11b. Response: <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 or Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is no impact.</p>				
12. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<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-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, Title 7 – Noise Code)</i></p> <p>A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City and the pre-zoning designations does not involve uses or activities that would increase ambient noise levels, nor will the annexation generate or expose people to noise. This proposed annexation does not authorize the construction or operation of new structures or facilities nor the disturbance of land. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of established City standards either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, Title 7 – Noise Code)</i></p> <p>A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City and the pre-zoning designations does not involve uses or activities that would increase groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, nor will the annexation generate or expose people to vibration or noise. This proposed annexation does not authorize the construction or operation of new structures or facilities nor the disturbance of land. Therefore, the project will have no impact on the exposure of persons to or the generation of vibration or noise levels in excess of established City standards either directly, indirectly or</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
cumulatively.				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p> <p>A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City and the pre-zoning designations does not involve uses or activities that would result in a substantial permanent increase ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. This proposed annexation does not authorize the construction or operation of new structures or facilities nor the disturbance of land. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</p> <p>A jurisdictional transfer of the annexation area from the County to the City and the pre-zoning designations does not involve uses or activities that would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. This proposed annexation does not authorize the construction or operation of new structures or facilities nor the disturbance of land. Therefore, no impact to temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity will occur due to the project either 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/ Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2014))</p> <p>The project site is located approximately 5.77 miles east of the Riverside Municipal Airport influence area and in excess of 4.5 miles southeast of the Flabob Airport influence area as established by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. The subject property is located in excess of three miles northwest of March Air Reserve Base and as such in located within the March Air Reserve Base influence area. The annexation and pre-zoning of the property will be consistent with the City of Riverside General Plan 2025. The proposed project was reviewed by ALUC in The proposed project was reviewed by ALUC in December 2014. ALUC determined that the project site is located within Compatibility Zone E of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area based on the current ALUCP. The site is approximately 23,000 feet (4.35 miles) northwest of Runway 16/34. The site is located outside of the 60 CNEL contour. The elevation of the site is 1,397 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and the height of the closest runway point is 1,535 feet AMSL. The ALUC determined that as the project is consistent with the ALUCP and will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to airport noise. Additionally, this proposed annexation does not authorize the construction or operation of new structures or facilities nor the disturbance of land. Therefore, the project will have no impact on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p align="center"><i>Base/ Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (2014)</i></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>				
<p>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG’s RCP and RTP)</i></p> <p>The annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of new homes or businesses that would directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth. Therefore, this project will have no impact on population growth either directly or indirectly.</p>				
<p>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13b. Response: <i>(Source: CADME 2012 Aerial Layer, site visit, Google imaging)</i></p> <p>The project site is currently vacant and void of any existing housing. The demolition of existing single-family residences is not proposed as part of the jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning. Therefore, there will be no impact on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13c. Response: <i>(Source: CADME 2012 Aerial Layer, site visit, Google imaging)</i></p> <p>The project site is currently vacant and void of any existing housing or residents. The demolition of existing single-family residences is not proposed as part of the jurisdictional transfer associated with the annexation and pre-zoning. Therefore, there will be no impact on people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p>				
<p>a. Fire protection?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14a. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)</i></p> <p>The City of Riverside Department (RFD) operates 14 fire stations throughout the City. The project site is located less than one mile of Fire Station 14 (Sycamore Canyon Station), located at 725 Central Avenue. The average time for on-site</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>response to fire calls is under 6 minutes. The fire department currently serves the areas to the west of the project site and also provides fire protection response through a mutual aid agreement for unincorporated areas adjacent to, and in close proximity to, the City of Riverside. Upon completion of the annexation, fire protection would be assumed by the City of Riverside Fire Department from the CalFire under contract with the County of Riverside. Although there would be an incremental increase in the Fire Station service areas, no additional facilities or personnel would be required to fully accommodate the annexation area.</p>				
<p>b. Police protection?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)</i></p> <p>The Riverside County Sheriff’s Department currently provides primary law enforcement to the annexation area, however the City and County jointly maintain a mutual aid agreement and share responsibility for responding to calls for emergency services. Upon annexation Primary police protection would change from Riverside County Sheriff to the Riverside Police Department. Because the City currently assumes response activities in the general area surrounding and including the annexation area through mutual aid, the proposed annexation would not substantially alter the demand for police services. Furthermore, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize construction or intensification of land use that would result in an increased demand for additional police services or facilities either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Schools?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14c. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries)</i></p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer of the land from the County to City will not result in any changes to school districts. Additionally, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize construction or addition of any housing units that would increase numbers of school age children. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Parks?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)</i></p> <p>Upon annexation, the City of Riverside Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Department would assume provision of park and recreation services. However, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of new housing units that would increase the population. Therefore, there will be no demand for additional park facilities or services as a result of the annexation.</p>				
<p>e. Other public facilities?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14e. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – Riverside Public Library Service Standards)</i></p> <p>The City of Riverside can adequately assume the provision of all service functions affected by this jurisdictional change. Additionally, the annexation and pre-zoning do not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of new housing units that would result in the demand for additional public facilities or services 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
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: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)</i></p> <p>The project will not result in an intensification of land use and therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional recreational facilities either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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>				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.				
<p>Would the project result in:</p>				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP)</i></p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the Annexation and Pre-Zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would generate or impact traffic, therefore no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the capacity of the existing circulation system will occur.</p>				
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other	<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
standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
<p>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)</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the Annexation and Pre-Zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would generate or impact traffic; therefore, there is no impact either directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the CMP.</p>				
<p>c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16c. Response: (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>The subject property is located in excess of five miles east of the Riverside Municipal Runway and is located outside of the Riverside Municipal Airport influence area, as established by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission. The proposed project was reviewed by ALUC in December 2014. ALUC determined that the project site is located within Compatibility Zone E of the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area based on the current ALUCP. The site is approximately 23,000 feet (4.35 miles) northwest of Runway 16/34. The site is located outside of the 60 CNEL contour. The elevation of the site is 1,397 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), and the height of the closest runway point is 1,535 feet AMSL. The ALUC determined that as the project is consistent with the ALUCP will have no impact on the airport operations or air traffic patterns.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16d. Response: (Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans)</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the Annexation and Pre-Zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would result in hazards due to design features such as driveways, intersection improvements, etc. As such, the project will have no impact on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16e. Response: (Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the Annexation and Pre-Zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would affect emergency access; therefore there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.</p>				
<p>f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>16f. Response: (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!)</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the Annexation and Pre-Zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would result in 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>				
<p>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p> <p>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The jurisdictional transfer associated with the Annexation and Pre-Zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would affect wastewater treatment; therefore there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to wastewater treatment.</p>				
<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?</p>	<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, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)</p> <p>The 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>				
<p>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</p> <p>The jurisdictional transfer associated with the Annexation and Pre-Zoning does not authorize the disturbance of land or the demolition, disturbance or construction of any structures that would require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the</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
project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				
<p>17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service Areas, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities, Table 5.16-E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, Table 5.16-F – Projected Water Demand, Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU including Water Reliability for 2025, RPU Master Plan)</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 t.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I and 5.16-J of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have no impact resulting in the insufficient water supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p> <p>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, no impact to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.</p>				
<p>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)</p> <p>The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Build-out Project level where future landfill capacity was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, no impact to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)</p> <p>The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% diversion rate, well above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building Code requires all developments to divert 50% of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for all projects and 100% of excavated soil and land clearing debris for all non-residential projects beginning January 1, 2011. The 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>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity, Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D)</i></p> <p>Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to be less than significant. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside’s history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to be less than significant.</p>				
<p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18b. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)</i></p> <p>Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated and therefore cumulative impacts of the proposed project beyond those previously considered in the GP 2025 FPEIR are less than significant.</p>				
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18c. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)</i></p> <p>Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology & water quality, noise, population and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic sections of this initial study and found to be less than significant for each of the above sections. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the proposed project are less than significant.</p>				

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