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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE

This 8th Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan 2025 and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report (GP FPEIR) (Albert A. Webb Associates, November 2007) (State Clearinghouse No. 2004021108) has been prepared by Michael Baker International (Michael Baker) in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Chapter 3 § 15000 et seq.), and City of Riverside CEQA Resolution No. 21106, to address minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program (as defined below), as a result of the 5th Cycle 2014-2021 update to the General Plan Housing Element chapter (2014-2021 Housing Element or Project).

State law (California Government Code (CGC) §§ 65580–65589.8) requires that jurisdictions evaluate their housing elements every eight years. The current statutory update in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region covers the planning period 2014 through 2021. The proposed 2014-2021 Housing Element (5th Cycle) represents a comprehensive update of the adopted 2006-2014 Housing Element (4th Cycle), in order to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan.

This amendment to the General Plan 2025 Program, the proposed 2014-2021 Housing Element Update Project, represents a comprehensive update of the adopted 2006-2014 Housing Element. In general, the Housing Element identifies and analyzes the existing and projected housing needs, and articulates the City’s official policies for the preservation, conservation, improvement, and production of housing within the City. It examines the City’s housing needs, as they exist today, and projects future housing needs. The Housing Element also sets forth statements of community goals, objectives, and policies concerning those needs, and includes a housing policy program that responds to current and future needs within the limitations posed by available resources. The Housing Element, which is one of 12 General Plan Elements, is comprised of three complementary documents: the Housing Technical Report, which provides background data necessary to understand the context for planning the City’s housing; the Housing Plan, which summarizes data contained in the Housing Technical Report and contains the City’s goals and policies for housing its current and future residents; and the Implementation Plan, which contains programs that will be implemented to address housing needs identified in the Housing Technical Report and Housing Plan.

1.2 BACKGROUND

CITY OF RIVERSIDE GENERAL PLAN 2025 PROGRAM AND PROGRAM EIR

The Riverside General Plan 2025 (General Plan) (Cotton/Bridges/Associates, November 2007) was adopted by Resolution No. 21536 on November 20, 2007. The City of Riverside General Plan 2025 and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report (GP FPEIR) (Albert A. Webb Associates, November 2007) (State Clearinghouse No. 2004021108) was certified by Resolution No. 21535 on November 20, 2007. The GP FPEIR includes also the City of Riverside General Plan 2025 Program Recirculated Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (GP DPEIR) (Albert A. Webb Associates, July 2007). As detailed on GP FPEIR Page 3-1, the “project” evaluated in the GP DPEIR included adoption and implementation of the following programmatic land use planning documents:
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1. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside General Plan (see GP DPEIR Figure 3-3, Conceptual Land Use Plan).
2. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside Zoning Code (City of Riverside Municipal Code (RMC) Title 19) and rezoning properties to reflect new zone names and respond to General Plan land use designation changes in focus areas City-wide.
3. Comprehensive update of the City of Riverside Subdivision Code (RMC Title 18).
4. Amendment to the City of Riverside Noise Code (RMC Title 7).
5. Adoption of the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan; (see GP DPEIR Figure 3-4, Specific Plan Areas);
6. Adoption of Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines.

Since its certification, seven Addendums to the GP FPEIR have been prepared to address the potential environmental impacts resulting from minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program; see Section 1.6, Incorporation by Reference. Addendums specifically concerning the Housing Element are as follows:

- **4th Addendum to Certified FPEIR, Adopted by Resolution No. 22437 on July 24, 2012**: The 4th Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of the 2006-2014 Housing Element.

- **6th Addendum to Certified FPEIR, Adopted by Resolution No. 22581 on October 22, 2013**: The 6th Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of implementation of the 2006-2014 Housing Element rezoning program.

**GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT**

CGC §§ 65580–65589.8 require that jurisdictions evaluate their housing elements every eight years to determine their effectiveness in achieving state and regional housing goals and objectives, and adopt an updated Housing Element reflecting the results of this evaluation.

According to CGC Code § 65583, the General Plan Housing Element is required to consist of an identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs, and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, financial resources, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing. The Housing Element is also required to identify adequate sites for housing and make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. The Housing Element is required to contain the following components, among others:

1. An assessment of housing needs and inventory of resources and constraints relevant to meeting these needs.
2. A statement of the community’s goals, quantified objectives, and policies relative to the maintenance, preservation, improvement, and development of housing.
3. A program which sets forth a schedule of actions during the planning period, each with a timeline for implementation.

**REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

The City of Riverside is one of 191 member cities to SCAG, a regional council of government. California State Housing Element law requires SCAG and other regional councils of government to determine the
existing and projected regional housing needs for persons at all income levels. SCAG is also required by law to determine each jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need in the six-county Southern California region.

SCAG’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process is performed periodically at the local level, as part of Housing Element and General Plan updates. For each jurisdiction, the RHNA quantifies the housing need by income group during specific planning periods. The current 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, which was adopted by SCAG on October 4, 2012, covers the planning period from October 15, 2013 to October 15, 2021. As shown in Table 1-1, RHNA Allocation (2014-2021), the City’s allocated share of the region’s housing need for the 2014-2021 planning period is 8,283 dwelling units (DU), including 3,338 DU in the low and very low income categories. The RHNA is used as a land use planning tool to prioritize local resource allocation and help decide how to address existing and future housing needs. The RHNA consists of two measurements: the existing housing need, which examines key Census data variables to measure ways in which the housing market is not meeting the needs of current residents; and the future housing need, which is determined by SCAG’s growth forecast and public participation process.

Table 1-1
RHNA Allocation (2014-2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (50% or less of median)</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (51% to 80% of median)</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (80% to 120% of median)</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate (&gt;120% of median)</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,283</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


CITY OF RIVERSIDE DRAFT 2014-2021 HOUSING ELEMENT

In an effort to comply with State law, the City completed a draft 2014-2021 General Plan Housing Element, which was submitted to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for review in July 2014 and April 2015. In their 2015 review, HCD concluded the draft Housing Element was not in full compliance, since the City had not yet completed Housing Element Implementation Plan Tool H-21, Rezoning Program. Since the April 2015 HCD comments, the City has identified a strategy that includes rezoning sites to meet the State law requirements. The environmental impacts associated with the 2014-2021 Housing Element Housing Implementation Plan are evaluated in a separate CEQA document, the “City of Riverside 2014 – 2021 Housing Element Housing Implementation Plan EIR” (SCH No. 2017041039). The environmental impacts associated with adoption of the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update, which constitutes the statement of the City’s housing policy and program of actions to support those policies, are evaluated in this 8th Addendum to the Certified GP FPEIR. The Project analyzed in this Addendum is limited to the City’s housing policy and program of actions to support those policies, and does not involve changes that would result in physical impacts, including land use designation changes or rezoning with potential to increase development capacities.
1.3 STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND REQUIREMENTS

CEQA Guidelines § 15164 states the following with respect to an Addendum to an EIR:

a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.

b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.

c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.

d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.

e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency’s findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

CEQA Guidelines § 15162, Subsequent EIRs and Negative Declarations, states the following with respect to Subsequent EIRs:

(a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

(1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

(2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or

(3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

(A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
(B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

(C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or

(D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

(b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.

When only some changes or additions to a previously certified EIR are necessary and none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines § 15162 are met, CEQA allows the lead agency to prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR (CEQA Guidelines § 15164(a)).

1.4 LEAD AGENCY AND DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

This 8th Addendum to the Certified GP FPEIR documents the City’s consideration of the potential environmental impacts resulting from the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of the update to the Housing Element for the current 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan. This 8th Addendum also explains and documents the City’s decision that a subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is not required.

1.5 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS FOR AN ADDENDUM

Based upon the analysis of potential environmental consequences anticipated to occur as a result of Project implementation (see Section 4.0, Environmental Checklist and Analysis), the City has determined that:

- The primary basis for the changes to the Program is to plan for population growth (as previously anticipated under the General Plan 2025), accommodate changing needs, strengthen neighborhoods, provide housing for all residents, and comply with State housing law. State housing law mandates that local governments adequately plan to meet the existing and projected housing needs of all economic segments of the community. Housing Element law requires housing elements to be updated every eight years and requires the HCD to review local housing elements for compliance with state law and report its written findings to the local government. The Project’s proposed changes involve minor technical edits and additions to the Housing Element that are necessary to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan.
The Project’s proposed changes involve minor technical edits and additions that would merely implement the Housing Element Programs and Policies, and would not result in the physical impacts associated with the Housing Element Rezoning Program. Because no new significant environmental effects or substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects would occur with Project implementation, major revisions to the GP FPEIR would not be required.

No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the 2014-2021 Housing Element is being undertaken that would result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; thus, major revisions to the GP FPEIR would not be required. The Housing Element, which is comprised of three complementary documents (the Housing Technical Report, Housing Plan, and Implementation Plan), contains the following components: Housing Needs Assessment; Constraints Analysis; Housing Resources; and Program Evaluation. The Project reaffirms the previous Housing Element, while updating to: reflect current demographic, social, and housing characteristics and existing land/housing inventories; evaluate the previous Housing Element programs to determine continued appropriateness; and provide Objectives, Policies, and Implementation Programs to address housing development, improvement, and conservation. The added data does not substantially change the GP FPEIR circumstances, but rather provides updated information that supports the Housing Element’s purpose of establishing Objectives, Policies, and Implementation Programs to address the City’s housing needs.

The new information concerning air quality and greenhouse gasses (see Section 4.0, Environmental Checklist and Analysis), which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the GP FPEIR was certified, is of substantial importance. However, the Project’s proposed changes involve minor technical edits and additions that would merely implement the Housing Element Programs and Policies, and would not result in the physical impacts associated with the Housing Element Rezoning Program. Therefore, concerning air quality and greenhouse gasses, the Project would:

- Not have any significant effects not discussed in the previous GP FPEIR;
- Not have significant effects previously examined in the GP FPEIR that would be substantially more severe than previously anticipated in the GP FPEIR;
- Not require any new mitigation measures or alternatives, including those previously found not to be feasible; and/or
- Not require any new mitigation measures or alternatives that would differ considerably from those analyzed in the GP FPEIR.

The Project’s proposed changes involve minor technical edits and additions that would not result in a new land use or increase in development intensity beyond what was considered under the Certified GP FPEIR. The proposed changes would merely implement the Housing Element Programs and Policies, and would not result in significant physical impacts. Project implementation would not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the GP FPEIR. For these reasons, although the Project necessitates some changes to the GP FPEIR, it would not satisfy any of the conditions that warrant preparation of a Subsequent EIR. Therefore, as Lead Agency, the City has determined that preparation of an Addendum is appropriate.
1.6 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

CEQA Guidelines § 15150 encourage environmental documents to incorporate by reference other documents that provide relevant data and analysis. The documents outlined below, which were utilized during preparation of this 8th Addendum to the GP FPEIR, are a matter of public record and are hereby incorporated by reference. These documents are available for review at the City of Riverside Community and Economic Development Department at 3900 Main Street, Riverside, and on the City’s website at http://www.riversideca.gov/.

- **Riverside General Plan 2025** (Cotton/Bridges/Associates, November 20, 2007) – Adopted by Resolution No. 21536 on November 20, 2007, and as amended since original adoption.

- **Riverside General Plan 2025 Implementation Plan** – Adopted November 20, 2007 and as amended since original adoption.


- **1st Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report** – Adopted by Resolution No. 21790 on February 24, 2009. The 1st Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of final settlement with the Friends of Riverside Hills.

- **2nd Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report** – Adopted by Resolution No. 21930 on November 10, 2009. The 2nd Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of the Magnolia Avenue widening, rehabilitation, and beatification project.

- **3rd Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report** – Adopted by Resolution No. 22360 on March 20, 2012. The 3rd Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of California State Assembly Bill No. 162 (AB 162), requiring minor General Plan Amendments to the Public Safety Element, Open Space and Conservation Element, and Public Facilities and Infrastructure Element. Independent of AB 162, additional sections of the Public Safety Element and the Open Space and Conservation Element also required amendments to incorporate updated information received after General Plan 2025 Program adoption.

- **4th Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report** – Adopted by Resolution No. 22437 on July 26, 2012. The 4th Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program,
as a result of the update of the Housing Element of the General Plan 2025 (Housing Element 2006-2014).

- **5th Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report** – Adopted by Resolution No. 22470 on November 13, 2012. The 5th Addendum (Case Numbers P10-0770 and P11-0594) analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of the 3rd Annual Review of the General Plan 2025 Program and General Plan Amendments.

- **6th Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report** – Adopted by Resolution No. 22581 on October 22, 2013. The 6th Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of the implementation program of the Housing Element of the General Plan 2025 (Housing Element 2006-2014).

- **7th Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report** – September 27, 2016. The 7th Addendum analyzes the minor changes to the General Plan 2025 Program, as a result of the implementation program of the Downtown Specific Plan.
2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

The City of Riverside (City) is located in western Riverside County and is bounded on the north by the unincorporated Riverside County community of Rubidoux and the cities of Jurupa Valley, Colton, and Rialto (San Bernardino County), on the south by the unincorporated Riverside County communities of Woodcrest and Mockingbird Canyon, on the east by the unincorporated Riverside County community of Highgrove and the City of Moreno Valley, and on the west by the unincorporated Riverside County community of Home Gardens and the cities of Norco and Corona; see Exhibit 2-1, Regional Vicinity Map. Regional access to the City is provided via State Route 91 (SR-91), a major regional freeway that traverses the City in an east–west orientation and Interstate 215 (I-215), an Inland Empire freeway that traverses the City’s eastern portion in a north-south orientation, respectively.

The incorporated City limits encompass approximately 81 square miles, as shown on Exhibit 2-2, Local Vicinity Map. Including the Sphere of Influence (SOI), the City’s Planning Area encompasses approximately 143 square miles and includes a broad array of land uses, ranging from high-density residential and commercial, to semi-rural to agricultural.

2.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

OVERVIEW OF 2014-2021 HOUSING ELEMENT

The proposed 5th Cycle 2014-2021 update to the General Plan Housing Element chapter (2014-2021 Housing Element or Project) represents a comprehensive update to the adopted 4th Cycle 2006-2014 Housing Element. The update is proposed to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Final Allocation Plan. The Housing Element, which is one of 12 General Plan Elements, contains the following components:

- **Housing Needs Assessment** – Contains demographic, social, and housing characteristics; current housing needs; and future housing needs due to population growth and change.

- **Constraints Analysis** – An analysis of potential constraints that affect the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for all income groups and people with disabilities.

- **Housing Resources** – An inventory of available land for housing, financial resources, and administrative capacity to manage housing programs that address the City’s housing needs.

- **Program Evaluation** – Evaluates the accomplishments of current housing programs, their success in meeting housing needs, and continued appropriateness for the present planning period.

- **Housing Plan** – Contains objectives, policies, and implementation programs to address the development, improvement, and conservation of housing in Riverside.
These components are organized into three complementary documents:

- **Housing Technical Report** – Provides the background data necessary to understand the context for planning the City’s housing.

- **Housing Plan** – Provides a synopsis of data contained in the Housing Technical Report, as a foundation for discussing the future. It also contains the City’s goals and policies for housing its current and future residents.

- **Implementation Plan** – Contains programs that will be implemented to address housing needs identified in the Housing Technical Report and Housing Plan.

In general, the Housing Element identifies and analyzes the existing and projected housing needs, and articulates the City’s official policies for the preservation, conservation, improvement, and production of housing within the City. It examines the City’s housing needs, as they exist today, and projects future housing needs. It sets forth statements of community goals, objectives, and policies concerning those needs, and includes a housing policy program that responds to current and future needs within the limitations posed by available resources.

The Housing Element includes various actions detailed in the Housing Implementation Plan, which are intended to achieve General Plan Objectives and Policies. For the Housing Element, Objectives and Policies are implemented through various actions (tools) included in the Housing Implementation Plan and specifically intended to encourage housing/neighborhood maintenance, improvement, development, and conservation. The Housing Technical Report summarizes the comments and input received from the community as a result of public outreach.

In compliance with State law requirements, the proposed 5th Cycle 2014-2021 Housing Element Update (Project) identifies and analyzes existing and projected housing needs, and articulates the City’s official policies for the preservation, conservation, improvement, and production of housing within the City.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPOSED HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATES**

The following summarizes the proposed updates and revisions to the 5th Cycle 2014-2021 Housing Element, as compared to the 4th Cycle 2006-2014 Housing Element.

**Housing Element Chapter**

**Public Outreach.** This Section was revised to describe the 5th Cycle community involvement during preparation of the Housing Element Update.

**Community Context.** This section was revised to update demographic characteristics and housing needs.

**Housing Plan.** This section was revised to update the RHNA summary, housing goals in the Quantified Objectives section, and current goals, policies, and implementation programs to address the City’s current housing needs and State mandates.
The Housing Plan reflects minor revisions/updates:

- **Neighborhood Livability Objective H-1 and Policies H-1.1 through H-1.8**: Added Policy H-1.8, *Neighborhood Livability*, as follows: “Enhance and preserve the character and neighborhood livability of existing single-family neighborhoods in proximity to major college campuses while working with college campuses to identify affordable housing options for students on and off campus.” No changes were made to Objective H-1 or Policies H-1.1 through H-1.7.

- **Housing Diversity Objective H-2 and Policies H-2.1 through H-2.7**: No changes to Objective or Policies.

- **Housing Assistance Objective H-3 and Policies H-3.1 through H-3.7**: No changes to Objective or Policies.

- **Housing Assistance Objective H-4 and Policies H-4.1 through H-4.6**: No changes to Objective or Policies.

**Housing Element Technical Report Chapter**

**Introduction.** Non-substantive and editorial changes were made to this Section.

**Housing Needs Assessment.** Updates were made to this Section concerning demographic, economic, and housing characteristics, special needs, housing needs, and housing preservation, including updates to Housing Element Table H-27, *Inventory of Publicly Assisted Multi-Family Housing*.

**Housing Constraints.** This section was updated to reflect current housing development fees and land use regulations.

**Housing Production.** This Section is completely revised to reflect the 2006-2014 unaccommodated RHNA need, combined 4th and 5th Cycles RHNA need, and capacity to meet the RHNA with projects in the pipeline and sites currently zoned to meet the need. This Section includes a completely new Rezoning Program. This Section also includes minor updates to the Financing and Administrative Resources discussion, including removal of the Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside and Neighborhood Stabilization Program discussions.

**Community Outreach.** This Section was revised to describe, in greater detail than in the Housing Element Chapter, the 5th Cycle community involvement during preparation of the Housing Element Update.

**New Technical Report Appendices.** New Housing Technical Report Appendices have been created as follows:

- **New Appendix A, 2006-2014 Housing Production.** New Appendix A moved the 4th Cycle Housing Element housing production information from the main body of the Technical Report to an appendix. No changes were made to this information.

- **New Appendix B, Projects Entitled or Pending Entitlement.** Housing Technical Report Appendix B summarizes Housing Production, which reflects substantial changes to account for housing production over a five-year period, since the 2012 adoption of the 4th Cycle Housing Element.
• **New Appendix C, 2006-2014 Sites Zoned for Residential Development.** New Appendix C moved 4th Cycle Housing Element information on housing sites from the main body of the Technical Report to an appendix. This was revised to show only those sites that were previously zoned or rezoned, since the 4th Cycle Housing Element.

• **New Appendix D, Rezoning Program.** This is an entirely new rezoning program that will accommodate the unmet RHNA need of the 4th Cycle Housing Element and the 5th Cycle RHNA, and identifies sites to be rezoned for Mixed Use and High-Density residential to accommodate a minimum of 4,767 dwelling units affordable to low-income households. The environmental impacts associated with Rezoning Program implementation are evaluated at a project level in a separate CEQA document, the City of Riverside 2014 – 2021 Housing Element Update Housing Implementation Plan EIR (SCH No. 2017041039), which is being prepared concurrent with this Addendum EIR.

• **New Appendix E, Review of Past Performance.** New Appendix E outlines progress made towards implementation of the 4th Cycle Housing Element Implementation Plan Tools.

• **New Appendix F, Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Minutes.** New Appendix F includes the meeting minutes to CAC Meeting No. 1, which was held on May 29, 2013.

**Implementation Plan**

Various amendments and updates to the Implementation Plan are proposed. The number of Implementation Tools (Programs) were reduced from 59 Tools in 4th Cycle Housing Element Implementation Plan to 53 Tools. This reduction consolidated duplicative tools and/or removed tools that were no longer viable or applicable. Generally, changes to Implementation Tools were minor non-substantive, and primarily involved updates on implementation progress. The most substantial change is a completely new discussion for Implementation Tool H-21, Rezoning Program, describing the City’s current rezoning program efforts to accommodate the RHNA.

Specific Changes to Implementation Tools are:

- Tool H-1 related to Rebuilding Together Riverside is eliminated as this program no longer exists.

- The portion of Tool H-2 pertaining to “Rehabilitation assistance to low and moderate income homeowners” has become Tool H-1.

- Tool H-2 now only pertains to “analysis of at-risk-units.”

- Tool H-5 Single-Family rehabilitation and foreclosure programs for Downtown, Northside and Brockton areas has been removed.

- Tool H-6 affordable housing projects and programs funded with the Redevelopment 20 percent set-aside and Neighborhood Stabilization Program has been removed.

- Tools H-7 through H-14 are now Tools H-5 through H-12.
• Tool H-15 is now Tool H-13 and has been updated to reflect new neighborhood organizing programs and remove old programs that no longer exist.

• Tool H-16 is now Tool H-14.

• Tools H-17 and H-18 related to previous updates to the Marketplace and University Avenue Specific Plans have been removed.

• Tool H-19 and H-20 related to continued implementation of the Downtown and Magnolia Avenue Specific Plans have been removed.

• Tool H-21 has been completely revised to describe the new Rezoning Program; see New Appendix D, Rezoning Program Section above.

• Tools H-22 through H-26 became Tools H-15 through H-19.

• Tool H-27 became Tool H-20 and has been updated to replace an old non-existent Riverside Public Utilities “WE CARE” weatherization program for low income, disabled, and senior households with a different “SHARE” program that assists low-income residential customers with their utility bills and deposits.

• Tool H-34 “Springboard Nonprofit Consumer Credit Management” has been consolidated into Tool H-33 with other homeowner preservation and foreclosure prevention tools, which is now Tool H-29.

• Tool H-35 to “periodically provide and/or market foreclosure prevention seminars” and Tool H-36 related to “maintaining a stock of rental housing affordable to seniors, families, and individuals earning lower incomes” are now Tools H-30 and H-31.

• Tool H-37 related to Redevelopment assistance has been removed. Redevelopment Agencies (RDAs) were dissolved as of February 1, 2012, as part of the 2011 Budget Act.

• Tools H-38 through H-42 are now Tools H-32 through H-36.

• Tool H-43 to review list of affordable housing projects, Tool H-44 to support “Rebuilding Together Riverside,” and Tool H-45 for the RDA to actively seek additional partnerships with for-profits and non-profits have been removed, as these programs are either duplicated in other Tools or no longer exist.

• Tools H-46 through H-52 are now Tools H-37 through H-43.

• Tool H-53 (now Tool H-44) has been updated to reflect a more recent Homeless Reduction and Prevention Strategy Five-Year Plan (Homeless Plan) and its top three priorities.

• Tool H-54 related to homelessness (now Tool H-45) has been updated to include minor updates to various homeless programs listed in this program.

• Tools H-55 through H-59 are now Tools H-46 through H-50.
Tool H-51, related to housing for people with disabilities, is a new tool to work with the Inland Regional Center and other appropriate non-profits to support the ability of persons with disabilities to live in integrated community settings.

Tool H-52, related to creating a lot consolidation overlay to combine small residential lots into larger developable lots, is a new tool.

Tool H-53, related to amending the Zoning Code to define and allow single-room occupancies (SRO’s) with a Conditional Use Permit in compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 2634, is a new tool.

All other Implementation Tools remain the same, with the exception of numbering changes for some.

Therefore, the Project analyzed in this Addendum is limited to the City’s housing policy and program of actions to support those policies, and does not involve changes that would result in physical impacts, including land use designation changes or rezoning with potential to increase development capacities. As previously noted, the environmental impacts associated with the Housing Implementation Plan (i.e., land use designation changes or rezoning) are evaluated at a project level in a separate CEQA document.

2.3 INTENDED USES OF THE ADDENDUM EIR

This 8th Addendum to the Certified GP FPEIR documents the City’s consideration of the potential environmental consequences anticipated to occur, as a result of the Project’s proposed changes to the Housing Element, which are necessary to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan. This Addendum also explains and documents the City’s decision that a subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is not required. The City of Riverside is the Lead Agency and has approval authority over the General Plan Program and the Housing Element, upon approval from the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

LIST OF AGENCIES

This City of Riverside, as the Lead Agency for this proposed Project, will use this Addendum EIR in consideration of the proposed 5th Cycle 2014-2021 Housing Element Update. This Addendum EIR will also provide environmental information to other agencies affected by the Project, or who have an interest in the Project. The various public, private, and political agencies and jurisdictions with particular interest in the proposed Project include, but are not limited to:

- State Department of Housing and Community Development; and
- Southern California Association of Governments.

LIST OF PERMITS AND OTHER APPROVALS

Upon its adoption by the Riverside City Council, the 5th Cycle Housing Element would serve as a comprehensive statement of City’s housing policy and program of actions to support those policies. The Project involves approval of the following City of Riverside entitlements:

- General Plan Amendment for Housing Element adoption (Planning Case No. P15-0842) to include the 5th Cycle Housing Element.
## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | **Project Title:**  
8th Addendum to the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the 2014-2021 Housing Element Update. |
| 2. | **Lead Agency Name and Address:**  
City of Riverside  
Community and Economic Development Department - Planning Division  
3900 Main Street, Third Floor  
Riverside, California 92522 |
| 3. | **Contact Person and Telephone Number:**  
Mr. Doug Darnell, AICP, Senior Planner, 951.826.5219 |
| 4. | **Project Location:**  
City of Riverside, County of Riverside; see Section 2.1, *Project Location and Setting*. |
| 5. | **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**  
City of Riverside  
Community & Economic Development Department - Planning Division  
3900 Main Street, Third Floor  
Riverside, California 92522 |
| 6. | **General Plan Designation:** Various |
| 7. | **Zoning:** Various |
| 8. | **Description of the Project:** See Section 2.2, *Project Characteristics*. |
| 9. | **Environmental Setting:** See Section 2.1, *Project Location and Setting*. |
| 10. | **Public Agency Approvals and Recommendations:** See Section 2.3, *Intended Uses of the Addendum EIR*. |
| 11. | **California Native American Tribal Consultation**  
*Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?*  
Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or EIR. As this environmental document is an Addendum EIR, consultation with California Native American tribes is not required. However, it is noted that the City has initiated the Project’s tribal consultation process for purposes of AB 52 as part of the *City of Riverside 2014 – 2021 Housing Element Housing Implementation Plan EIR*. The City has received AB 52 requests for consultation from the following California Native American tribes for the proposed Housing Implementation Plan EIR:  
- Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians;  
- Cahuilla Band of Indians; |
- Gabrielino Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation;
- San Manuel Band of Mission Indians;
- Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians;
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians;
- Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians;
- Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians; and
- San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians.
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND ANALYSIS

This Section provides an analysis of the potential environmental consequences anticipated to occur as a result of Project implementation. This Section is patterned after the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Checklist. Each of the environmental topical areas presented below includes the following: a summary of the Certified City of Riverside General Plan and Supporting Documents Final Program Environmental Impact Report (GP FPEIR) conclusions; a brief discussion supporting the finding that the impact was adequately addressed in the FPEIR; and a listing of the General Plan 2025 Policies (see Appendix A, Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies, for the Policy text in its entirety) and FPEIR mitigation measures applicable to the Project. This section supports the findings that only some changes/additions to the previously certified GP FPEIR are necessary and none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines § 15162 are met.

4.1 AESTHETICS

Would the Project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

4.1.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

GP FPEIR Section 5.1, Aesthetics, analyzes impacts concerning aesthetic resources, as summarized below:

Scenic Vista: Implementation of the General Plan and its supporting documents (Zoning Code, Subdivision Code, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan (MASP), and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines) (hereinafter, “General Plan Program”) could have an adverse effect on a scenic vista, including the natural and scenic vistas identified on General Plan Figure LU-3, Riverside Parks. The most notable scenic vistas in the City include the La Sierra/Norco Hills, Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park, and Box Springs Mountain Regional Park, among others. The General Plan incorporates policies, which act to balance development interests with broader community preservation objectives. Following compliance with General Plan policies concerning scenic vistas, impacts from General Plan implementation would be less than significant. The General Plan’s supporting documents would also result in less than significant impacts to scenic vistas.

Substantially Damage Scenic Resources: General Plan Program implementation could substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a scenic highway. With implementation of applicable General Plan policies and designation of the parkways, and implementation of existing policies in the Tree Policy Manual, impacts to scenic resources would be less than significant. Additionally, there are no scenic highways within the City that could be impacted. Therefore, impacts from General Plan Program implementation would be less than significant.
**Degrades Visual Character:** General Plan Program implementation could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the Planning Area. However, the General Plan is intended to enhance visual character qualities. Future development would be required to implement the General Plan’s goals and policies, and would be subject to design review consistent with established Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. The City’s Zoning Code requires review of all site plans to prevent unlawful or nonconforming uses and structures. The Subdivision Code, MASP, and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines encourage high-quality design and therefore would not involve negative impacts to visual character. Thus, negative impacts to visual character would be less than significant.

**Source of Light and Glare:** General Plan Program implementation could create a new source of substantial light or glare, which could adversely affect day or nighttime views. Portions of the City are located within the Mount Palomar Nighttime Lighting Policy Area. General Plan buildout would result in new street lights, commercial parking lots, parks, office buildings, residential security lighting, and industrial areas which would contribute to light and glare and affect the nighttime sky. The City’s Zoning Code includes performance standards regulating site lighting to avoid light and glare impacts. With implementation of the Zoning Code and the Roadway Lighting Handbook lighting requirements, as well as GP FPEIR MM AES-1, General Plan buildout would result in less than significant impacts involving light and glare. The General Plan’s supporting documents would also result in less than significant impacts involving light and glare.

**4.1.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**Impact Analysis:** The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element concerning: existing/projected housing needs; adequate housing sites; goals, policies, and objectives; and schedules for program implementation. The update is proposed to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan (RHNA) Allocation Plan. The update is limited to the City’s housing policy and program of actions to support those policies, and does not involve changes that would result in physical impacts, including land use designation changes or rezoning with potential to increase development capacities. Concerning aesthetics, the Housing Element adds Policy H-1.8, *Neighborhood Livability*, which would serve to improve the character of neighborhoods; refer to Section 2.2, *Project Characteristics*. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning aesthetics has been discovered, since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning aesthetics than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy HE-2.3
- Policy LU-3.1
- Policy LU-3.2
- Policy CCM-2.2
- Policy CCM-2.8
- Policy OS-2.2
- Policy OS-2.4

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.
MODIFIED/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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 forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

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?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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?

4.2.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.2, Agricultural Resources, analyzes impacts concerning farmland, as summarized below:

Conversion of Farmland: General Plan Program implementation could result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The General Plan identifies several areas of designated farmland, which would be affected by General Plan Program implementation. The General Plan incorporates policies which discourage the premature conversion of agricultural lands. According to the GP FPEIR, General Plan and Zoning Code implementation would result in a significant impact to conversion of farmland, since the proposed General Plan land uses and zoning would not provide for the preservation of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and since the General Plan’s policies do not require preservation of designated Farmland. The other General Plan supporting documents would not impact farmland.
Conflict with Williamson Act: General Plan Program implementation could conflict with a Williamson Act contract or existing zoning for agricultural use. There are two Williamson Act preserve areas within the City limits; however, the General Plan Program does not propose to cancel those contracts. Any future Williamson Contract cancelations would be subject to CEQA on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, impacts concerning Williamson Act contract conflicts would be less than significant. According to the GP FPEIR, General Plan and Zoning Code implementation would result in a significant impact concerning conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use in a few locations where General Plan land use and zoning designations would change from agricultural to non-agricultural. Therefore, because General Plan and Zoning Code implementation would alter existing agricultural zoning and General Plan designations, potential impacts to existing zoning for agricultural uses would be significant and unavoidable. The other General Plan supporting documents would not involve impacts to Williamson Act contracts or existing zoning for agricultural uses.

Involve Other Changes to the Existing Environment: General Plan Program implementation could involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. General Plan implementation would indirectly influence the conversion of Farmland of Local Importance, land subject to Proposition R and Measure C, as well as other land being used for agricultural use by: facilitating development; increasing densities; and constructing roads and infrastructure in proximity to operating agricultural areas. Additionally, where residential areas are in proximity to agricultural areas, nuisance complaints concerning farming activities could also discourage farming. The General Plan includes policies and tools that would retain, protect, and encourage agricultural land use. Although the General Plan and Zoning Code still allow for agricultural uses, the indirect influence of existing and proposed development is expected to contribute to direct and indirect conversion of agricultural resources. Therefore, impacts concerning the conversion of Farmland of Local Importance, land subject to Proposition R and Measure C, as well as any other land being used for agricultural uses, as non-conforming uses would be significant and unavoidable.

Post GP FPEIR Certification Thresholds: Since GP FPEIR certification, CEQA Guidelines Appendix G has been revised to include a new Forestry Resources threshold. Accordingly, a review has been conducted and is presented below.

4.2.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect farmland or agricultural uses. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning farmland or agricultural uses has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning farmlands or agricultural uses than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

As discussed above, CEQA Guidelines Appendix G has been amended to include forestry resources, since GP FPEIR certification. Currently, there is no land zoned for forestry resources in the City; see RMC Title 19, Zoning, and City of Riverside Zoning Map. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with

---

existing zoning for, or cause the rezoning of, forest land or timberland. Additionally, there is no forest land in the City. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or cause changes that would result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. No impact would occur in this regard.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy LU-6.1
- Policy LU-6.2
- Policy LU-6.3
- Policy LU-6.4
- Policy LU-6.5
- Policy OS-3.1
- Policy OS-3.2
- Policy OS-3.3
- Policy OS-3.4
- Policy OS-3.5
- Policy OS-3.6
- Policy OS-4.2

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

There are no GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures relevant to Agricultural and Forestry Resources.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.

**4.3 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?

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

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

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

**4.3.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions**

FPEIR Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, analyzes impacts concerning air quality, as summarized below:

*Conflict with Air Quality Plan:* General Plan Program implementation could conflict with the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (SCAQMP). The General Plan incorporates policies, which serve to promote mixed use, walkable communities, and promote alternative transportation, and proposes land uses that
encourage pedestrian uses through placement and design that that would reduce air pollutant emissions over time. The GP FPEIR analyzes the General Plan’s potential to conflict with the SCAQMP under a typical and maximum (worst-case) development scenario. According to the GP FPEIR, the General Plan buildout at the expected typical development scenario would be consistent with SCAG population projections and thus would be consistent with the SCAQMP. As the Zoning Code and MASP would be consistent with the General Plan, impacts under the typical development scenario would also be less than significant. The maximum development scenario would conflict with SCAG projections and thus would conflict with the SCAQMP. Impacts under this scenario would be significant and unavoidable. The other General Plan supporting documents would not involve impacts concerning potential conflicts with an air quality plan.

**Violate any Ambient Air Quality Standard:** General Plan Program implementation could violate an ambient air quality standard and/or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Short-term construction-related impacts from General Plan buildout would result in increased air emissions from grading, earthmoving, and construction activities. According to the GP FPEIR, short-term impacts would be significant and unavoidable under all development scenarios, despite implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Long-term operational impacts from General Plan buildout would result in additional emissions over time from both stationary and mobile sources (vehicular trips). The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that long-term emissions from General Plan buildout would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality under all development scenarios, despite implementation of recommended mitigation measures. Additionally, as the Zoning Code and MASP would be consistent with the General Plan, their implementation would result in significant and unavoidable short- and long-term impacts to air quality. The other General Plan supporting documents would not involve impacts concerning potential conflicts with an air quality standard.

**Criteria Pollutants:** General Plan Program implementation could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal and State ambient air quality standard. Additionally, General Plan Program implementation could result in a cumulatively considerable increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. According to the GP FPEIR, the City is located in an area designated as non-attainment for ozone, PM-10 and PM-2.5 under State standards, and as non-attainment for ozone, CO, and PM-10 and PM-2.5 under federal standards. Short-term emissions from all development projects within the basin would be significant and unavoidable. Although long-term emissions are expected to decrease by 2025, all criteria pollutants would remain above SCAQMD thresholds, and therefore, would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. GHG production and emissions from energy use and other stationary sources would be significant and unavoidable under all development scenarios. General Plan implementation would also result in a significant and unavoidable impact concerning a net increase of criteria pollutants and GHG emissions. Additionally, as the Zoning Code and MASP would be consistent with the General Plan, their implementation would result in a cumulatively significant net increase of criteria pollutants and GHG emissions, despite compliance with applicable regulatory requirements and General Plan policies. The other General Plan supporting documents would not involve impacts concerning criteria pollutants and global warming gases.

**Sensitive Receptors:** General Plan Program implementation could expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The GP FPEIR classifies the Planning area’s existing/future residential uses, school playgrounds, childcare facilities, hospitals, and convalescent homes as sensitive receptors. According to the GP FPEIR, General Plan buildout would result in significant and unavoidable short- and long-term impacts to sensitive receptors, despite implementation of recommended mitigation measures and General Plan policies. Additionally, as the Zoning Code and MASP would be consistent with
the General Plan, their implementation would also result in significant and unavoidable impacts concerning exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, despite implementation of recommended mitigation measures and General Plan policies. The other General Plan supporting documents would not involve impacts concerning exposing sensitive receptors to criteria pollutants.

**Odors:** General Plan Program implementation could expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. According to the GP FPEIR, General Plan buildout would result in less than significant impacts concerning odors following compliance with applicable regulatory requirements (i.e., SCAQMD Rule 402) and General Plan policies. Additionally, as the Zoning Code and MASP would be consistent with the General Plan, their implementation would also result in a less than significant impact concerning exposing a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. The other General Plan supporting documents would not involve impacts concerning odors.

### 4.3.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact Analysis:** The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not result in any activities, which would result in short- or long-term emissions or odors. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning air quality has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning air quality than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy CCM-5.5
- Policy CCM-6.1
- Policy CCM-6.2
- Policy CCM-9.1
- Policy CCM-11.7
- Policy OS-8.1
- Policy AQ-1.1
- Policy AQ-1.2
- Policy AQ-1.3
- Policy AQ-1.4
- Policy AQ-1.5
- Policy AQ-1.6
- Policy AQ-1.7
- Policy AQ-1.8
- Policy AQ-1.9
- Policy AQ-1.23
- Policy AQ-1.24
- Policy AQ-1.25
- Policy AQ-1.26
- Policy AQ-2.1
- Policy AQ-2.2
- Policy AQ-2.3
- Policy AQ-2.4
- Policy AQ-2.5
- Policy AQ-2.6
- Policy AQ-2.7
- Policy AQ-2.8
- Policy AQ-2.9
- Policy AQ-2.10
- Policy AQ-2.11
- Policy AQ-3.3
- Policy AQ-3.4
- Policy AQ-3.5
- Policy AQ-3.6
- Policy AQ-3.7
- Policy AQ-4.1
- Policy AQ-4.2
- Policy AQ-4.3
- Policy AQ-4.4
- Policy AQ-4.5
- Policy AQ-5.7
- Policy AQ-7.7
- Policy AQ-7.8
- Policy AQ-7.9
- Policy AQ-7.10

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.
MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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?

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?

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?

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

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?

4.4.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.4, Biological Resources, analyzes impacts concerning biological resources, as summarized below:

Conflict with an Adopted Plan: General Plan implementation could conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. The City Planning Area and Sphere of Influence are affected by four adopted habitat conservation plans: the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP); Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan (SKR HCP); Lake Mathews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan & Natural Community Conservation Plan; and El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan. According to the GP FPEIR, General Plan Program implementation would not conflict with adopted habitat conservation plans following compliance with General Plan policies and MSHCP and SKR HCP procedures; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Sensitive Plant and Wildlife Species: General Plan implementation could impact existing sensitive plant and wildlife biological resources through habitat loss and diminished habitat quality. MSHCP implementation would minimize direct and indirect impacts from future projects proposed in accordance with the General Plan, including through payment of the mitigation fee and compliance with all applicable requirements. The GP EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant.
following compliance with existing Federal, State and local regulations, and implementation of the recommended mitigation.

**Riparian and Other Sensitive Communities:** General Plan implementation could adversely impact a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). MSHCP implementation would minimize direct and indirect impacts from future projects, including through the requirement for habitat assessments for riparian habitat areas. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with General Plan policies and the regulatory framework, including the MSHCP.

**Jurisdictional Waters or Resources:** General Plan implementation could impact wetlands or other jurisdictional waters of the U.S. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) must authorize construction features expected to adversely affect these features. If construction activities result in fill, a Section 401 Water Quality Certification would be needed from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). If construction activities were expected to alter, or otherwise adversely affect any regulated streambed or associated vegetation, a Streambed Alteration Agreement would be requested from the CDFW. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with State and federal regulations and the MSHCP.

**Wildlife Corridors:** General Plan implementation could impact established wildlife corridors. MSHCP implementation would minimize direct and indirect impacts from future projects. The GP EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with General Plan policies and federal and State regulations.

**Tree Ordinance:** General Plan implementation could conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. The General Plan is subject to all the federal, State, and local policies and regulations concerning protection of biological resources. Future applicants of proposed development would be required to pay MSHCP mitigation fees and SKR HCP fee assessment. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with General Plan policies and MSHCP and SKR HCP requirements.

### 4.4.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact Analysis:** The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect biological resources. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning biological resources has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning biological resources than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy LU-2.2
- Policy LU-3.1
- Policy LU-5.3
- Policy LU-5.4
- Policy LU-5.5
- Policy LU-7.1
GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

4.5.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.5, Cultural Resources, analyzes impacts concerning cultural resources, as summarized below:

Historical Resources: General Plan implementation could adversely impact the City’s historic resources, including federal, State, and local resources. All development would be subject to federal, State, and local regulations, including RMC Title 20, the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan, and the State Historic Resources Inventory. The GP EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with these regulations and applicable General Plan policies.

Archaeological Resources: General Plan implementation could adversely impact the City’s archeological resources. Any construction-related and earth-disturbing actions could damage archeological resources. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with applicable regulations, General Plan policies, and recommended mitigation measures.

Paleontological Resources: General Plan implementation could adversely impact a unique paleontological resource or site. Any construction-related and earth-disturbing actions could damage or destroy fossils in rock units. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with applicable regulations and General Plan policies.
Disturbance of Human Remains: General Plan implementation could adversely impact buried human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Consistent with State laws protecting these remains, sites containing human remains must be identified and treated in a sensitive manner. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with applicable regulations and recommended mitigation measures.

Post GP FPEIR Certification Thresholds: Since GP FPEIR certification, CEQA Guidelines Appendix G has been revised to include a new Tribal Cultural Resources threshold; refer to Section 4.17, Tribal Cultural Resources, for further discussion.

4.5.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflects the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect cultural resources. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning cultural resources has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning cultural resources than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy LU-4.6
- Policy LU-30.4
- Policy PS-11.1
- Policy PS-11.2
- Policy PS-11.3
- Policy HP-1.1
- Policy HP-1.2
- Policy HP-1.3
- Policy HP-1.4
- Policy HP-1.5
- Policy HP-1.6
- Policy HP-1.7
- Policy HP-2.1
- Policy HP-2.2
- Policy HP-2.3
- Policy HP-3.1
- Policy HP-3.2
- Policy HP-4.1
- Policy HP-4.2
- Policy HP-4.3
- Policy HP-5.1
- Policy HP-5.2
- Policy HP-7.1
- Policy HP-7.2
- Policy HP-7.3
- Policy HP-7.4

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.
4.6 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:
   1) 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.
   2) Strong seismic ground shaking?
   3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
   4) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

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?

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?

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?

4.6.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.6, Geology and Soils, analyzes impacts concerning geology and soils, as summarized below:

Exposure to Adverse Effects of Earthquakes: General Plan implementation could expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and landslides. There are no designated Alquist-Priolo Fault Zones in the City of Riverside; thus, no impact would occur due to General Plan Program implementation. However, the fault zones located within the Planning Area have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking in their vicinity. Compliance with California Building Standards Code regulations and policies included in the General Plan would ensure that impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, and landslide hazards are less than significant. The General Plan addresses potential adverse effects caused by seismic and geologic hazards by including policies that limit the Planning Area’s land use densities and intensity and address safety to minimize risk of injury, loss of life, and property damage. Additionally, the RMC includes provisions concerning grading and development on or near hillsides to further minimize risk of injury, loss of life, and property damage. Thus, compliance with the California Building Code regulations and applicable General Plan policies would ensure that impacts concerning strong seismic ground shaking would be reduced to less than significant. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.
Loss of Topsoil: General Plan implementation could result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. To mitigate these potential effects, individual construction activities would be subject to compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, which include implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) through a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Additionally, RMC Title 17, Grading, and RMC Chapter 18.200, Grading and Soil Erosion, set forth erosion control standards. The GP FPEIR concludes less than significant impacts concerning soil erosion/loss of topsoil following compliance with NPDES RMC requirements.

Unstable Geologic Units: General Plan implementation could accommodate future development proposals 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. The City's Subdivision Code requires completed reports of soil conditions, which could identify unsuitable soil conditions including landslides, liquefaction, and subsidence. Compliance with RMC requirements and General Plan policies would ensure maximum practical protection available for building occupants and infrastructure and impacts would be less than significant.

Expansive Soils: General Plan implementation could accommodate future development located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property. Within the City, expansive soils are widely scattered and found in hillside areas, as well as low lying alluvial basins. Development under the General Plan would be subject to compliance with the Subdivision Code and California Building Code concerning soil hazards and expansive soils. The General Plan includes policies which, would also minimize potential impacts concerning expansive soils. Following compliance with existing regulatory requirements and General Plan policies, this impact would be less than significant.

Septic Systems: The majority of the City is served by existing sewer infrastructure and it is anticipated that the majority for the new development in the Planning Area would not require the use of septic tanks. However, General Plan implementation could accommodate future development located on soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. For any development proposing use of septic systems, compliance with the recommended mitigation would reduce project impacts to less than significant.

4.6.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect the potential exposure to seismic or geologic hazards. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning seismic or geologic hazards has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning seismic or geologic hazards than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.
GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy PS-1.1
- Policy PS-1.2
- Policy PS-1.3
- Policy PS-1.4
- Policy PR-1.5
- Policy PS-1.6
- Policy PS-9.8
- Policy OS-2.3

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.

### 4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

**Would the project:**

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

**4.7.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions**

FPEIR Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, analyzes impacts concerning greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, as summarized below:

**Criteria Pollutants:** At the time of the GP FPEIR’s writing, no definitive protocol had been established by an agency responsible for air quality and/or GHG emissions. Therefore, the GP FPEIR’s analysis involved the City’s best effort, based on all available information, to quantify the project’s GHG emissions compared to statewide, regional, and project levels. Due to the overall increase and magnitude of change, which would be necessary to reduce overall CO₂ emissions to 1990 levels, the GP FPEIR concluded this impact would be significant and unavoidable. Given that the General Plan build-out would result in GHG emissions of 1.63 million metric tons in 2020 within a region that would produce 7.3 metric tons, and would generate approximately three times the annual level in 1990 and approximately two times the tons of CO₂ per person, the increase in GHG was concluded to be significant. Therefore, GHG production would be cumulatively considerable. GHG emissions from energy use and other stationary sources would be cumulatively considerable under all development scenarios.

**Post GP FPEIR Certification Thresholds:** In 2010, the State adopted amendments to the CEQA Guidelines requiring the analysis and mitigation of the effects of GHG emissions in CEQA documents. The CEQA Guidelines regarding GHG emissions do not specifically address situations involving subsequent implementation actions for a project with a previously certified EIR. Therefore, a GHG emissions analysis is provided below to respond to CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Section VII.
4.7.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect GHG emissions. It is noted that since GP FPEIR certification, the CEQA Guidelines have been amended requiring the analysis and mitigation of the effects of GHG emissions. However, in an effort to demonstrate its commitment to environmental stewardship and culture of innovation, the City prepared its Riverside Economic Prosperity Action Plan (EPAP) and Climate Action Plan (CAP) in 2016. The EPAP and CAP work together to identify actions necessary to reduce the City’s GHG emissions in a manner, which aligns with the City’s planning priorities and vision of a future “green” economy, which is based on sustainable businesses. More specifically, the EPAP identifies the CAP measures and strategies with the greatest potential to influence local economic prosperity through clean-tech investment, entrepreneurship, and expansion of local green businesses.

The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with facilitation or implementation of the City’s CAP. No additional information of substantial importance concerning GHG has been discovered, since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning GHG than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy LU-8.1
- Policy LU-8.3
- Policy LU-9.5
- Policy CCM-5.5
- Policy CCM-6.1
- Policy CCM-6.2
- Policy CCM-9.1
- Policy CCM-11.7
- Policy OS-8.10
- Policy AQ-8.2
- Policy AQ-8.3
- Policy AQ-8.4
- Policy AQ-8.10
- Policy AQ-8.11
- Policy AQ-8.12
- Policy AQ-8.13
- Policy AQ-8.14
- Policy AQ-8.15
- Policy AQ-8.20
- Policy AQ-8.21
- Policy AQ-8.22
- Policy AQ-8.23
- Policy AQ-8.24
- Policy AQ-8.25

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.
4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

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?

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?

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?

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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?

4.8.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, analyzes impacts concerning hazards and hazardous materials, as summarized below:

Hazardous Material Use, Transport and Storage: General Plan buildout could create or increase a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use, transport, storage, or disposal of hazardous materials. All new developments that handle or use hazardous materials would be required to comply with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), State, and City of Riverside regulations, standards, and guidelines concerning storage, use, and disposal of hazardous materials. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with the General Plan Public Safety Element and applicable Federal, State, and local regulations.

Accidental Hazardous Material Release: General Plan buildout could 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. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with all applicable federal and State laws concerning transportation of hazardous materials. The GP FPEIR analysis also concludes that impacts involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant following compliance with existing regulations and proposed General Plan policies.
Hazardous Materials Near Schools: General Plan implementation could increase the quantity of sensitive receptors, including schools, in areas adjacent to industrial and commercial land uses and thereby potentially increasing the risk of exposure to hazardous materials. All hazardous materials handling would be subject to compliance with the City’s Fire Code and California Health and Safety Code. Individual school districts would continue to be responsible for siting schools away from hazardous sites. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations.

Hazardous Materials Sites: General Plan implementation could lead to development of sites identified as creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Once discovered, these sites would be required to undergo remediation and cleanup under the California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) and the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Santa Ana RWQCB) before construction activities begin. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with existing Federal, State, and local regulations.

Public Airport Safety Hazard: General Plan implementation could lead to safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project area. Portions of the City are located within aircraft hazard areas for the Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport, and March Air Reserve Base (MARB). General Plan implementation would result in maintenance and limited expansions of the currently developed mix of land uses within airport areas. General Plan implementation also provides opportunity for new development, which could potentially represent a hazard to future employees and residents within those areas. Individual developments within or near the safety or compatibility zones would be required to demonstrate consistency with the Airport Land Use Compatibility (ALUC) Plans. The GP EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with County and City ALUC Plans and applicable General Plan policies.

Private Airport Safety Hazard: There are no private airstrips located within the vicinity of the City of Riverside; however, the Riverside Municipal Airport provides general private airstrips in the City. The Riverside Airport Master Plan for the Riverside Municipal Airport has been developed to avoid allowing intensive new uses within the airport influence areas. The GP FPEIR concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with General Plan policies and continued compliance with adopted County and City Airport Plans.

Adopted Emergency Response Plan: General Plan buildout could impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The City of Riverside has developed an extensive Emergency Operations Plan, created by the Emergency Management Office. The General Plan also provides policies to identify emergency plan implementation methods. The GP FPEIR concludes impacts would be reduced to less than significant with continued use of the Safety and Environmental Management Systems (SEMS) and implementation to General Plan policies enforcing compliance with the Emergency Operations Plan.

Wildland Fires: General Plan buildout could lead to an increase in residential or commercial/industrial development in areas susceptible to wildland fires. The City of Riverside Fire Department utilizes a highly trained workforce, progressive technology, and responsible fiscal management to provide diverse services to the community. In addition, the Riverside County Fire Department and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection provide mutual aid to the City for fire protection to unincorporated territory within the City’s sphere of influence. The GP FPEIR concludes impacts would be less than significant
following compliance with General Plan policies and existing codes and standards, and continuation of current City, County, and State practices.

4.8.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not result in greater exposure to hazards or hazardous materials. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning hazards or hazardous materials has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning hazards or hazardous materials than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

GP POLICIES

- Policy CCM-11.1
- Policy CCM-11.2
- Policy CCM-11.3
- Policy CCM-11.4
- Policy CCM-11.5
- Policy CCM-11.7
- Policy LU-22.1
- Policy LU-22.2
- Policy LU-22.3
- Policy LU-22.4
- Policy LU-22.5
- Policy LU-22.6
- Policy LU 22.7
- Policy LU 22.8
- Policy LU 22.9
- Policy LU-32.1
- Policy PS-3.1
- Policy PS-3.2
- Policy PS-3.3
- Policy PS-3.4
- Policy PS-3.5
- Policy PS-4.1
- Policy PS-4.2
- Policy PS-4.3
- Policy PS-4.4
- Policy PS-4.5
- Policy PS-4.6
- Policy PS-6.1
- Policy PS-6-3
- Policy PS-6.4
- Policy PS-6.5
- Policy PS-6.6
- Policy PS-6.9
- Policy PS-9.3
- Policy PS-9.5
- Policy PS-9.7
- Policy PS-9.8
- Policy PS-10.3
- Policy PS-10.4
- Policy PS-10.5
- Policy PS-10.6
- Policy PS-10.7
- Policy PS-10.8
- Policy PS-10.9

GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.
4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

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?

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?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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?

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

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?

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

4.9.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, analyzes impacts concerning hydrology and water quality, as summarized below:

Violate Water Quality Standards: General Plan implementation could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The City of Riverside must comply with the Clean Water Act, and therefore any standards promulgated by the Santa Ana RWQCB. Future development consistent with the General Plan would increase the amount of impervious surface area within the City. Individual projects implemented under the General Plan would be subject to compliance with applicable federal, State, and local water quality regulations. However, all sources of runoff could potentially carry pollutants, thus, could degrade water quality and not meet standards. Therefore, impacts concerning potential exceedances of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be significant and unavoidable.

Groundwater Supplies: General Plan buildout could impact 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. Potable drinking water is provided to the City by Riverside Public Utilities (RPU), Western Municipal Water District (WMWD), and Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). Because safe groundwater yield would be maintained in the groundwater basins and none of the basins are overdrafted (nor are they projected to become so), other forms of conservation such as recycled water would be developed, and because the project has no direct impacts to groundwater recharge, General Plan implementation would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

*Alter Drainage Patterns:* General Plan implementation could substantially alter the City’s existing drainage patterns, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river in a manner, which would result in substantial flooding, erosion, or siltation on- or off-site. The General Plan includes numerous policies aimed at protecting the City’s drainage courses, especially its arroyos. Most of the City is urban and built-out and therefore impacts concerning flooding, erosion, and siltation would not be a significant issue for projects developed as infill within already urbanized areas where impervious surfaces already exist. However, development proposals located within the City’s undeveloped and lower density areas could create changes to drainage patterns and cause flooding, erosion, and siltation. The General Plan incorporates several policies related to retaining and protecting the City’s drainage patterns. All development would be subject to compliance with General Plan policies and NPDES requirements, including preparing/implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Impacts would be less than significant.

*Create or Contribute Runoff Water:* General Plan implementation could create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, provide substantial additional sources or polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. All future individual construction projects would be subject to compliance with the State’s General Permit for Construction Activities and Best Management Practices. Although the stormwater management measures would reduce impacts of stormwater pollutants and discharges, the NPDES permit and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) would not prevent all discharges of storm and non-storm waters. Therefore, impacts concerning potential exceedances of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be significant. The City of Riverside has developed a five year Capital Improvement Plan, which includes a Storm Drain Program. Impacts related to exceeding capacity to storm drains would be less than significant.

*Housing in 100-Year Flood Hazard Area:* General Plan implementation could place housing or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area, which could impede or redirect flood flows. The 100-year flood zone is primarily located along channels, creeks, streams, and watercourses, and the City reviews all development proposals to assess if a project is in a flood hazard area. Implementation of General Plan policies and compliance with the RMC would sufficiently protect new houses or structures within a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, impacts to housing or structures concerning flood hazards would be less than significant.

*Levee or Dam Failure:* General Plan implementation could 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. There are nine dams in the City of Riverside, and General Plan buildout could result in the placement of housing or other structures in a dam inundation area. The State Division of Safety of Dams routinely inspects operating dams to ensure they are adequately maintained, but cannot eliminate the risk of dam
failure. Thus, the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of dam failure would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow**: General Plan implementation could subject people or structures to inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Land uses proposed in the General Plan for areas surrounding Lake Mathews and Lake Evans are open space or park areas, and thus damage concerning a seiche would be less than significant. Tsunamis are tidal waves that occur in coastal areas. Since the project is not located in a coastal area, no impact would occur concerning tsunamis. Mudflows associated with erosion and fire damage could occur in hillside and arroyo areas, however, the General Plan has designated these areas for open space and recreation uses. Potential impacts associated concerning inundation from mudflows would be less than significant.

### 4.9.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact Analysis**: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect hydrology or water quality. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning hydrology or water quality has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning hydrology or water quality than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy PS-2.1
- Policy PS-2.2
- Policy PS-2.3
- Policy PS-2.4
- Policy PS-2.6
- Policy PS-2.7
- Policy OS-10.6
- Policy OS-10.7
- Policy OS-10.8
- Policy OS-10.9
- Policy OS-10.10
- Policy OS-10.11

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

There are no GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures relevant to Hydrology and Water Quality.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.
4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

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?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

4.10.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.9, Land Use and Planning, analyzes impacts concerning land use and planning, as summarized below:

Physically Divide an Established Community: General Plan implementation could physically divide an established community. The General Plan recognizes 28 neighborhoods; however, the General Plan Program does not propose land uses that would physically divide an existing community. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant. The General Plan’s supporting documents are consistent with the General Plan; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

Conflict with Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations: The GP FPEIR evaluated project consistency with various regionally and locally adopted land use plans, policies, and regulations. The following discussion addresses these relevant plans/policies and how they relate to the City’s General Plan Program.

- **California Water Code Sections 10910-10915**: The General Plan would allow for substantial new development, and may facilitate large projects that would require compliance with either SB 610 or SB 221. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that the City must ensure new projects comply with California Water Code Sections 10910-10915, and thus impacts would be less than significant.

- **SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (adopted October 2, 2008)**: Project consistency with SCAG’s regional plans was analyzed. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that following compliance with SCAG and General Plan policies, the project would be consistent and impacts concerning compliance with SCAG regional plans would be less than significant.

- **South Coast Air Quality Management Plan**: The General Plan supports SCAQMP’s intent and would facilitate implementation. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant.

- **Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan**: Project consistency with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan was analyzed. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that following compliance with General Plan policies and existing County/City Airport Plans, the

2 It is noted, all future development would be subject to compliance with relevant SCAG regional plans in effect at the time the entitlement applications are submitted, as appropriate.
project would be consistent and impacts concerning County/City Airport Plans would be less than significant.

- **Other City of Riverside Plans/Documents:** The Zoning Code, Subdivision Code Update, Noise Code Amendment, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, were determined to be consistent with the General Plan and thus the GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant.

- **Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan:** General Plan implementation could create a conflict with an existing habitat conservation plan. The four habitat conservation plans (HCP) relevant to the Planning Area are: 1) the Western Riverside County MSHCP, 2) the Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan, 3) Lake Matthews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan & Natural Community Conservation Plan, and 4) El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan. The General Plan is in conformance with applicable HCPs, and therefore the GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant. The General Plan’s supporting documents are consistent with the General Plan, and thus the GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant.

### 4.10.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact Analysis:** The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect land use and planning. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning land use and planning has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning land use and planning than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

There are no GP Land Use and Planning Policies relevant to the Project.

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

There are no General Plan Mitigation Measures relevant to Land Use and Planning.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.

---

3 Project consistency with Riverside Redevelopment Agency policies was also analyzed in the GP FPEIR and impacts were concluded to be less than significant. However, RDAs were officially dissolved as of February 1, 2012, as part of the 2011 Budget Act.
4.11 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?

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?

4.11.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.10, Mineral Resources, analyzes impacts concerning mineral resources, as summarized below:

Regionally Significant Mineral Resource Loss: The City Planning area includes State-classified MRZ-2 and MRZ-4 areas (see GP FPEIR Figure 5.10-1, Mineral Resources); however, there are no active mines located within the City of Riverside. MRZ-2 areas are those where the available geologic information indicates the presence of significant mineral deposits or a high likelihood of supporting significant mineral deposits. MRZ-4 areas have insufficient data to determine the potential for significant mineral deposits. The General Plan provides for the preservation of State-classified mineral resources as either open space or parks/recreation. Therefore, the General Plan Land Use Plan has taken the State-classified areas into consideration, and the land use designations do not preclude the mining of underlain resources. Additionally, it is unknown and therefore unlikely that there are areas of significant mineral deposits that would be affected by the General Plan implementation, therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Locally Significant Mineral Resource Loss: There are no locally important mineral resource recovery sites within the Planning Area. Thus, General Plan implementation impacts would be less than significant. The Zoning Code update is consistent with the General Plan, and thus no significant impacts would occur.

4.11.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect mineral resources. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning mineral resources has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning mineral resources than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

GP POLICIES

There are no GP Policies relevant to mineral resources.
GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

There are no GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures relevant to mineral resources.

MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.12 NOISE

Would the project:

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?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

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?

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?

4.12.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

GP FPEIR Section 5.11, Noise, analyzes impacts concerning noise, as summarized below:

Noise Exposure in Excess of Established Standards:

- General Plan: General Plan implementation could result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Locations throughout the City would experience changes in noise levels as a result of an increase in motor vehicle traffic, and General Plan implementation would expose existing sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of established standards set forth in the General Plan Noise Element standards. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable, despite compliance with General Plan policies and implementation tools.

By requiring new development proposals to comply with noise standards and the Noise Element compatibility matrix, and provide noise mitigation as necessary, the City would ensure that new development complies with applicable noise standards. The GP EIR analysis determined that impacts concerning noise levels in excess of City standards for proposed land uses would be less than significant, following implementation of recommended mitigation measures and General Plan policies.
• **Noise Code:** The Noise Code amendment would bring the Noise Code into consistency with the proposed General Plan Noise Element and State regulations, and facilitate development of mixed- and in-fill uses. The Noise Code amendment would increase allowable noise levels, both interior at night and exterior. For this reason, the GP FPEIR analysis concluded impacts would be significant and unavoidable for existing sensitive receptors. Additionally, the Noise Code amendment would increase the interior noise limit for mixed use and in-fill development. Future land uses meeting proposed Noise Code levels would not experience an adverse change concerning noise levels; however, because the Noise Code amendment would increase interior noise standard established in Title 24, this change would be significant and unavoidable.

• **Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan:** Development under the General Plan takes into account all projected future growth and development within the MASP. The MASP proposes alternative transportation modes and pedestrian friendly land uses to help alleviate traffic increases due to growth and automobile dependency, yet impacts concerning noise levels in excess of City standards would be significant without mitigation. By requiring development proposals within MASP to adhere to the noise standards and compatibility matrix in the Noise Element, the City would ensure that new development complies with applicable noise standards. The GP FPEIR concludes impacts would be less than significant following implementation of recommended mitigation measures, as well as General Plan policies and implementation plan tools.

• **Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines (Design Guidelines):** According to the GP FPEIR, limitations or maximum wall heights could reduce the ability to comply with California Code of Regulations Title 24 and City Noise Code exterior noise standards. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes impacts would be less than significant following implementation of recommended mitigation measures. In addition, the City may consider increased wall height as one measure to reduce noise to acceptable levels.

*Exposure or Generation of Excessive Groundborne Vibration:* General Plan implementation could expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts concerning excessive groundborne vibration are less than significant for uses not located immediately adjacent to railroad tracks. Impacts would be significant yet intermittent to existing and proposed sensitive land uses located adjacent to rail lines, despite conformance with the recommended General Plan mitigation measures. Implementation of the RMC would ensure impacts concerning excessive groundborne vibration due to construction activities would be less than significant. The Noise Code does not address groundborne vibration, and thus its implementation would have no impact. The MASP would facilitate new development; however, there are no uses proposed in the MASP which would cause long-term sources of groundborne vibration and thus impacts would be less than significant. No Design Guideline standards relate to vibration, and thus its implementation would have no impact.

*Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels:* General Plan implementation could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing conditions. General Plan buildout would add people, automobiles and businesses to the community. Impacts to ambient noise levels would be significant and unavoidable. The Noise Code Amendment would not generate new noise; therefore, no increases in ambient noise levels would result in this change. Implementation of the MASP would result in less than significant impacts to ambient noise levels as compared to existing levels. No Design Guideline standards relate to increases in ambient noise, and thus its implementation would have no impact.
Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels: General Plan implementation could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Because the General Plan would add people, automobiles, and businesses to the community, ambient noise levels would increase. The GP FPEIR concludes that General Plan buildout would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to ambient noise levels. Implementation of the Noise Code Amendment would not result in ambient noise level impacts. Implementation of the MASP would result in less than significant impacts relating to ambient noise levels. No Design Guideline standards relate to increases in ambient noise, and thus its implementation would have no impact.

Exposure to Excessive Public Airport Noise Levels: General Plan implementation could expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels within an airport land use plan. Three Airport Land Use Planning Areas affect the City: Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport, and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port. The General Plan does not propose placing any sensitive receptors within the noise contours of these airports. The GP EIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of General Plan policies and the City’s Municipal Code. The Noise Code Amendment would bring the Noise Code into consistency with the proposed Noise Element of the General Plan, and thus no impacts would result. The MASP would not expose people residing or working in an airport land use plan area to excessive noise levels. No Design Guideline standards relate to public airport noise levels, and thus its implementation would have no impact.

Exposure to Excessive Private Airport Noise Levels: There are no private airstrips in the City. The GP FPEIR concludes that the project would not expose people residing or working in the Planning Area to excessive noise levels concerning a private airstrip, and thus General Plan Program implementation would have no impact.

4.12.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect noise levels. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning noise impacts has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning noise than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

GP POLICIES

- Policy N-1.1
- Policy N-1.2
- Policy N-1.3
- Policy N-1.4
- Policy N-1.5
- Policy N-1.8
- Policy N-2.1
- Policy N-2.2
- Policy N-2.5
- Policy N-3.1
- Policy N-3.3
GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

4.13.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.12, Population and Housing, analyzes impacts concerning population and housing, as summarized below:

Substantial Population Growth: General Plan implementation could induce substantial population growth in the area, either directly (by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (through extension of roads or other infrastructure). The General Plan was prepared to accommodate anticipated growth under the typical development scenario by providing adequate services, access, and infrastructure. Although anticipated by SCAG in its population projections and regional planning efforts, General Plan adoption would directly and indirectly induce population growth. Thus, significant and unavoidable impacts would occur in this regard.

Displace Existing Housing: General Plan buildout could displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Development under the General Plan could occur on sparse/vacant developable land, intensifying current land uses, and through the conversion of land uses of economically underperforming and obsolete development. The General Plan does not propose substantial demolition of residential uses. General Plan implementation would not directly displace housing or create a need for replacement housing. Therefore, at the programmatic level, the impact would be less than significant.

Displace Substantial Numbers of People: General Plan implementation could displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No substantial demolition of existing residential uses is specifically proposed under the General Plan. General Plan implementation would not directly displace housing or create the need for replacement housing elsewhere, thus the project would not displace substantial numbers of people. Therefore, at a programmatic level, the impact would be less than significant.
4.13.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact Analysis:** In general, a Housing Element identifies and analyzes existing and projected housing needs, and articulates a city’s official policies for the preservation, conservation, improvement, and production of housing within the City. The Project involves a comprehensive update to the City of Riverside Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The updated Housing Element examines the City’s housing needs, as they exist today, and projects future housing needs, in accordance with the City’s allocated share of the region’s housing need for the 2014-2021 planning period. The Housing Element also sets forth statements of community goals, objectives, and policies concerning those needs, and includes a housing policy program that responds to current and future needs within the limitations posed by available resources. The changes proposed by the Housing Element Update would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect population or housing growth. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning population and housing has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning population and housing than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

There are no GP Policies relevant to population and housing.

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

There are no GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures relevant to population and housing.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.

4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

a) **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:**

1) Fire protection?
2) Police protection?
3) Schools?
4) Parks?
5) Other public facilities?
4.14.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.13, Public Services, analyzes impacts concerning public services, as summarized below:

**Fire Protection:** General Plan buildout could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire facilities, or need for new or physically altered fire facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. General Plan implementation would increase the City’s population. This population increase would require new and expanded facilities to ensure acceptable service levels. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with General Plan policies concerning fire protection and emergency services.

**Police Protection:** General Plan buildout could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities, or need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. General Plan implementation would increase the City’s population. This population increase would require new and expanded facilities to ensure acceptable service levels. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with recommended mitigation measures and General Plan policies concerning police protection services.

**Schools:** General Plan buildout could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, or need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. General Plan implementation would increase the City’s population. This increase in population would require new and expanded facilities to ensure acceptable service levels. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with General Plan policies concerning educational facilities.

**Parks:** Refer to Section 4.15, Recreation, below.

**Libraries:** General Plan implementation could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered library facilities, or need for new or physically altered library facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. General Plan implementation would increase the City’s existing population. This increase in population would require new and expanded facilities to ensure acceptable service levels. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be reduced to less than significant following compliance with applicable mitigation measures and General Plan policies.

**Impacts to Other Public Facilities:** General Plan implementation could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered public facilities, or need for new or physically altered public facilities. General Plan implementation would increase the City’s population. This population increase would require new and expanded public facilities to ensure acceptable service levels. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant.

4.14.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact Analysis:** The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would
be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect fire or police protection, schools, parks, libraries, or other public services. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning public services has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning public services than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

GP POLICIES

- Policy ED-1.1
- Policy ED-3.1
- Policy ED-5.1
- Policy PS-6.1
- Policy PS-6.2
- Policy PS-6.3
- Policy PS-6.4
- Policy PS-6.6
- Policy PS-6.7
- Policy PS-7.1
- Policy PS-7.2
- Policy PS-7.4
- Policy PS-7.5
- Policy PS-10.3
- Policy LU-26.1

GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.15 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?

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?

4.15.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.14, Recreation, analyzes impacts concerning recreation, as summarized below:

Impacts to Existing Parks and Recreational Facilities: General Plan implementation could result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. General Plan implementation would increase the City’s population. This population increase would require new and expanded facilities to ensure acceptable service levels. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts to parks and recreational facilities would remain significant, despite implementation of recommended mitigation measures and General Plan policies.
Impacts to Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities: General Plan implementation would entail maintenance, enhancement, and continued funding for existing open space and recreational facilities to suit the needs of current and future City residents. The General Plan update recommends and proposes future parks for development, but the General Plan update does not directly approve their development or construction. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant, with implementation of General Plan policies.

4.15.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect parks or recreational uses. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning recreation has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning recreation than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

GP POLICIES

- Policy LU-26.1
- Policy PF-10.1
- Policy PF-10.2
- Policy PF-10.4
- Policy PR-1.1
- Policy PR-1.2
- Policy PR-1.3

GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
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?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

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.

4.16.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.15, Transportation/Traffic, analyzes impacts concerning transportation/traffic, as summarized below:

*Increase in Traffic in Relation to the Existing Traffic Load and Capacity:* General Plan implementation could involve substantial increases in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The existing conditions model used SCAG land use and socioeconomic data for the entire region. The results of this comparison between existing and proposed project traffic indicate General Plan implementation would result in an increase in traffic which is substantial, at least 50 percent, in relation to the existing traffic condition. Thus, potential adverse impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Additionally, increases in Average Daily Traffic (ADT) at key locations are projected to be substantial and therefore potentially significant without mitigation. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

*Exceed a Level of Service Standard:* General Plan implementation could exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service (LOS) standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. The City has generally adopted LOS “D” as the minimum threshold goal for a system wide LOS on arterials and collectors. General Plan implementation could result in exceedances of LOS standards where impacts would be significant without mitigation for the listed roadway segments. In addition, under the Maximum with PRD scenario, nearly every roadway in the City and Sphere areas would operate at LOS below the City’s adopted standard (LOS D), thereby resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.

*Air Traffic Patterns:* General Plan implementation is not expected to significantly increase the number of individuals using the airport facilities at Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport, or MARB. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant.

*Design Hazards or Incompatible Uses:* General Plan implementation could substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. There are no site-specific project plans at this time, and thus it is not possible to estimate various types of impacts concerning potentially incompatible land uses. The General Plan policies would help reduce potential hazards due to design features. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes that impacts would be less than significant.

*Emergency Access:* General Plan implementation could result in inadequate emergency access. The City continues to implement adopted road standards, and as a result new roadways would be designed to avoid unsafe design and provide adequate emergency access. The City of Riverside has an Emergency Operations Plan, and the Riverside Fire Department provides response management through activation...
of SEMS. The General Plan also provides policies to identify methods of implementing the emergency plan. Therefore, the GP FPEIR concludes that impacts to emergency access would be less than significant.

**Inadequate Parking Capacity:** General Plan implementation would not result in inadequate parking capacity, as no site-specific development proposals are identified as part of project. Future development accommodated through General Plan implementation would be subject to compliance with the existing RMC parking standards. The GP FPEIR concludes that impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

**Conflict with Adopted Policies:** General Plan implementation could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Major principles underlying the General Plan include focusing future development near existing transportation corridors, ensuring land uses are supported by an efficient local roadway network and supporting alternative modes of transportation such as walking, biking, and transit. The General Plan and its relevant policies would therefore support, rather than conflict with, policies, plans, and programs concerning alternative transportation. The GP FPEIR concludes that impacts would be less than significant.

**Post GP FPEIR Certification Thresholds:** Since GP FPEIR certification, CEQA Guidelines Appendix G has been revised to exclude the parking capacity threshold. Accordingly, no further review is needed in this regard.

### 4.16.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**Impact Analysis:** The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect traffic or transportation. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning traffic and transportation has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning traffic and transportation than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

- Policy CCM-2.1
- Policy CCM-2.3
- Policy CCM-5.2
- Policy CCM-5.4
- Policy CCM-6.1
- Policy CCM-9.1
- Policy CCM-9.5
- Policy CCM-10.1
- Policy CCM-10.2
- Policy CCM-10.7
- Policy CCM-10.8
- Policy CCM-10.10
- Policy OS-1.11
- Policy PR-2.3
- Policy PR-2.4

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.
4.17 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

4.17.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

The FPEIR did not analyze impacts concerning tribal cultural resources, as explained below.

Post GP FPEIR Certification Thresholds: Since GP FPEIR certification, CEQA Guidelines Appendix G has been revised to include a new Tribal Cultural Resources threshold. Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requires a lead agency to consult with any California Native American tribe that requests consultation and is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration, or EIR. As this environmental document is an Addendum EIR, consultation with California Native American tribes is not required.

4.17.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: As noted above, consultation with California Native American tribes is not required, given this environmental document is an Addendum EIR. However, it is noted, the City of Riverside, acting as the Lead Agency, initiated consultation for the City of Riverside 2014 – 2021 Housing Element Housing Implementation Plan EIR, in accordance with AB 52 requirements on May 1, 2017. Moreover, the Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect tribal cultural resources. Thus, Project implementation would not result in environmental impacts concerning tribal cultural resources, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:

GP POLICIES

Not Applicable.

GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.
MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES

No mitigation required.

4.18 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

**Would the project:**

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- 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?
- 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?
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- 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?
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

4.18.1 Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.16, *Utilities and Service Systems*, analyzes impacts concerning utilities and service systems, as summarized below:

**Stormwater Drainage Facilities:** General Plan buildout could require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects. Increased development within the Planning Area would result in an increase of impervious surface areas, and would generate increased stormwater flows with potential to impact drainage facilities and require the provision of additional facilities. The General Plan identifies policies and programs aimed at reducing the environmental effects of the development of such facilities, as described throughout the GP FPEIR. The GP FPEIR analysis concludes impacts concerning construction of stormwater drainage facilities would be less than significant.

**Water Supplies:** According to the General Plan, the City’s existing and projected water supplies would be adequate for the project at typical development levels. Therefore, the project’s impacts to water supplies associated with RPU and WMWD water service would not cause these suppliers to have insufficient water supplies, and impacts would be less than significant. With implementation of General Plan policies and applicable mitigation measures, impacts concerning water availability would be reduced to less than significant.
**Construction of New Water Facilities:** The City of Riverside regularly updates its Water System Master Plan, and describes improvements needed to address both upgrading existing facilities as well as constructing new facilities including storage reservoirs, booster pump stations, new pressure reducing stations, and pipelines. However, the GP FPEIR concludes interim impacts concerning the water system’s capacity would remain significant. Compliance with General Plan policies concerning water conservation would reduce the demand placed upon water supplies and infrastructure. Therefore, impacts concerning construction of new or expansions of water facilities would be less than significant.

**Exceed Wastewater Treatment Facilities:** General Plan buildout could cause a significant impact if the project exceeds wastewater treatment requirements. The City’s Regional Water Quality Control Plant is subject to Waste Discharge Requirements. All new development anticipated by the General Plan would be required to comply with all NPDES requirements, as enforced by the Santa Ana RWQCB. Therefore, General Plan implementation would not exceed applicable Santa Ana RWQCB wastewater treatment requirements concerning discharges to the City’s sewer system. Future development accommodated by the proposed General Plan would be subject to compliance with existing regulations and relevant General Plan policies. Therefore, less than significant impacts would occur.

**Inadequate Wastewater Treatment Facilities:** General Plan implementation could result in a significant impact concerning inadequate wastewater treatment facilities if a wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project determines that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments. According to the GP FPEIR, impacts associated with the typical level of project development would be less than significant. However, impacts associated with the maximum buildout or maximum with PRD would be significant. Following implementation of General Plan policies and recommended mitigation measures, impacts concerning wastewater capacity would be less than significant.

**Construction of New Wastewater Treatment Facilities:** General Plan implementation could cause significant impacts if it requires or results in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. All future projects would be consistent with the General Plan and would comply with the recommended mitigation and General Plan policies. Therefore, impacts from the construction or expansion of wastewater facilities would be less than significant.

**Solid Waste Capacity:** General Plan buildout could generate an increased demand for solid waste collection and disposal capacity. According to the GP FPEIR, the typical development would contribute only eight percent (8%) of the projected landfill capacity. Following compliance with existing regulations and standards concerning waste reduction programs and diversion from landfills, and with implementation of recommended mitigation measures, impacts concerning solid waste would be less than significant. However, the GP FPEIR concludes that cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable if landfill expansion does not keep pace with growth in the region or if growth within the Planning Area exceeds typical levels.

**Solid Waste Regulations:** General Plan buildout could create significant impacts if the project does not comply with federal, State and local statues and regulations concerning solid waste. However, General Plan implementation would not conflict with any federal, State, or local regulations concerning solid waste, as the City furthers its commitment to existing waste reduction and minimization measures. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.
Dry Utilities Capacity: General Plan buildout could create an additional demand for new power or supplies, or substantial alterations to existing systems. New development within the Planning Area consistent with the Project would result in additional demands for fuel and energy. The GP FPEIR concludes that the “Riverside Transmission Reliability Project (RTRP)” and other planned generating units would provide additional capacity for the projected power demand at the typical expected Project buildout and potential adverse impacts resulting in a need for new power capacity or supplies, or substantial alterations to existing systems would be less than significant. The worst case analysis buildout would result in less than significant impacts with implementation of recommended General Plan policies and mitigation measures.

Natural Gas Capacity: General Plan implementation could result in a need for natural gas systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to existing systems. According to the GP FPEIR, the Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas) continuously expands its network of gas pipelines to meet the needs of new commercial and residential development. Thus, SoCal Gas would have an adequate supply of natural gas available to serve the additional development, and the natural gas service provided to the City would not be impaired by General Plan buildout. Impacts would be less than significant.

Communication Systems Capacity: General Plan implementation could result in a need for new communication systems or substantial alterations to existing systems. The General Plan includes policies and programs that would minimize the environmental effects of development of such facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

4.18.2 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not affect utilities and service systems. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning utilities and service systems has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts concerning utilities and service systems than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

GP Policies and Mitigation Measures:

GP POLICIES

- Policy PF-1.1
- Policy PF-1.2
- Policy PF-1.3
- Policy PF-1.4
- Policy PF-3.1
- Policy PF-3.2
- Policy PF-3.3
- Policy PF-4.1
- Policy PF-4.2
- Policy PF-4.3
- Policy PF-5.1

GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES

No GP FPEIR mitigation required.
4.19  MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:

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 endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

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)?

c) Does the Project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

4.19.1  Summary of GP FPEIR Conclusions

FPEIR Section 5.17, Mandatory Findings of Significance, analyzes impacts concerning mandatory findings of significance, as summarized below:

Substantially Degrade the Quality of the Environment: General Plan implementation could substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. According to the GP FPEIR, General Plan implementation would result in less than significant impacts to biological and cultural resources with mitigation incorporated; see Sections 4.4 and 4.5 above.

Cumulative Impacts: General Plan implementation could have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. According to GP FPEIR Section 6.1, Cumulative Impacts, implementation of the GP FPEIR would result in cumulatively significant impacts to air quality, agricultural lands, water quality, dam inundation, noise, parks, and transportation despite implementation of relevant GP Policies, mitigation measures, and other project features.

Substantially Adverse Effects on Human Beings: General Plan implementation could result in environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. According to the GP FPEIR, General Plan implementation could result in direct and indirect impacts to human beings, with respect to agricultural lands, air quality, noise, population and housing, and traffic.

4.19.2  Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Analysis: The Project involves a comprehensive update to the Housing Element to comply with State housing law and reflect the current 5th Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan. The proposed changes would
be minor and policy-related, and would not result in physical impacts, since they do not involve a new land use or density/intensity beyond what was considered under the GP FPEIR. Therefore, the proposed changes would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, or involve cumulative impacts or substantial adverse effects on human beings. In addition, no new information of substantial importance concerning these issue areas has been discovered since GP FPEIR certification. Thus, Project implementation would not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts than anticipated in the GP FPEIR, and no mitigation is required.

**GP Policies and GP FPEIR Mitigation Measures:**

**GP POLICIES**

Refer to the GP Policies identified in Section 4.1 through 4.18 above.

**GP FPEIR MITIGATION MEASURES**

No GP FPEIR mitigation measures required.

**MODIFIED GENERAL PLAN/NEW MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation required.
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Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies
## APPENDIX A
### RELEVANT GENERAL PLAN 2025 POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.1: Ensure that all land use decisions, including enforcement actions, are made in an equitable fashion to protect residents, regardless of age, culture, ethnicity, gender, race, socioeconomic status or geographic location, from the health effects of air pollution.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.2: Consider potential environmental justice issues in reviewing impacts (including cumulative impacts for each project proposed).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.3: Separate, buffer and protect sensitive receptors from significant sources of pollution to the greatest extent possible.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.4: Facilitate communication between residents and businesses on nuisance issues related to air quality.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.5: Encourage infill development projects within urbanized areas, which include job centers and transportation nodes.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.6: Provide a mechanism to create opportunities for mixed use development that allows the integration of retail, office, institutional and residential uses for the purpose of reducing costs of infrastructure construction and maximizing the use of land.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.7: Support appropriate planned residential developments and infill housing, which reduce vehicle trips.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.8: Promote “Job/Housing Opportunity Zones” and incentives to support housing in job-rich areas and jobs in housing-rich areas, where the jobs are located at nonpolluting or extremely low-polluting entities.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable General Plan Policies</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.9: Adhere to the adopted Master Plan for open spaces, trails and bikeways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.23: Increase residential and commercial densities around rail and bus transit stations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.24: Support programs to provide “station cars” for short trips to and from transit nodes (e.g., Neighborhood Electric Vehicles).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.25: Serve as an advocate for the City’s residents regarding location/expansion of facilities/ uses (e.g., freeways, busy roadways), which are not within the City’s authority to regulate, to ensure that the health impacts of such projects are thoroughly investigated and mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-1.26: Require neighborhood parks and community centers near concentrations of residential areas to include pedestrian walkways and bicycle paths to encourage non-motorized travel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.1: Support Transportation Management Associations between large employers and commercial/industrial complexes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.2: Support programs and educate employers about employee rideshare and transit incentives for employers with more than 250 employees at a single location. The City will provide incentives and programs to encourage alternative methods of transit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.3: Cooperate with local, regional, State and Federal jurisdictions to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and motor vehicle emissions through job creation in job poor areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.4: Monitor and strive to achieve performance goals and/or VMT reduction which are consistent with SCAG’s goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.5: Consult with the California Air Resources Board to identify ways that it may assist the City (e.g., providing funding, sponsoring programs) with its goal to reduce air pollution by reducing emissions from mobile sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.6: Develop trip reduction plans that promote alternative work schedules, ridesharing, telecommuting and work at-home programs, employee education and preferential parking.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.7: Use incentives, regulations and Transportation Demand Management in cooperation with surrounding jurisdictions to eliminate vehicle trips that would otherwise be made.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.8: Work with Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) to establish mass transit mechanisms for the reduction of work-related and non-work-related vehicle trips.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.8: Work with Riverside Transit Authority (RTA) to establish mass transit mechanisms for the reduction of work-related and non-work-related vehicle trips.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.9: Encourage local transit agencies to promote ridership through careful planning of routes, headways, origins and destinations, types of vehicles.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.10: Identify and develop non-motorized transportation corridors.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-2.11: Develop ways to incorporate the “Good Neighbor Guidelines for Siting New and/or Modified Warehouse/Distribution Facilities” into the Development Review process and Citywide air quality education programs.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-3.3: Support SCAQMD’s efforts to require stationary air pollution sources, such as gasoline stations, restaurants with charbroilers and deep fryers, to comply with or exceed applicable SCAQMD rules and control measures.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-3.4: Require projects to mitigate, to the extent feasible, anticipated emissions which exceed AQMP Guidelines.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-3.5: Consider ordinances and/or voluntary incentive programs that encourage residential builders to go above and beyond State codes to conserve energy and reduce air pollution.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy AQ-3.6: Support “green” building codes that require air conditioning/filtration installation, upgrades or improvements for all buildings, but particularly for those associated with sensitive receptors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-3.7: Require use of pollution control measures for stationary and area sources through the use of best available control activities, fuel/material substitution, cleaner fuel alternatives, product reformulation, change in work practices and of control measures identified in the latest AQMP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-4.1: Identify and monitor sources, enforce existing regulations and promote stronger controls to reduce particulate matter (e.g., require clean fuels for street sweepers and trash trucks, exceed the AQMD requirements for fleet rules).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-4.2: Reduce particulate matter from agriculture (e.g., require use of clean non-diesel equipment and particulate traps), construction, demolition, debris hauling, street cleaning, utility maintenance, railroad rights-of-way and off-road vehicles to the extent possible, as provided in SCAQMD Rule 403.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-4.3: Support the reduction of all particulates potential sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-4.4: Support programs that reduce emissions from building materials and methods that generate excessive pollutants through incentives and/or regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-4.5: Require the suspension of all grading operations when wind speeds (as instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 miles per hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-5.7: Require residential building construction to meet or exceed energy use guidelines in Title 24 of the California Administrative Code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-7.7: Support legislation that promotes cleaner industry, clean fuel vehicles and more efficient burning engines and fuels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

| Policy AQ-7.8: Support the introduction of Federal, State or regional enabling legislation to promote inventive air quality programs which otherwise could not be implemented. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-7.9: Adhere with Federal, State and regional air quality laws, specifically with Government Code Section 65850.2, which requires that each owner or authorized agent of a project indicate, on the development or building permit for the project, whether he/she will need to comply with the requirements for a permit for construction or modification from the SCAQMD. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-7.10: Incorporate, to the extent applicable and permitted by law, current and proposed AQMP measures. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-8.2: Support appropriate initiatives, legislation, and actions for reducing and responding to climate change. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-8.3: Encourage community involvement and public/private partnerships to reduce and respond to global warming. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-8.4: Develop a Climate Action Plan that sets a schedule to complete an inventory of municipal and private greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, sets targets for reductions and methodologies to reach targets. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-8.10: Establish the 1990 GHG emission baseline for the City government on a per capita basis by the end of 2008. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-8.11: Implement a climate action plan that will reduce GHG emissions by 7% of the 1990 municipal baseline by 2012. | ✓ |
| Policy AQ-8.12: Develop a calculation for and establish the 1990 GHG emissions baseline on a per capital basis for the City of Riverside as a geographic locale by the end of 2009. | ✓ |
### Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-8.13: Utilizing the City boundaries as defined in 2008, implement a climate action plan to reduce GHG emissions by 7% of the 1990 City baseline by 2012.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-8.14: Establish programs that comply with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and the City’s General Plan 2025 to increase the quality of air in Riverside.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-8.15: Aggressively support programs at the AQMD that reduce GHG and particulate matter generation in the Los Angeles and Orange County regions to improve air quality and reduce pollution in Riverside.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-8.20: Establish a policy that mandates a green building rating system standard that applies to all new municipal buildings over 5,000 square feet by January 1, 2008.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-8.23: Apply urban planning principles that encourage higher density, mixed use, walkable/bikeable neighborhoods, and coordinate land use and transportation with open space systems in 2008.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy AQ-8.25: Evaluate programs that address indoor air quality issues by the end of 2008.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-2.1: Complete the Master Plan of Roadways shown on Figure CCM-4 (Master Plan of Roadways).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-2.2: Balance the need for free traffic flow with economic realities and environmental and aesthetic considerations, such that streets are designed to handle normal traffic flows with tolerances to allow for potential short-term delays at peak-flow hours.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-2.3: Maintain LOS D or better on Arterial Streets wherever possible. At key locations, such as City arterials that are used by regional freeway bypass traffic and at heavily traveled freeway interchanges, allow LOS E at peak hours as the acceptable standard on a case-by-case basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-2.8: Design street improvements considering the effect on aesthetic character and livability of residential neighborhoods, along with traffic engineering criteria.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-5.2: Support implementation of the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-5.4: Actively participate with other jurisdictions and agencies such as the County, RCTC, RTA, SCAG, WRCOG and CALTRANS to facilitate regionally integrated transportation networks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-5.5: Participate in programs to mitigate regional traffic congestion.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-6.1: Encourage the reduction of vehicle miles, reduce the total number of daily peak hour vehicular trips, increase the vehicle occupancy rate and provide better utilization of the circulation system through the development and implementation of TDM programs contained in the SCAQMD and County of Riverside TDM Guidelines.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-6.2: Encourage the use of telecommunications by Riverside residents, employees and students as a means to reduce air and noise pollution generated by traffic.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy CCM-9.1:</th>
<th>Encourage increased use of public transportation and multi-modal transportation as means of reducing roadway congestion, air pollution and non-point source water pollution, through such techniques as directing new growth along transportation corridors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-9.5:</td>
<td>Incorporate facilities for transit and other alternative modes of transportation, such as park and ride lots and bus turn-outs, in the design of future developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-10.1:</td>
<td>Ensure the provision of bicycle facilities consistent with the Bicycle Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-10.2:</td>
<td>Incorporate bicycle and pedestrian trails and bicycle racks in future development projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-10.7:</td>
<td>Maintain an extensive trails network that supports bicycles, pedestrians and horses and is linked to the trails systems of adjacent jurisdictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-10.8:</td>
<td>Maximize links between trails and major activity centers, residential neighborhoods, schools, and shopping centers and employment centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-10.10:</td>
<td>Evaluate the needs of bicycle traffic in the planning, design, construction and operation of all roadway projects funded by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-11.1:</td>
<td>Protect flight paths from encroachment by inappropriate development using the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan to determine the consistency of proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-11.2:</td>
<td>Limit building heights and land use intensities beneath airport approaches and departure paths to protect public safety consistent with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and all other applicable State and Federal regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-11.3:</td>
<td>Ensure that Riverside Municipal Airport continues to serve general aviation needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy CCM-11.4: Support continued development of MARB/MIP.</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-11.5: Coordinate public and local transit planning for air transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy CCM-11.7: Ensure environmental impacts such as noise, air quality, pollution, traffic congestion, and public safety hazards associated with continued operation of local airports are mitigated to the extent practicable.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED-1.1: Provide an adequate level of infrastructure and services to accommodate campus growth at all educational levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED-3.1: Partner with local schools, colleges, early childhood education programs and other educational institutions to accommodate the educational needs of residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy ED-5.1: Provide ample and convenient library facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HE-2.3: Housing Design. Require excellence in the design of housing through the use of materials and colors, building treatments, landscaping, open space, parking, sustainable concepts, and environmentally sensitive building and design practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-1.1: The City shall promote the preservation of cultural resources to ensure that citizens of Riverside have the opportunity to understand and appreciate the City’s unique heritage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-1.2: The City shall assume its direct responsibility for historic preservation by protecting and maintaining its publicly owned cultural resources. Such resources may include, but are not limited to, buildings, monuments, landscapes, and right-of-way improvements, such as retaining walls, granite curbs, entry monuments, light standards, street trees, and the scoring, dimensions, and patterns of sidewalks, driveways, curbs and gutters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HP-1.3</td>
<td>The City shall protect sites of archaeological and paleontological significance and ensure compliance with all applicable State and federal cultural resources protection and management laws in its planning and project review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-1.4</td>
<td>The City shall protect natural resources and geologic features, heritage trees, and landscapes in the planning and development review process and in park and open space planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-1.5</td>
<td>The City shall promote neighborhood/city identity and the role of historic preservation in community enhancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-1.6</td>
<td>The City shall use historic preservation as a tool for &quot;smart growth&quot; and mixed use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-1.7</td>
<td>The City shall ensure consistency between this Historic Preservation Element and all other General Plan elements, including subsequent updates of the General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-2.1</td>
<td>The City shall actively pursue a comprehensive program to document and preserve historic buildings, structures, districts, sites (including archaeological sites), objects, landscapes, and natural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-2.2</td>
<td>The City shall continually update its identification and designation of cultural resources that are eligible for listing in local, state and national registers based upon the 50 year age guideline for potential historic designation eligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-2.3</td>
<td>The City shall provide information to citizens, and the building community about what to do upon the discovery of archaeological sites, as well as, the treatment, preservation, and repatriation of such resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable General Plan Policies</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-3.1: The City shall conduct educational programs to promote an understanding of the significance of the City’s cultural resources, the criteria for historic designation, historic design review processes, building permit requirements, and methods for rehabilitating and preserving historic buildings, sites, and landscapes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-3.2: The Planning Division shall promote an understanding and appreciation of the importance of historic preservation by the City’s departments, boards, commissions, and elected officials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-4.1: The City shall maintain an up-to-date database of cultural resources and use that database as a primary information resource for protecting those resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-4.2: The City shall apply the California State Historical Building Code to ensure that City building code requirements do not compromise the integrity of significant cultural resources, at the property owner’s request.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-4.3: The City shall work with the appropriate tribe to identify and address, in a culturally appropriate manner, cultural resources and tribal sacred sites through the development review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-5.1: The City shall use its design and plot plan review processes to encourage new construction to be compatible in scale and character with cultural resources and historic districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-5.2: The City shall use its design and plot plan review processes to encourage the compatibility of street design, public improvements, and utility infrastructure with cultural resources and historic districts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy HP-7.1: The City shall apply code enforcement, zoning actions, and building safety/construction regulations as tools for helping to protect cultural resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HP-7.2</td>
<td>The City shall incorporate preservation as an integral part of its specific plans, general plan, and environmental processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-7.3</td>
<td>The City shall coordinate historic preservation with other activities within its government structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP-7.4</td>
<td>The City shall promote the preservation of cultural resources controlled by other governmental agencies, including those related to federal, state, county, school district, and other agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-2.2</td>
<td>Utilize the 2004 Santa Ana River Task Force Report in planning, programming and implementing environmental and recreational improvements to the River area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-3.1</td>
<td>Pursue methods to preserve hillside open space and natural habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-3.2</td>
<td>Seek annexation of properties that will reduce ridgeline/hillside development on the City's periphery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-4.6</td>
<td>Ensure protection of prehistoric resources through consultations with the Native American tribe(s) identified by the Native American Heritage Commission pursuant to Government Code §65352.3 and as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU-5.3</td>
<td>Encourage that any crossings of the City’s major arroyos are span bridges or soft bottom arch culverts that minimize disturbance of the ground and any wetland area. At grade crossings are strongly discouraged in major arroyos. To minimize disturbance of the arroyo the design will take into consideration aesthetics, biological, hydrological and permitting (i.e., MSHCP, ACOE, DFG, etc.) requirements to promote the free movement of water and wildlife. In addition, areas of the arroyo disturbed by construction will be restored consistent with requirements of the MSHCP, as well as the ACOE’s 404 Permit Program and DFG’s Streambed Alteration Agreement Program as applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy LU-5.4:</th>
<th>Continue to require open space easements in conjunction with new development to be recorded over arroyo areas, per the City's Grading Code.</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-5.5:</td>
<td>Work with Riverside County to develop, implement and maintain comprehensive management plans for protection of entire arroyo systems.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-6.1:</td>
<td>Enforce and adhere to the protections for agricultural areas set forth in Proposition R and Measure C.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-6.2:</td>
<td>Preserve the viability of the Gage Canal to enable continued agricultural and citricultural uses within the City.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-6.3:</td>
<td>Protect and maintain the Arlington Heights Greenbelt agricultural character through adherence with applicable provisions of the Subdivision and Zoning Codes in addition to Proposition R and Measure C.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-6.4:</td>
<td>Review development within agricultural areas to encourage efficient land use and facilitate long-term perpetuation of citrus stock.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-6.5:</td>
<td>Encourage the potential relocation of the University of California, Riverside's experimental citrus groves to one or more locations within the Arlington Heights neighborhood to help the neighborhood retain its agricultural character.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-7.1:</td>
<td>Continue to maintain Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park as primarily a functioning wildlife habitat.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-7.2:</td>
<td>Design new development adjacent and in close proximity to native wildlife in a manner which protects and preserves habitat.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-7.3:</td>
<td>Continue to require natural open space easements in conjunction with new development in hillside and arroyo areas over non-graded areas of the development.</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-7.4: Continue to participate in the Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-8.1: Ensure well-planned infill development Citywide, allow for increased density in selected areas along established transportation corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-8.3: Allow for mixed-use development at varying intensities at selected areas as a means of revitalizing underutilized urban parcels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-9.5: Encourage the design of new commercial developments as “integrated centers,” rather than as small individual strip development. Integrate pedestrian access, parking, access, building design and landscape themes across all parcels in the commercial center to unify the development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-9.7: Protect residentially designated areas from encroachment by incompatible uses and from the effects of incompatible uses in adjacent areas. Uses adjacent to planned residential areas should be compatible with the planned residential uses and should employ appropriate site design, landscaping and building design to buffer the non-residential uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.1: Work cooperatively with the March Joint Powers Authority to promote and facilitate business development associated with the March Inland Port.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.2: Work cooperatively with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission in developing, defining, implementing, and protecting airport influence zones around the MARB/MIP, Riverside Municipal and Flabob Airports and in implementing the new Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.3: Work to limit the encroachment of uses that potentially pose a threat to continued airport operations, including intensification of residential and/or commercial facilities within identified airport safety zones and areas already impacted by current or projected airport noise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.4: Adopt and utilize an Airport Protection Overlay Zone and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan as it affects lands within the City of Riverside.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.5: Review all proposed projects within the airport influence areas of Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport or March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport as noted on Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas for consistency with all applicable airport land use compatibility plan policies adopted by the Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and the City of Riverside, to the fullest extent the City finds feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.6: Review all subsequent amendments that the ALUC may adopt to the airport land use compatibility plan for Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport or March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Airport and either adopt the plan as amended or overrule the ALUC as provided by law (Government Code Section 65302.3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.7: Prior to the adoption or amendment of the General Plan or any specific plan, zoning ordinance or building regulation affecting land within the airport influence areas of the airport land use compatibility plan for Riverside Municipal Airport, Flabob Airport or March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport, refer such proposed actions for determination and processing by the ALUC as provided by Public Utilities Code Section 21670.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.8: The City may from time to time elect to voluntarily submit proposed actions or projects that are not otherwise required to be submitted to the ALUC under Airport Land Use law in the following circumstances:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Clarification: If there is a question as to the purpose, intent or interpretation of an airport land use compatibility plan (ALUCP) or its provisions; or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Advisory: If assistance is needed concerning a proposed action or project relating to Airport Land Use matters; or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable General Plan Policies</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ALUC Request: The ALUC requests that certain types be voluntarily submitted for review. These actions are identified in the ALUCP as “major land use action.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-22.9: All development proposals within an airport influence area and subject to ALUC review will also be submitted to the manager of the affected airport for comment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-26.1: Develop and enforce standards for community facilities (such as fire and police station, libraries and parks) based upon population densities and proximity to existing facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-30.4: Promote the placement of relocated historic structures on in-fill lots in neighborhoods within a designated historic district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-32.1: Encourage developers of single family residences to include a higher level of sound attenuation in new homes than required by City standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-38.1: Use a combination of land acquisition and regulatory approaches, potentially including cluster development, to preserve agricultural land and open space.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy LU-79.3: Seek to balance the Park’s potentially conflicting roles as both wildlife habitat and a community recreational and open space resource.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy N-1.1: Continue to enforce noise abatement and control measures particularly within residential neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy N-1.2: Require the inclusion of noise-reducing design features in development consistent with standards in Figure N-10 (Noise Land Use Compatibility Criteria), Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and Title 7 of the Municipal Code.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy N-1.3: Enforce the City of Riverside Noise Control Code to ensure that stationary noise and noise emanating from construction activities, private developments/residences and special events are minimized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

| Policy N-1.4: Incorporate noise considerations into the site plan review process, particularly with regard to parking and loading areas, ingress/egress points and refuse collection areas. | ✓ |
| Policy N-1.5: Avoid locating noise-sensitive land uses in existing and anticipated noise-impacted areas. | ✓ |
| Policy N-1.8: Continue to consider noise concerns in evaluating all proposed development decisions and roadway projects. | ✓ |
| Policy N-2.1: Ensure that new development can be made compatible with the noise environment by using noise/land use compatibility standards (Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria) and the airport noise contour maps (found in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans) as guides to future planning and development decisions. | ✓ |
| Policy N-2.2: Avoid placing noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential uses, hospitals, assisted living facilities, group homes, schools, day care centers, etc.) within the high noise impact areas (over 60 dB CNEL) for Riverside Municipal Airport and Flabob Airport in accordance with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. | ✓ |
| Policy N-2.5: Utilize the Airport Protection Overlay Zone, as appropriate, to advise landowners of special noise considerations associated with their development. | ✓ |
| Policy N-3.1: Avoid placing noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential uses, hospitals, assisted living facilities, group homes, schools, day care centers, etc.) within the high noise impact areas (over 65 dB CNEL) for March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port in accordance with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. | ✓ |
| Policy N-3.3: Carefully consider planned future operations of the March Air Reserve Base and March Inland Port in land use decisions for properties located within the airport-influenced area. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-1.1: Protect and preserve open space and natural habitat wherever possible. | ✓ |
### Applicable General Plan Policies

| Policy OS-1.4: Support efforts of State and Federal agencies and private conservation organizations to acquire properties for open space and conservation uses. Support efforts of nonprofit preservation groups, such as the Riverside Land Conservancy, to acquire properties for open space and conservation purposes. | ✔ |
| Policy OS-1.11: Develop a program for City acquisition of identified open space land and encourage land donations or the dedication of land in lieu of park fees for acquisition of usable land for public parks, open space, and trail linkages. | ✔ |
| Policy OS-2.2: Limit the extent and intensity of uses and development in areas of unstable terrain, steep terrain, scenic vistas, arroyos and other critical environmental areas. | ✔ |
| Policy OS-2.3: Control the grading of land, pursuant to the City's Grading Code, to minimize the potential for erosion, landsliding and other forms of land failure, as well as to limit the potential negative aesthetic impact of excessive modification of natural landforms. | ✔ |
| Policy OS-2.4: Recognize the value of ridgelines, hillsides and arroyos as significant natural and visual resources and strengthen their role as features which define the character of the City and its individual neighborhoods. | ✔ |
| Policy OS-3.1: Promote and encourage agriculture as an essential industry and a desirable open space use. The Arlington Heights Greenbelt and La Sierra Lands (i.e., Rancho La Sierra) are important agricultural lands because of their high soil quality, favorable climate and low water costs. | ✔ |
| Policy OS-3.2: Identify land for retention and encouragement of agricultural use based on consideration of historic use, soil suitability, agricultural significance, prevailing parcel sizes and geographical associations. | ✔ |
| Policy OS-3.3: Protect valuable agricultural land from urban development through the use of agricultural zoning districts and other appropriate development regulations, as well as financial and tax incentives. | ✔ |
### Applicable General Plan Policies

| Policy OS-3.4: | Encourage property owners to preserve citrus groves and implement public programs to provide incentives and other assistance to promote and protect citrus farming on prime agricultural lands. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-3.5: | Consider strategies to enhance the productivity of the local agricultural industry, such as the creation of special electric and water rate structures and the establishment of an interest subsidy program for loans used for fencing, screening and replanting of agricultural lands. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-3.6: | Support alternative allowable uses, such as crop diversification, within historic viticulture areas, where such uses will retain the agricultural use and character of the areas. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-4.2: | Establish buffers and/or open space between agricultural and urban uses so that the potential impacts from urban development will be mitigated. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-5.1: | Preserve significant habitat and environmentally sensitive areas, including hillsides, rock outcroppings, creeks, streams, viewsheds and arroyos through application of the RC Zone standards and the Hillside/Arroyo standards of the City’s Grading Code. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-5.2: | Continue to participate in the MSHCP Program and ensure all projects comply with applicable requirements. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-5.3: | Continue to participate in the Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Habitat Conservation Plan including collection of mitigation fees. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-5.4: | Protect native plant communities in the General Plan Area, including sage scrub, riparian areas and vernal pools, consistent with the MSHCP. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-6.1: | Protect and enhance known wildlife migratory corridors and create new corridors as feasible. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-6.2: | Support regional and local efforts to acquire, develop and maintain open space linkages. | ✓ |
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<p>| Policy OS-6.3: Preserve the integrity of Riverside’s arroyos and riparian habitat areas through the preservation of native plants. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-6.4: Continue with efforts to establish a wildlife movement corridor between Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park and the Box Springs Mountain Regional Park as shown on the MSHCP. New developments in this area shall be conditioned to provide for the corridor and Caltrans shall be encouraged to provide an underpass at the 60/215 Freeway. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-8.1: Support the development and use of non-polluting, renewable energy sources. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-8.10: Support the use of public transportation, bicycling and other alternative transportation modes in order to reduce the consumption of non-renewable energy supplies. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-10.6: Continue to enforce RWQCB regulations regarding urban runoff. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-10.7: Work with the RWQCB in the establishment and enforcement of urban runoff water quality standards. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-10.8: Cooperate with Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and adjacent jurisdictions in the review and approval of new developments which affect the quality and quantity of basin-wide groundwater and surface water resources. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-10.9: Evaluate development projects for compliance with NPDES requirements, and require new development to landscape a percentage of the site to filter pollutant loads in stormwater runoff and provide groundwater percolation zones. | ✓ |
| Policy OS-10.10: Protect aquifer recharge features and areas of important aquifers from degradation of water quality and reduction of recharge. | ✓ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy OS-10.11: Monitor the quality and quantity of groundwater and surface water resources and consider revisions to the General Plan’s policies if monitoring identifies significant reductions in water quality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-1.1: Coordinate the demands of new development with the capacity of the water system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-1.2: Support the efforts of the Riverside Public Utilities Department, Eastern Municipal Water District and Western Municipal Water District to work together for coordination of water services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-1.3: Continue to require that new development fund fair-share costs associated with the provision of water service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-1.4: Ensure the provision of water services consistent with the growth planned for the General Plan area, including the Sphere of Influence, working with other providers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-3.1: Coordinate the demands of new development with the capacity of the wastewater system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-3.2: Continue to require that new development fund fair-share costs associated with the provision of wastewater service.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-3.3: Pursue improvements and upgrades to the City’s wastewater collection facilities consistent with current master plans and the City’s Capital Improvement Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-4.1: Continue to fund and undertake storm drain improvement projects as identified in the City of Riverside Capital Improvement Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-4.2: Continue to cooperate in regional programs to implement the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PF-4.3: Continue to routinely monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the storm drain system and make adjustments as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy PF-5.1: Develop innovative methods and strategies to reduce the amount of waste materials entering landfills. The City should aim to achieve 100% recycling citywide for both residential and non-residential development.</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Policy PF-10.1: Provide every neighborhood with easy access to recreation and service programs by decentralizing community centers and programs. Promote the development of shared facilities and satellite offices in each Riverside neighborhood.

Policy PF-10.2: Work cooperatively with the Riverside Transit Agency to improve transportation services to community centers for those who rely on public transportation, such as seniors, the disabled and teenagers.

Policy PF-10.4: Ensure that youth activities and programs are provided or are accessible by all neighborhoods, either in City facilities or through joint-use or cooperative agreements with other service providers.

Policy PR-1.1: Implement the policies of the City of Riverside Park and Recreation Master Plan. Revise the neighborhood/community park ration standard to two acres of community park and one acre of neighborhood park per one thousand residents.

Policy PR-1.2: Distribute recreational facilities equally throughout Riverside’s neighborhoods.

Policy PR-1.3: Encourage private development of recreation facilities that complement and supplement the public recreational system.

Policy PR-2.3: Improve and create more connections to increase the safety of the bicycling, equestrian and pedestrian trail system within the City.

Policy PR-2.4: Create a primary trail loop to connect signature parks, County and State open spaces and parks.

Policy PS-1.1: Ensure that all new development in the City abides by the most recently adopted City and State seismic and geotechnical requirements.
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-1.2: Locate important public facilities of City importance outside of geologically hazardous areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-1.3: Provide the public with information on how to be prepared for a seismic event, and minimize any related damage or threat to health and public safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-1.4: Use open space easements and other regulatory techniques to prohibit development and avoid creating public safety hazards where geologic instability is identified and cannot be mitigated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PR-1.5: Coordinate efforts between public safety, building officials, communication staff and others to create innovative public awareness programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-1.6: Coordinate with the City Building Official to explore and implement, where feasible, best practices and latest technologies to minimize damage to structures located in areas determined to have a high liquefaction potential during seismic activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-2.1: Reduce flood risks for residents and businesses within urbanized areas, as feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-2.2: Encourage flood control infrastructure that does not reduce the natural character or limit the use of the site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-2.3: Minimize additional flood risk exposure in developing areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-2.4: Identify existing facilities located in the 1% annual chance of flood zone, particularly bridges and potential emergency access routes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-2.6: Create and maintain evacuation routes for areas that could be affected by flooding or dam failure, with special emphasis on critical and emergency facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable General Plan Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-2.7: Minimize flood risks to the City’s agricultural greenbelt by working with the Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District to identify and implement appropriate flood control measures where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-3.1: Ensure that hazardous materials used in business and industry are handled properly.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-3.2: Provide the Fire Department with resources to ensure that hazardous materials used and generated by businesses are handled properly.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-3.3: Work with responsible Federal, State and County agencies to identify and regulate the disposal of toxic materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-3.4: Reduce the risks associated with ground transportation hazards, where feasible.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-3.5: Encourage sewer service to minimize groundwater contamination.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-4.1: Minimize the risk of potential hazards associated with aircraft operations at the Riverside Municipal Airport, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port and Flabob Airport through the adoption and implementation of the Airport Protection Overlay Zone and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-4.2: When planning for development near airports, anticipate possible increases in airport activity and expansion of airport facilities and services and the effects these changes may have on public safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-4.3: Encourage development in the vicinity of the Riverside Municipal Airport that would not cause land use conflicts, hazards to aviation or hazards to the public and that is in compliance with the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for the airport.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable General Plan Policies</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas emissions</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-4.4: Maintain open space adjoining the Riverside Municipal Airport, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port and Flabob Airport as required for safety for both the present runway configurations and for possible future expansion as identified in the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and the Riverside Municipal Airport Master Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-4.5: Review the Riverside Municipal Airport Master Plan periodically to update operational and safety procedures, reflect State and Federal mandates, better utilize airport property and recommend land use capability standards for land surrounding the airport.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-4.6: Ensure that development within airport influence areas is consistent with the Airport Protection Overlay Zone development standards and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-4.7: Ensure compatible land uses near March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port through participation of staff and elected officials in the adoption of the March Joint Land Use Study and the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-6.1: Ensure that sufficient fire stations, personnel and equipment are provided to meet the needs of the community as it grows in size and population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-6.2: Endeavor to meet/maintain a response time of five minutes for Riverside’s urban areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-6.3: Integrate fire safety considerations in the planning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-6.4: Evaluate all new development to be located in or adjacent to wildland areas to assess its vulnerability to fire and its potential as a source of fire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-6.5: Mitigate existing fire hazards related to urban development or patterns of urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS-6.6</td>
<td>Continue to implement stringent brush-clearance requirements in areas subject to wildland fire hazards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-6.7</td>
<td>Continue to involve the City Fire Department in the development review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-6.9</td>
<td>Provide outreach and education to the community regarding fire safety and prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-7.1</td>
<td>Deploy human and financial resources to ensure adequate and equitable distribution of police services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-7.2</td>
<td>Support the transition of the Riverside Police Department from a centralized agency to one built around projects as a means of providing more rapid, equitable and proactive community policing services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-7.4</td>
<td>Coordinate with the Riverside County Sheriff in its efforts to provide law enforcement services within Sphere of Influence areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-7.5</td>
<td>Endeavor to provide minimum response times of seven minutes on all Priority 1 calls and twelve minutes on all Priority 2 calls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-9.1</td>
<td>Maintain an effective, coordinated and up-to-date community-wide emergency response plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-9.2</td>
<td>Support the Riverside Emergency Management Office in coordinating the City’s response to disasters, providing public outreach and presentations and assisting residents to prepare for major events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-9.3</td>
<td>Review and test the City’s Emergency Operations Plan periodically to note any deficiencies or practices requiring modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS-9.5</td>
<td>Provide effective and relevant information to the public regarding disaster preparedness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicable General Plan Policies

<p>| Policy PS-9.7: Identify actions to reduce the severity and probability of hazardous occurrences. |   |   |
| Policy PS-9.8: Reduce the risk to the community from hazards related to geologic conditions, seismic activity, flooding and structural and wildland fires by requiring feasible mitigation of such impacts on discretionary development projects. |   | ✓ |
| Policy PS-10.3: Ensure that public safety infrastructure and staff resources keep pace with new development planned or proposed in Riverside and the Sphere of Influence. |✓ | ✓ |
| Policy PS-10.4: Continue to ensure that each development or neighborhood in the City has adequate emergency ingress and egress, and review neighborhood access needs to solve problems, if possible. |   | ✓ |
| Policy PS-10.5: Coordinate with local agencies and organizations to educate all residents and businesses to take appropriate action to safeguard life and property during and immediately after emergencies. |   | ✓ |
| Policy PS-10.6: Improve communications between public safety agencies and other City departments, particularly with regard to new development or annexation areas. |   | ✓ |
| Policy PS-10.7: Encourage the development of financial programs to improve emergency response services. |   | ✓ |
| Policy PS-10.8: Investigate and pursue additional funding mechanisms available to fund City services for hazard response and recovery. |   | ✓ |
| Policy PS-10.9: Maintain a safe and secure, technologically advanced Emergency Operations Center allowing for room to expand as the City grows. |   | ✓ |
| Policy PS-11.1: Protect resources listed in the Historical Resources Inventory from premature or inadvertent demolition and encourage retrofitting of these resources to protect them from damage caused by a disaster episode. |   | ✓ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant General Plan 2025 Policies</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Geology and Soils</th>
<th>Greenhouse Gas emissions</th>
<th>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</th>
<th>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</th>
<th>Land Use/Planning</th>
<th>Noise</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Transportation/Traffic</th>
<th>Tribal Cultural Resources</th>
<th>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-11.2: Take reasonable steps to prevent the loss of historic building without endangering public safety or contributing to additional property damage.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy PS-11.3: Preserve sensitive and significant archaeological, cultural and historic resources by maintaining coordination between Riverside’s Emergency Management Office, the Eastern Information Center (EIC) at the University of California, Riverside (UCR) and Native American Tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to obtain area specific information related to sensitive resources during natural and human-caused disasters, hazards and/or other emergency events.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>