Section IV — The Planning Process

This section summarizes the process followed to prepare and adopt this General Plan. The process includes significant public input, thorough analysis of baseline conditions in the City, definition of alternative planning approaches and selection of a preferred approach. Upon completion of a draft plan, the process involves additional public input in a formal adoption process.

A. Introduction

The process of developing or updating a plan gives a community the opportunity to consider its existing policies, the needs of its residents, and its objectives for the future. For the City of Riverside, this General Plan update continues and builds on a long tradition of creative planning. It addresses a community which has already been extensively developed and which has an established community character. As a result, this Plan Update process has examined Riverside's community objectives and has supported a continuation of existing policies. Rather than changing course, the process has refined the City's current planning direction and has extended it into the Twenty—First Century.

An update of Riverside's adopted General Plan was initiated in July of 1987. It has included review of previously-adopted Plan Elements, Community Plans and Specific Plans; public participation through a variety of means; collection and updating of technical information; and evaluation of policy alternatives. These steps are discussed in greater detail below.

B. Public Input

An understanding of the community's concerns and objectives is vital to the preparation of a General Plan. Several methods of public input were used to identify citizens' concerns and objectives, including Community Goals Conferences, opinion surveys and Citizen's Advisory Committee comments.

1. Community Goals Conferences

A series of nine Community Goals Conferences were held in April and May, 1989. These sessions were designed to give residents of Riverside, and Riverside's Sphere of Influence, a forum for providing information, ideas and opinions for consideration in shaping the Plan's policies. Comments received at these conferences were used in drafting preliminary community objectives for Riverside.

2. Community Opinion Surveys

Two Community Opinion Surveys were distributed in March of 1989. The first survey was sent to a random sample of households in the City of Riverside and its Sphere of Influence, drawn from the household files of the Riverside County Board of Education. This eleven page survey asked about public services, use of facilities, employment and commuting patterns, and demographic characteristics. The second survey was a two page questionnaire of citizen opinions about the City of Riverside and its public services. This shorter survey was included in a City newsletter mailed to 90,000 addresses within the City limits.

Survey respondents were generally satisfied with the quality of life in Riverside, and with City services and facilities. They supported provision of some additional recreational facilities, particularly for walking and bicycling. In addition, they

expressed a willingness to support tax increases for acquisition of open space, and for provision of public facilities and services. These surveys provided the General Plan process participants with an understanding of the opinions and concerns of the general public, concerns which were then considered in defining community objectives.

3. *Citizen's Advisory Committee*

A Citizens' Advisory Committee for the General Plan Update was appointed by the Riverside City Council in February, 1989. Its nineteen members were selected to represent key community and neighborhood interests. The Citizens' Advisory Committee first developed a set of community objectives. The Committee considered the comments received through the Goals Conferences and the community opinion surveys. Based on this information, and members' own perspectives, a set of preliminary community objectives were developed. Preliminary objectives were organized according to six major topics: Housing and Residential Neighborhoods; Shopping and Commercial Services; Economic Development; Transportation Systems; Community Facilities and Services; and Environmental Quality. These objectives were approved by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on October 18, 1989. They established priorities and direction for the remainder of the planning process.

C. *Baseline Assessment*

The City staff and consultants collected information, prepared maps and conducted other analysis to serve as the basis for plan development. A detailed inventory of existing land uses provided a complete assessment of the current development patterns, as well as identifying those vacant areas where future development might occur. Community facilities were identified and information regarding location, facility type and capacity was collected. Based on general service standards, service areas were delineated for the major community facilities — neighborhood and community parks, libraries, and emergency service facilities.

An environmental baseline report identified existing environmental constraints and laid the foundation for pinpointing the environmental issues to be addressed in the General Plan. Natural features, such as slopes, drainage basins and wildlife habitat areas, were mapped. Other resources, such as open space areas, agricultural lands, and scenic routes, were also evaluated.

Another background report focused on the utility systems, their capacities and the policies regarding their expansion. Additionally, a demographic baseline was prepared to describe the existing character of the City's people, housing, employment and other non-residential activities.

D. Evaluation of Plan Alternatives

Three General Plan alternatives were selected for a detailed analysis: the *Trends Alternative*, the *Compact City Alternative*, and the *Natural Areas Alternative*. These are the alternatives that are most reflective of the major policy options facing the City of Riverside. The process for selecting these three alternatives is described below. Each of these three alternatives are defined in terms of future population and employment, urban form, and other policies represented by the alternative.

1. The Alternatives Selection Process

In defining alternatives, the Citizens' Advisory Committee considered levels of growth, location of new development, and policies related to community character. In considering overall levels of growth, the Committee reviewed a set of nine projections of population and employment growth for the City of Riverside in the year 2010. All projections addressed the geographic area contained within the present City limits. They were based on varying assumptions about growth in the Southern California Region and the City's growth within that context. As shown in Exhibit 31 (Page IV - 6), projections range from a low of 230,000 persons for the Regional Baseline to a high of 314,605 persons with a continuation of current growth rates (at two and a half percent per year). Comparable employment projections reflected varying assumptions about Riverside's ability to capture an increasing share of the regional employment growth and, as a result, increase the ratio of jobs to residents in the City by 2010.

From the nine sets of projections, three were chosen for use in developing the alternatives for detailed study. These three were the "Regional Growth Management" projection, consistent with the Southern California Association of Government's (SCAG) adopted Regional Growth Management Plan; the "Modified Population Growth/Improved Job Balance" projection, which assumes a slowing of population growth to two percent per year but an increasing jobs-housing balance; and the "Current Population Growth/Improved Job Balance" projection, which assumes a continuation of past population growth and an improved jobs-housing balance. These three projections are highlighted in Exhibit 31 (Page IV - 6).

Five urban development alternatives were also reviewed and discussed by the Committee. Each alternative proposes a different geographic pattern of urban development representing a particular policy direction the City could choose to establish through the General Plan. The policy direction for each of these alternatives is presented in Exhibit 32 (Page IV - 8).

Exhibit 31:

Plan Alternatives — All Projections and Scenarios

SCENARIO PROJECTIONS	TREND	AGRICULTURAL EMPHASIS/INFILL	COMPACT CITY	NATURAL AREAS	EXPANSION CITY
Regional Baseline	• **230,300 Population** • **154,300 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 230,300 Population • 154,300 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development • Infill at Existing Intensities	• **230,300 Population** • **154,300 Employment** • **More Intensity Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **230,300 Population** • **154,300 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 230,300 Population • 154,300 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Development of Agriculture and Hills • Infill at Existing Intensities
Regional Growth Management	• **276,844 Population** • **170,533 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **276,844 Population** • **170,533 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agriculture Protected, Hills with Development** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **276,844 Population** • **170,833 Employment than General** • **More Intensity Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **276,844 Population** • **170,533 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **276,844 Population** • **170,533 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Development of Agriculture and Hills** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**
City Development Policy	• **280,175 Population** • **204,619 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 280,176 Population • 204,619 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development • Infill at Existing Intensities	• **280,176 Population** • **204,619 Employment than General** • **More Intensity Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **280,176 Population** • **204,619 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 280,176 Population • 204,619 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Development of Agriculture and Hills • Infill at Existing Intensities
Current Population Growth/ Current Balance	• **314,605 Population** • **151,010 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 314,605 Population • 151,010 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development • Infill at Existing Intensities	• **314,605 Population** • **151,010 Employment than General** • **More Intensity Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **314,605 Population** • **151,010 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 314,605 Population • 151,010 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Development of Agriculture and Hills • Infill at Existing Intensities
Modified Population Growth/Current Balance	• **291,634 Population** • **139,984 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 291,634 Population • 139,984 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development • Infill at Existing Intensities	• **291,634 Population** • **139,984 Employment than General** • **More Intensity Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **291,634 Population** • **139,984 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 291,634 Population • 139,984 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Development of Agriculture and Hills • Infill at Existing Intensities

Exhibit 31:

Plan Alternatives — All Projections and Scenarios

SCENARIO PROJECTIONS	TRENDS	AGRICULTURAL EMPHASIS/INFILL	COMPACT CITY	NATURAL AREAS EMPHASIS	EXPANSION CITY
Current Population Growth/ Improved Balance	• **314,605 Population** • **195,055 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non- Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 314,605 Population • 195,055 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development • Infill at Existing Intensities	• **314,605 Population** • **195,055 Employment** • **More Intensity than General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **314,605 Population** • **195,055 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 314,605 Population • 195,055 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Development of Agricultural and Hills • Infill at Existing Intensities
Modified Population Growth/ Improved Balance	• **291,634 Population** • **180,813 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills, Non- Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **291,634 Population** • **180,813 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **291,634 Population** • **180,813 Employment** • **More Intensity than General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **291,634 Population** • **180,813 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **291,634 Population** • **180,813 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Development of Agricultural and Hills** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**
Current Population Growth/High	• **314,605 Population** • **229,662 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non- Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **314,605 Population** • **229,662 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **314,605 Population** • **229,662 Employment** • **More Intensity than General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **314,605 Population** • **229,662 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Agricultural Developed, Hills Non-Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• **314,605 Population** • **229,662 Employment** • **General Plan in Urbanized City** • **Development of Agricultural and Hills** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**
Current Population Growth/High Job Growth	• **291,634 Population** • **212,893 Employment** • **Reflects Existing General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non- Urban** • **Infill at Existing Intensities**	• 291,634 Population • 212,893 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Agricultural Protected, Hills with Development • Infill at Existing Intensities	• **291,634 Population** • **212,893 Employment** • **More Intensity than General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• **291,634 Population** • **212,893 Employment** • **More Intensity than General Plan** • **Agricultural Areas & Hills Non-Urban** • **Intensification**	• 291,634 Population • 212,893 Employment • General Plan in Urbanized City • Development of Agricultural and Hills • Infill at Existing Intensities

scenario development patterns, please refer to the report titled "Alternative Plan Scenarios" prepared for Task #6 of this program.

(continued)

Exhibit 32: Summary of Development Scenarios

Trends Scenario

- Reflects Current General Plan
- Agricultural and Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity
- Infill in Already Urbanized Areas
- Most New Growth Occurs in Outer Portions of Planning Area
- Moderate Employment Growth Potential
- Automobile is Primary Transportation Mode
- Moderate Population Holding Capacity
- Projections and Scenario Appear Compatible

Agricultural Emphasis/Infill Scenario

- Tends to Reflect the Existing General Plan in Already Urbanized Areas
- Agricultural Lands and Hillside Lands Over thirty percent Slope Retain Low Development Capacity — Moderate
- Development Capacity Increase on Lands fifteen percent — thirty percent
- Infill in Existing Urbanized Areas
- Agricultural Lands in Outlying Areas Retained
- Limited Development of Non-Agricultural Lands in Outlying Areas
- Low to Moderate Employment Growth Potential
- Projections and Scenario Appear Compatible

Compact City Scenario

- Reflects Higher Development Intensity than Current General Plan
- Agricultural and Hillside Land Retain Low Development Capacity
- Intensified Development in Existing Urbanized Area
- Low Development Intensity in Outer Portions of Study Area
- Higher Employment Growth Potential
- Transportation by Automobile but Potential for More Bus Service & Light Rail
- Higher Population Holding Capacity
- Projections and Scenario Appear Compatible

Natural Areas Emphasis Scenario

- Reflects Substantial Increase in Intensity Above Current General Plan in Many Lower Density Areas
- Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity — Agricultural Lands Allowed to Develop at Moderate Intensity
- Outlying Agricultural Lands Urbanized
- Planned Satellite Urban Community in Woodcrest/Rancho El Sobrante Area
- Emphasis on Preservation of Arroyos and Steep Hillsides
- Moderate Employment Growth Potential
- Auto is Primary Transportation Mode; Clustering May Support Additional Public Transportation
- Moderate to High Population Holding Capacity
- Projections and Scenario Appear Compatible

City Expansion Scenario

- Reflect Substantially More Overall Intensity than General Plan
- Agricultural & Hillside Lands Allowed to Urbanize to a Substantial Degree
- Intensification of Existing Urbanized Area
- Substantial Urbanization of Outlying Areas
- High Employment Potential
- Automobile is Primary Transportation Mode, but Higher Holding Capacity May Support Additional Public Transportation
- High Population Holding Capacity
- Projections and Scenario Appear Potentially Compatible

- The "*Trends*" alternative reflects growth under the current City General Plan.

- *"Agricultural Emphasis/Infill"* gives the highest priority to preservation of agricultural areas; it provides for infill to the extent such development will not significantly affect existing neighborhoods.

- The "*Compact City*" alternative uses infill and intensification of existing urban development to accommodate higher levels of growth without substantial outward expansions, thus making maximum use of existing infrastructure.

- In the "*Natural Areas Emphasis*" preservation of the City's natural resources receives the highest priority. This alternative proposes development in some agricultural areas (including a "satellite urban community" in the Woodcrest area) but it protects natural areas such as hillsides and sensitive habitats.

- The "*City Expansion*" alternative accommodates growth by extending urban development into agricultural and natural areas surrounding the existing community, providing for continuing growth without increasing urban development intensities.

The policies and urban patterns reflected in each of these alternatives were debated by the Committee. Of the five, three were selected for further consideration: *"Trends"*, *"Compact City"*, and *"Natural Areas Emphasis"*. These three were selected because they represent the current policy and two alternatives which modify key policies: intensification of existing urban areas in the case of *Compact City*, and urbanization of some agricultural areas in the *Natural Area Emphasis*. Exhibit 31 (Page IV - 6) highlights those choices made by the Committee in narrowing the list of alternatives.

The "short list" of projections and alternatives created nine plan alternatives. These options are summarized in Exhibit 33 (Page IV - 11). Once again, the Citizens' Advisory Committee evaluated these options. Issues considered in discussing the nine options included:

- the assessment of whether the alternatives were realistic in their treatment of physical features and existing development;

- the provision of a range of possible future outcomes to be examined;

- the inclusion of major policy options in the alternatives for detailed study; and

- the internal consistency of each alternative.

The Committee unanimously selected three of the nine for detailed alternatives analysis. These three were recommended to the City Council, and approved for detailed evaluation, which included minor adjustments to population and employment projections to reflect existing conditions and planned development potential.

The "*Trends*" urban pattern, combined with the Regional Growth Management projections, were selected as one alternative. This alternative provides a good representation of current City policy and a growth level consistent with adopted SCAG Regional policy. This alternative reflects the continuation of these policies.

The second selected alternative combines the *Compact City Alternative* and the projections for modified population growth and improved jobs-housing balance. This option results in higher 2010 population and employment levels than the first alternative. It protects the hillside and agricultural areas, accommodating this growth through higher intensity development within the existing urbanized areas of the City of Riverside.

The third alternative chosen for detailed analysis was the *Natural Areas Emphasis Alternative* combined with the projections for modified population growth and improved jobs-housing balance. While the amount of growth is the same as in the *Compact City Alternative*, the *Natural Areas* option proposes a different development pattern to accommodate that growth. Rather than planning for higher intensity uses in already developed areas, it plans for extension of intensities comparable to those which exist now into areas not now urbanized, including agricultural areas. The three alternatives selected for detailed analysis are highlighted in Exhibit 33 (Page IV - 11). Each of them poses distinct policy choices for the City of Riverside. Their evaluation gives the City an understanding of the costs and benefits of various development policies, an assessment which was critical to the update of the City's General Plan.

2. Common Assumptions

Each of the three alternatives is defined in greater detail below. The definitions focus on distinct aspects of each alternative and changes from the character of the existing community. There are some features which are the same in all three alternatives.

First, much of the Riverside of 2010 already exists — development in many parts of the community will not change dramatically in the next twenty years. Since these alternatives all build on and modify the features of the existing community, they show similar development patterns in areas where the existing uses are expected to remain.

Exhibit 33: Nine Principal Plan Alternatives

Trends Scenario Alternatives		
Alternative A	**Alternative B**	**Alternative C**
• **276,800 Population**	• 291,600 Population	• 314,600 Population
• **170,500 Jobs**	• 180,800 Jobs	• 229,700 Jobs
• **Reflects Current General Plan**	• Reflects Current General Plan	• Reflects Current General Plan
• **Agricultural and Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity**	• Agricultural and Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity	• Agricultural and Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity
• **Infill in Already Urbanized Areas**	• Infill in Already Urbanized Areas	• Infill in Already Urbanized Areas
• **Most New Growth Occurs in Outer Portions of Planning Area**	• Most New Growth Occurs in Outer Portions of Planning Area	• Most New Growth Occurs in Outer Portions of Planning Area
• **Moderate Employment Growth Potential**	• Moderate Employment Growth Potential	• Moderate Employment Growth Potential
• **Automobile is Primary Transportation Mode**	• Automobile is Primary Transportation Mode	• Automobile is Primary Transportation Mode
• **Moderate Population Holding Capacity**	• Moderate Population Holding Capacity	• Moderate Population Holding Capacity
• **Projections and Scenario Appear Compatible**	• Projections and Scenario Appear Potentially Compatible	• Projections and Scenario Appear to be Compatible Only with Difficulty
Compact City Scenario Alternatives		
Alternative G	**Alternative H**	**Alternative I**
• 276,800 Population	• **291,600 Population**	• 314,600 Population
• 170,500 Jobs	• **180,800 Jobs**	• 229,700 Jobs
• Reflects Higher Development Intensity than Current General Plan	• **Reflects Higher Development Intensity than Current General Plan**	• Reflects Higher Development Intensity than Current General Plan
• Agricultural and Hillside Land Retain Low Development Capacity	• **Agricultural and Hillside Land Retain Low Development Capacity**	• Agricultural and Hillside Land Retain Low Development Capacity
• Intensified Development in Existing Urbanized Area	• **Intensified Development in Existing Urbanized Area**	• Intensified Development in Existing Urbanized Area
• Low Development Intensity in Outer Portions of Study Area	• **Low Development Intensity in Outer Portions of Study Area**	• Low Development Intensity in Outer Portions of Study Area
• Higher Employment Growth Potential	• **Higher Employment Growth Potential**	• Higher Employment Growth Potential
• Transportation by Automobile but with Potential for More Bus Service and Light Rail	• **Transportation by Automobile but with Potential for More Bus Service and Light Rail**	• Transportation by Automobile but with Potential for More Bus Service and Light Rail
• Higher Population Holding Capacity	• **Higher Population Holding Capacity**	• Higher Population Holding Capacity
• Projections and Scenario Appear Compatible	• **Projections and Scenario Appear Potentially Compatible**	• Projections and Scenario Appear Potentially Compatible
Natural Areas Emphasis Scenario Alternatives		
Alternative J	**Alternative K**	**Alternative L**
• 276,800 Population	• **291,600 Population**	• 314,600 Population
• 170,500 Jobs	• **180,800 Jobs**	• 229,700 Jobs
• Reflects Substantial Increase in Intensity Above Current General Plan in Many Lower Density Areas	• **Reflects Substantial Increase in Intensity Above Current General Plan in Many Lower Density Areas**	• Reflects Substantial Increase in Intensity Above Current General Plan in Many Lower Density Areas
• Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity - Agricultural Lands Allowed to Develop at Moderate Intensity	• **Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity Agricultural Lands Allowed to Develop at Moderate Intensity**	• Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity Agricultural Lands Allowed to Develop at Moderate Intensity
• Outlying Agricultural Lands Urbanized	• **Outlying Agricultural Lands Urbanized**	• Outlying Agricultural Lands Urbanized
• Planned Satellite Urban Community in Woodcrest/Rancho El Sobrante Area	• **Planned Satellite Urban Community in Woodcrest/Rancho El Sobrante Area**	• Planned Satellite Urban Community in Woodcrest/Rancho El Sobrante Area
• Emphasis on Preservation of Arroyos and Steep Hillsides	• **Emphasis on Preservation of Arroyos and Steep Hillsides**	• Emphasis on Preservation of Arroyos and Steep Hillsides
• Moderate Employment Growth Potential	• **Moderate Employment Growth Potential**	• Moderate Employment Growth Potential
• Auto is Primary Transportation Mode but Clustering May Support Additional Public Transportation	• **Auto is Primary Transportation Mode, but Clustering May Support Additional Public Transportation**	• Auto is Primary Transportation Mode, but Clustering May Support Additional Public Transportation
• Moderate to High Population Holding Capacity	• **Moderate to High Population Holding Capacity**	• Moderate to High Population Holding Capacity
• Projections and Scenario Appear Compatible	• **Projections and Scenario Appear Potentially Compatible**	• Projections and Scenario Appear Potentially Compatible

NOTE: Bold indicates plan alternatives selected for detailed alternatives analysis.

Second, all three alternatives will have more population and employment than the City has today. As a result, all alternatives will have greater impacts on some aspects of the community than are currently experienced. The comparison between alternatives focuses, not solely on whether there is more impact than today, but rather on the relative impacts between the alternatives — for example, does the geographic pattern of development mean that more parks are needed for one alternative versus another to serve the same 2010 population.

Finally, the evaluation of alternatives generally assumes that technology (for service provision, transportation, and so forth) will remain essentially unchanged from the present. While dramatic changes could occur between now and the year 2010, the three alternatives are not predicated on such changes since they are beyond present forecast capabilities. Should such technological changes occur, they would not be expected to occur in a different way in the different alternatives. For this reason, the alternatives assume a constant level of technology.

With these common assumptions, there are nevertheless important differences between the alternatives. These differences are identified in the following section. The three alternatives are defined in terms of policy intent, development potential, 2010 population and employment projections, and an assumed urban form. These urban forms are shown on conceptual alternative diagrams.

3. *The Selected Alternatives*

Alternative 1: ***Trends***

The *Trends Alternative* assumes that development will follow the policies contained in the previously-adopted City of Riverside General Plan, with the amount of growth through 2010 consistent with SCAG's Regional Growth Management Plan policies. Under this alternative, the growth rate between now and 2010 will be slower than that experienced in Riverside during the 1980's, an assumption that is consistent with slower growth region-wide. The ratio of jobs to residents would increase from the present rate, however, signifying faster non-residential development. Within the current City limits, this alternative projects approximately 277,000 residents. For the General Plan Area as a whole, this alternative is projected to have 309,000 persons and 195,000 jobs in 2010.

The urban development pattern of this alternative reflects the prior City of Riverside General Plan and the patterns of development activity currently occurring in the City. The conceptual alternative map (Exhibit 34 (Page IV - 14)) is intended to represent the City's adopted land use plan. Under this alternative, the existing neighborhoods in areas such as Wood Streets, Casa Blanca, Arlington, Ramona and Magnolia Center would experience some infill development on vacant properties, at densities similar to the existing neighborhoods.

Higher intensity development would continue to occur along Highway 91 (Riverside Freeway), Magnolia Avenue, and Arlington Avenue. Higher intensity development is also planned in the Canyon Springs/Sycamore Canyon areas and along Alessandro Boulevard and Trautwein Road. The Arlanza/La Sierra area is designated for Moderate Urban and Semi-Rural/Low Intensity Urban uses, with some Rural/Non-Urban development near the Santa Ana River and the Norco Hills. Similarly, Arlington Heights and Alessandro Hills would develop with a mix of Semi-Rural/Low Intensity Urban and Rural/Non-Urban areas.

The *Trends Alternative* includes the development of certain new areas in accordance with specific plans that have been formalized through development agreements. These agreements affect Canyon Springs, Orangecrest, the Lusk Highlander project area, and Mission Grove.

Outside the City limits, the *Trends Alternative* anticipates Semi-Rural/Low Intensity Urban development in the Woodcrest community near the Washington Street - Van Buren Boulevard intersection. In the southernmost section of the General Plan Area east of Wood Road, moderate and high intensity urban uses are anticipated. Areas in County agricultural preserves would continue in Rural/Non-Urban use, while other areas would experience Semi-Rural/Low Intensity Urban development.

This pattern of development does provide opportunities for development beyond that projected for 2010. The "build-out" of this alternative is calculated based upon the existing land uses, and on full development of vacant land in accordance with this concept map. The *Trends Alternative's* build-out estimate is 346,000 persons and 240,000 jobs.

Principal Features of the *Trends Alternative*

- 2010 Population Within Current City Limits of 277,000
- 2010 Employment Within Current City Limits of 177,000
- 2010 General Plan Area Population of 309,351
- 2010 General Plan Area Employment of 195,000
- Reflects Current General Plan
- Agricultural and Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity
- Infill in Already Urbanized Areas
- Most New Growth Occurs in Outer Portions of Planning Area
- Automobile is Primary Transportation Mode

Exhibit 34: Plan Alternative 1 *Trends Scenario*

Alternative 2: *Compact City*

The *Compact City Alternative* incorporates a more intense urban pattern to efficiently accommodate future development. It limits most urban development to the presently-urbanized parts of the General Plan Area, while assuming a higher population and employment level than the *Trends Alternative*. As a result, higher intensity development would occur in areas already largely developed. Within the City limits, the 2010 population and employment projections are 292,000 persons and 189,000 jobs. This level of growth is 5.4% higher than that assumed in the *Trends Alternative*. It reflects population growth at a slower pace than that which occurred in the City in the 1980's but at a higher rate (two percent per year) than SCAG's Growth Management Plan projects for Riverside.

Exhibit 35 (Page IV - 17) shows the higher development intensities of the *Compact City Alternative*. This alternative emphasizes intensification of Downtown-area development. However, it also provides for intensification of other central areas, by allowing new development to occur at higher intensities than those which exist today. Within residential areas, the planned intensification could take the form of removal of existing uses (such as single family homes) and replacement with more intense uses (townhomes or apartments, for example). It would also involve development of vacant lots at higher intensities than surrounding development; the addition of "second units" on parcels would also be a possible result of this alternative.

Non-residential uses would also be expected to intensify under this alternative. In particular, the "corridor" along Highway 91 and the Santa Fe Railroad line would be targeted for new, more intense non-residential use.

Planning areas with significant vacant areas remaining would develop at Semi-rural intensities under this alternative (although proposals with approved development agreements are reflected). This approach ensures that moderate and higher urban intensity development is concentrated, minimizing infrastructure extension costs. It also provides more opportunities for Semi-Rural/Low Intensity Urban development than would the *Trends* option.

Principal Features of the *Compact City Alternative*

- 2010 Population Within Current City Limits of 292,000
- 2010 Employment Within Current City Limits of 189,000
- 2010 General Plan Area Population of 316,000
- 2010 General Plan Area Employment of 206,000
- Reflects Higher Development Intensity than Current General Plan
- Agricultural and Hillside Land Retain Low Development Capacity
- Intensified Development in Existing Urbanized Area
- Low Development Intensity in Outer Portions of General Plan Area
- Transportation by Automobile but with Potential for More Bus Service and Light Rail
- Development "Build-out" Potential Estimated at 363,000 Persons and 240,000 Jobs

Exhibit 35: Plan Alternative 2 *Compact City Scenario*

Alternative 3: ***Natural Areas***

The third alternative selected for detailed analysis gives the highest priority to preservation of natural areas within the City and General Plan Area. At the same time, it is intended to accommodate a higher population and employment level than that of the *Trends Alternative*. The population projections are the same as in the *Compact City Alternative*, with a 2010 General Plan Area population of 316,000 and 206,000 jobs. However, the geographic distribution of the development is different, with more of the new development in out-lying areas of the City and in the adjacent sphere of influence. The jobs per resident ratio would also remain the same as in the *Compact City Alternative*.

Exhibit 36 (Page IV - 20) depicts the conceptual development scenario for this alternative. Focusing on the preservation of natural areas, this alternative restricts the amount of development on slopes and in other important natural areas, such as significant habitats, stream corridors and other significant natural topographic features. These natural areas are planned for Rural/Non Urban development. Areas within the urbanized city are planned to infill at intensities much like those that exist today. The additional development anticipated by 2010 would occur in areas now in agricultural use. Some of these areas, such as the land adjacent to the Santa Ana River Corridor in Arlanza/La Sierra, would be planned for Semi-Rural/Low Intensity Urban development similar to the urban development now existing in this area. Portions of Arlington Heights would be planned for Moderate Urban development under this alternative. The Highgrove/Hunter Park area would also be planned for Higher Intensity Urban development. This alternative assumes that agricultural uses would not be retained within the study area if not generally viable.

Additionally, a "satellite urban community" would be identified in the Rancho El Sobrante/Woodcrest area. This plateau would be designated for a community with a mix of residential and non-residential uses. It would be separated from the existing urban area by the Rural/Non-Urban areas and greenbelts of the Mockingbird Canyon and the slopes to the east of this canyon. Higher intensities would be clustered at the intersections of Van Buren and Washington Street, and Van Buren and Wood Road. These designations give an opportunity for creation of a well-designed community with a distinct identity. High quality industrial and office development might locate here, as might "executive housing".

Principal Features of the *Natural Areas Alternative*

- 2010 Population Within Current City Limits of 281,000
- 2010 Employment Within Current City Limits of 184,000
- 2010 General Plan Area Population of 316,000
- 2010 General Plan Area Employment of 206,000
- Hillside Lands Retain Low Development Capacity
- Agricultural Lands Allowed to Develop at Moderate Intensities
- Planned Satellite Urban community Created in Woodcrest/Rancho El Sobrante Area
- Emphasis on Preservation of Arroyos and Steep Hillsides
- Automobile is Primary Transportation Mode, but Clustering of Urban Uses May Support Additional Public Transportation
- Development "Build-out" Potential Estimated at 368,000 Persons and 219,000 Jobs

Exhibit 36: Plan Alternative 3 ***Natural Areas Emphasis Scenario***

4. Summary of Selected Alternatives

Exhibit 37 (Page IV - 22) presents the major features of all three alternatives selected for detailed analysis. As it indicates, these three alternatives present different options for the community in terms of intensification of existing neighborhoods, the treatment of agricultural lands, the outward extent of urbanization, and overall levels of population and employment.

5. Comparison of Plan Alternative Impacts

Review of these three plan alternatives led to several conclusions. First, many impacts on the City of Riverside are related simply to the fact that there will be more people in Riverside in 2010 than there are today. Demands for service, the amount of urban development, and other factors increase simply due to the amount of growth over the twenty-year period. Planning for a reasonable level of continuing growth will require the commitment of additional resources to meet these demands.

Second, all three plan alternatives are able to accommodate the projected population and employment growth, with some level of excess capacity remaining. None of the alternatives would restrict the General Plan Area's development potential below the levels needed to accommodate a reasonable amount of growth.

Third, the differences in geographic distribution of growth do result in some differences in impacts on natural resources. Both the *Trends* and *Compact City Alternatives* successfully retain major areas of agricultural value; *Compact City* and *Natural Areas* are very similar in their protection of other natural resources (steep slopes, sensitive habitats, and the like). All alternatives have some effect on smaller environmental features; refinement of a preferred alternative could minimize most of these effects.

Community facility demands, for those services using a defined geographic service area, increase as urban development extends outward. The *Natural Areas Alternative* generally demands the largest number of new facilities due to the greater extent of urbanization (in currently agricultural areas), while *Compact City* and *Trends* show somewhat lower facility needs.

Exhibit 37: Summary of Selected Plan Alternatives

ISSUE	*TRENDS* ALTERNATIVE	*COMPACT CITY* ALTERNATIVE	*NATURAL AREA* ALTERNATIVE
Comparison to Existing General Plan	Comparable Policy Direction and Intent	More Intense Uses in Some Devoted Areas; Comparable in Most Outlying Areas	Comparable in Most Developed Areas; More Urban Uses in Outlying Areas
Agricultural Lands	Protection of important agricultural land	Protection of important agricultural land	Plans for Urban Uses of Agricultural Areas
Hillsides/Natural Areas	Protection of slopes of fifteen percent or more	Less Development in Some Hillside Areas	Protection of slopes of fifteen percent or more
2010 Population (Est.) **• Current City Limits** **• Study Area**	277,000 309,000	292,000 316,000	281,000 316,000
2010 Employment (Est.) **• Current City Limits** **• Study Area**	177,000 195,000	189,000 206,000	184,000 206,000
"Build-out" Capacity (Est.) **• Population** **• Employment**	346,000 240,000	361,000 240,000	368,000 219,000

Several community character issues are affected differently by the three Plan Alternatives. For these issues, a choice between alternatives is not a matter of reducing impact, but rather of the character of the preferred plan. The *Trends Alternative*, since it approximates the adopted General Plan, most strongly reflects a continuation of Riverside's traditional development patterns and an emphasis on preserving existing neighborhoods. The other plan alternatives offer a number of choices or trade-offs:

- provision of more intense non-residential development opportunities adjacent to a potential transit station or provision of a "campus industrial" setting in a satellite community;

- planning for higher densities in the existing community or extending moderate intensity development opportunities to more of the outlying area; and

- determining how significant the preservation of Riverside's agricultural heritage is to the desired community character.

For all of these issues, the selection of a "Preferred Plan Alternative" is a choice which must take into account the community's desired character as well as the estimated service costs and impacts on natural resources.

E. Preferred Plan Alternative — Quality City

Detailed analysis established that each of the three alternatives was technically feasible. Each alternative had its positive and negative aspects; no single alternative was completely superior to another. Therefore, a preferred alternative was developed which combined desirable aspects from each of the plan alternatives. This alternative, termed "*Quality City*", combined the emphasis on preservation of existing neighborhoods and agricultural areas from the *Trends Alternative*, the intensification along transportation corridors and emphasis on Downtown from the *Compact City Alternative*, and the protection of environmentally sensitive areas from the *Natural Areas Alternative*. In addition, it reflected the concerns of Sphere of Influence residents by providing for development in their areas comparable to that presently planned for their communities by Riverside County government.

The major characteristics of the *Quality City Alternative* are summarized in Exhibits 38 (Page IV - 24) and 39 (Page IV - 26). This *Quality City Alternative* was adopted by the Citizens' Advisory Committee on December 4, 1990, and was then approved by City Council on December 18, 1990. As a general policy direction, it formed the basis for drafting of the General Plan document itself.

Exhibit 38: *Quality City* Characteristics

Land Use

- Basic current development patterns retained
- Measure R agricultural and hillside lands substantially retained in low development intensity reflecting the current impact of the RA-5 and RC Zones and the extension of similar development parameters to steep hillside and agricultural lands in the Sphere area in accordance with Measure C
- Intensification at locations which do not adversely affect an established neighborhood's character, such as along major transportation corridors
- Emphasis on infill rather than development in outlying areas

Community Character

- Identification of and capitalization on unique natural and man-made physical features of Riverside as well as its cultural resources
- Strong emphasis on neighborhood preservation
- Strong emphasis on planning at the community level
- Create community level design criteria to foster greater visual quality, compatibility and consistency
- Provision of City-wide linkages between neighborhoods and between significant City landmarks and features including, but not limited to, public open space and parks, prominent public and historic buildings and major elements of the natural environment
- Inclusion of Historic Preservation policies and related implementation programs

Environmental Quality

- Preservation of significant natural environmental features such as ridgelines, arroyos and wildlife habitats
- Preservation of significant blocks of agricultural land and implementation of programs which support the continuing viability of agricultural uses
- Emphasis on local control of and participation in solution of regional environmental problems such as air pollution, noise pollution, water quality, solid waste disposal, hazardous waste control, and traffic congestion

Population and Employment

- Plan for estimated population and employment levels to provide for moderate levels of growth, midway between the *Trends* and *Compact City* projections
- 2010 Population (Current City) 285,000
- 2010 Employment (Current City) 183,000
- 2010 Population (Study Area) 313,000
- 2010 Employment (Study Area) 201,000
- Improve job/housing balance to encourage and provide more opportunity for residents to work locally

Exhibit 38: ***Quality City*** **Characteristics (*continued)***

Transportation • Provision of an adequate system of streets and highways • Creation and implementation of a Transportation Management System • Intensification along major transportation corridors to encourage public transit systems such as improved bus service, commuter rail and possibly light rail
Housing • Provision of a full range of housing types to accommodate the needs of all citizens • Emphasis on compatible land use relationships to help assure a continued supply of decent, affordable housing
Economic Development • Creation of a high quality, balanced, diverse community capable of attracting and holding desirable industries • Provision of an adequate supply of land to accommodate industrial and commercial expansion • Encouragement of linkages of local industry with resources relating to the University of California, other local educational institutions and March Air Force Base
Adequate Public Facilities and Services • Establishment of specific service levels for urban, semi-rural, and rural development • Provision of the public facilities needed to meet these standards • Provision of General Plan policies to direct the timing and sequencing of facility expansions to meet the needs of residents and to support the City's economic development efforts • Establishment of a strong linkage between long-range fiscal planning and the timely provision of needed facilities (such as fire stations, neighborhood parks, and schools) to support development as it occurs
Sphere of Influence • Development of plans and policies which recognize the needs and desires of residents and property owners in the Sphere of Influence areas, consistent with the established community plans in the Sphere, to the extent they can interface in a compatible manner with the existing and planned character of the present City area • Consideration of an urban reserve designation in portions of the Woodcrest/Rancho El Sobrante area which could be provided with urban facilities and services at some time in the future when specific timing criteria have been met

Exhibit 39: ***Quality City*** **Scenario**

F. Preparation of the General Plan Document

1. Refinement of Quality City Plan Alternative

Extensive refinement and detailing of the *Quality City* concept was an integral part of the development of specific goals and policies for the General Plan Elements. This refinement of the Plan Alternative produced a Land Use Diagram *(Located in the Map Pocket of this Document)* for the General Plan. Creation of the Land Use Diagram required:

- creation of a set of precise, detailed land use categories;
- correlation of those categories with the intensity levels used in the plan alternatives;
- application of these land use categories to all areas within the General Plan Area, based on the existing land uses, current General Plan designations, *Quality City* intensity levels, and other policy objectives of this selected plan alternative; and
- calculation of the development potential of the Land Use Diagram *(Located in the Map Pocket of this Document)*, based on typical development intensity levels.

This Land Use Diagram was used as the basis for additional analysis of the planned transportation system. As goals and policies were drafted, the ability of this Land Use Diagram to support the goals was also reviewed.

2. Preparation of General Plan Goals and Policies

Based on the *Quality City Plan Alternative*, the City staff and consultants developed a set of goals and policies for the General Plan. Preparation of these goals and policies included a review of all goals and policies in the City's adopted General Plan, including individual Plan Elements, Community Plans and Specific Plans. These policies were revised to strengthen their support for the *Quality City*, to provide more precise direction, and to incorporate new information. The draft goals and policies were reviewed extensively by staff in many City departments and were revised based on this input. Appropriate maps, charts and tables were prepared to illustrate these goals and policies.

3. Plan Implementation Recommendations

The General Plan also includes recommendations for action by the City to accomplish its goals. As with the goals and policies, this section of the Plan was developed based on existing plans and regulations, the direction of the selected plan alternative, and recent information regarding potential action programs.

4. General Plan Document Completion

All sections of the General Plan were drafted, reviewed for compatibility and produced in a single format style. Diagrams and other exhibits were also prepared, in order to complete the draft General Plan for public review.

5. Preparation of the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Along with preparation of a General Plan document, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared. This document contains the analysis of potential environmental impacts of the General Plan, and identifies possible mitigation measures.

G. Plan Adoption

The final step in updating the City of Riverside's General Plan is public review and City action on the draft General Plan. Review of the Plan draft by the Citizens' Advisory Committee began September 18, 1991 and was completed January 22, 1992. The Committee's comments and recommendations were forwarded directly to the City Council and considered during the Council's hearing of the draft Plan.

Concurrently, the Riverside Planning Commission held thirteen public hearings of the draft General Plan between September 9, 1991, and January 23, 1992. The Planning Commission also forwarded an extensive set of recommendations for City Council consideration.

The General Plan update process included preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) which was reviewed by the Environmental Protection Commission. On January 15, 1992, the Commission recommended the certification of the final EIR by the City Council.

Beginning July 21, 1992, the City Council held a lengthy series of public hearings on the draft Plan. From these hearings arose significant traffic circulation issues which required preparation and processing of a supplemental EIR. That supplemental EIR was certified July 12, 1992, by Resolution No. 18536. The General Plan update hearings were completed August 16, 1994. The comprehensively updated General Plan was finally adopted on September 13, 1994, by Resolution No. 18572. The related EIR was certified on that same date by Resolution No. 18571.