# COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
## Planning Division

City of Arts & Innovation

# Draft Negative Declaration

**AGENDA ITEM NO.:**

WARD: 3

1. **Case Number:** P11-0675 (Tract Map) & P11-0676 (Planned Residential Development)

2. **Project Title:** Tentative Tract Map

3. **Hearing Date:** May 9, 2013

4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522

5. **Contact Person:** Yvette Sennewald
**Phone Number:** (951) 826-5168, YSennewald@RiversideCa.gov

6. **Project Location:** 2300 Arlington Avenue, situated on the southerly side of Arlington Avenue, between Royale Place and Sunset Ranch Drive.

7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

**Owner**
Van Owen Holdings, LLC
9887 S. Santa Monica Blvd.
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

**Engineer/Applicant**
Keith Christiansen
Christiansen & Company
5961 Omega Street
Riverside, CA 92506

8. **General Plan Designation:** VLDR – Very Low Density Residential and HR – Hillside Residential

9. **Zoning:** R-1-1/2 Acre – Single Family Residential and RC – Residential Conservation Zone

10. **Description of Project:**

The subject site consists of three vacant parcels totaling approximately 13.9 acres in size. The project site is situated on the southerly side of Arlington Avenue, between Royale Place and Sunset Ranch Drive. The Tentative Tract Map proposes to subdivide the property into 10 single family residential lots, a proposed publicly dedicated cul-de-sac street and a designated remainder open space lot. As proposed, the lots range in

size from 0.57 to 1.15acres in size. All lots are proposed to take access from the proposed private gated cul-de-sac. This project proposes subdivision only, no development is proposed at this time. However, if approved, the project could facilitate the future construction of 10 single family residences and the cul-de-sac street. There is one variance proposed in conjunction with this project related to the lot width of Lots 5, 6 and 7. A Planned Residential Development (PRD) application is being processed in conjunction with the proposed Tentative Tract Map to allow for a density bonus within the project.

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

| | Existing Land Use | General Plan Designation | Zoning Designation |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Site** | Vacant | VLDR – Very Low Density Residential and HR – Hillside Residential | R-1-1/2 Acre – Single Family Residential and RC – Residential Conservation |
| **North** (Across Arlington Ave.) | Single Family Residential | HR – Hillside Residential | RC – Residential Conservation |
| **East** | Single Family Residential | LDR – Low Density Residential and HR – Hillside Residential | R-1-8500 – Single Family Residential and RC – Residential Conservation |
| **South** | Vacant | HR – Hillside Residential | PF – Public Facilities |
| **West** (Across Adams St.) | Single Family Residential | VLDR – Very Low Density Residential and HR – Hillside Residential | R-1-1/2 Acre – Single Family Residential and RC – Residential Conservation |

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

None

13. **Other Environmental Reviews Incorporated by Reference in this Review:**

a. General Plan 2025
b. GP 2025 FPEIR
c. General Biological Assessment prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc.
d. Historical/Archeological Resources Survey Report
e. Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by Christiansen & Company
f. Preliminary Noise Study prepared by Urban Crossroads

14. **Acronyms**

AICUZ - Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study
AQMP - Air Quality Management Plan
AUSD - Alvord Unified School District
CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act
CMP - Congestion Management Plan
EIR - Environmental Impact Report
EMWD - Eastern Municipal Water District
EOP - Emergency Operations Plan
FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency
FPEIR - GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
GIS - Geographic Information System
GhG - Green House Gas
GP 2025 - General Plan 2025
IS - Initial Study

| | |
|---|---|
| LHMP - | Local Hazard Mitigation Plan |
| MARB/MIP - | March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port |
| MJPA-JLUS - | March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study |
| MSHCP - | Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan |
| MVUSD - | Moreno Valley Unified School District |
| NCCP - | Natural Communities Conservation Plan |
| OEM - | Office of Emergency Services |
| OPR - | Office of Planning & Research, State |
| PEIR - | Program Environmental Impact Report |
| PW - | Public Works, Riverside |
| RCALUC - | Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission |
| RCALUCP - | Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan |
| RCP - | Regional Comprehensive Plan |
| RCTC - | Riverside County Transportation Commission |
| RMC - | Riverside Municipal Code |
| RPD - | Riverside Police Department |
| RPU - | Riverside Public Utilities |
| RTIP - | Regional Transportation Improvement Plan |
| RTP - | Regional Transportation Plan |
| RUSD - | Riverside Unified School District |
| SCAG - | Southern California Association of Governments |
| SCAQMD - | South Coast Air Quality Management District |
| SCH - | State Clearinghouse |
| SKR-HCP - | Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan |
| SWPPP - | Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan |
| USGS - | United States Geologic Survey |
| WMWD - | Western Municipal Water District |
| WQMP - | Water Quality Management Plan |

DRAFT

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

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

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

The City of Riverside finds that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

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

Signature _____ Date _____

Printed Name & Title _____ For City of Riverside

DRAFT

# Environmental Initial Study

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a. **Earlier Analysis Used.** Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b. **Impacts Adequately Addressed.** Identify which effects from the above checklist were with in the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measure which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1. AESTHETICS.** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**1a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, and Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways)***

The project site is located on Arlington Avenue and will facilitate the future development of 10 residential lots. Since the property is located in the R-1-1/2 Acre – Single Family Residential and the RC – Residential Conservation Zones, any future development of single family homes would require compliance with the development standards. Although Design Guidelines are a part of the proposed Planned Residential Development, a condition of approval will require the submittal of a separate Administrative Design Review cases for each lot. The Design Review process will further ensure that the single family homes will be compatible with the surrounding area and all applicable development standards. As the site is surrounded by suburban development, the future development of up to 10 single family residences in compliance with the development standards of the R-1-1/2 and RC Zones and any applicable conditions of approval will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista. Therefore, the proposed project will have **less than significant impacts** to a scenic vista.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**1b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City's Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, Title 20 – Cultural Resources and, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones - RC Zone)***

There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. In addition the proposed project is not located along or within view of a scenic boulevard, parkway or special boulevard as designated by the City's General Plan 2025 and therefore will not have any effect on any scenic resources within a scenic roadway. The rock outcroppings on the subject property are to remain in an Open Space area also; there are no historic buildings within view of this proposed project so no impacts to these resources are expected. Compliance with the City's Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, scenic resources will be protected and even enhanced. Lastly, the Zoning Code regulates building setbacks, building heights, land uses, landscaping, parking and other development standards for use and development of all properties. This project complies with or will be required to comply with these standards with the exception of any requested variances proposed as a part of this project. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from this project will be **less than significant impact**.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**1c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)***

The project will result in slopes generally up to 25 feet in height. Slopes of this magnitude create potential aesthetic impacts. A condition of approval has been added that would require contour grading of the tops and bottoms of the slope areas, as well as along the slope faces to alleviate the excessive slope heights proposed. Additionally, landscape and irrigation plans for all slopes that are over five feet in vertical height or higher within interior side yards shall be submitted to and approved by Planning Division staff. A separate application and filing fee is required. Compliance with the Coty's Grading Ordinance would ensure that any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from this project will be **less than significant**.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**1d. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-2 – Mount Palomar Lighting Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)***

The subsequent development of up to 10 single family residences will involve the introduction of new lighting typically associated with residential development. This lighting would be similar to that which exists in the surrounding area and would not be considered significant. Additionally, the site is not within the Mount Palomar Lighting Area. The impact is

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| less than significant. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 complied by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project: | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **2a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability & General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)*** The Project is located within an urbanized area. A review of Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability of the General Plan 2025 reveals that the project site is not designated as, and is not adjacent to or in proximity to any land classified as, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to agricultural uses. | | | | |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **2b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)*** A review of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR reveals that the project site is not located within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act Preserve or under a Williamson Act Contract. Moreover, the project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not next to land zoned for agricultural use; therefore, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **2c. Response:** ***(Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)*** The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, **no impacts** will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **2d. Response:** ***(Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)*** The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore **no impacts** will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 –** ***Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves*****, T*****itle 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones – RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data)*** The project is located in an urbanized area of the City. Additionally, the site is identified as urban/built out land and therefore does not support agricultural resources or operations. The project will not result in the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. In addition, there are no agricultural resources or operations, including farmlands within proximity of the subject site. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, **no impacts** will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land. | | | | |
| **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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **3a. Response:** ***(Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP))*** Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG's modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD's AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TRIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 "Typical Growth Scenario." Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan. | | | | |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **3b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 AQMP, CalEEMod)*** **Less Than Significant Impact.** An Air Quality Model was conducted using CalEEMod. The results of the air quality model showed that the proposed project would generate emissions far lower than the SCAQMD thresholds for significance for air quality emissions and it was determined to be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to ambient air quality and will not contribute to an existing air quality violation. | | | | |
| 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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **3c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance*** | | | | |

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

***Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod 2007 Model)***

Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, AQMP thresholds indicate future construction activities under the General Plan are projected to result in significant levels of NOx and ROG, both ozone precursors, PM-10, PM-2.5 and CO. Although long-term emissions are expected to decrease by 2025, all criteria pollutants remain above the SCAQMD thresholds.

The portion of the Basin within which the City is located is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM-10 and PM-2.5 under State standards, and as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, PM-10, and PM-2.5 under Federal standards.

Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants as a result of the project were previously evaluated as part of the cumulative analysis of build out anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Program. As a result, the proposed project does not result in any new significant impacts that were not previously evaluated and for which a statement of overriding considerations was adopted as part of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR. Therefore, cumulative air quality emissions impacts are **less than significant**.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**3d. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod)***

Short-term impacts associated with construction from General Plan 2025 typical build out will result in increased air emissions from grading, earthmoving, and construction activities. Mitigation Measures of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR requires individual development to employ construction approaches that minimize pollutant emissions (General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM AIR 1- MM AIR 5, e.g., watering for dust control, tuning equipment, limiting truck idling times). In conformance with the General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM AIR 1 and MM AIR 7 a CalEEMod computer model analyzed short-term construction and long-term operational related impacts of the project and determined that the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for short-term construction and long-term operational impacts. Therefore, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and a **less than significant impact** will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively for this project.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**3e. Response:**

While exact quantification of objectionable odors cannot be determined due to the subjective nature of what is considered "objectionable," the nature of the proposed 19 lot single family residential subdivision, associated infrastructure and related off-site improvements present a potential for the generation of objectionable odors associated with construction activities. The operation of subdivision is not typically associated with the generation of objectionable odors. However, the construction activities associated with the expected build out of the project site will generate airborne odors like diesel exhaust emissions, architectural coating applications, and on- and off-site improvement installations. However, said emissions would occur only during daylight hours, be short-term in duration, and would be isolated to the immediate vicinity of the construction site. Therefore, they would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors on a permanent basis. Therefore, the project will not cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur.

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **4a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP, General Biological Assessment and Habitat Assessment prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. on March 1, 2012)*** A habitat assessment prepared by a qualified biologist was prepared for the project. The findings of the habitat assessment determined that the project is in compliance with the MSHCP, and shows that, no candidate, sensitive, species of concern, or special status species or suitable habitat for such species occurs on site and no additional surveys or mitigation measures are required. Therefore, the project has a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to these resources. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **4b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, and General Biological Assessment and Habitat Assessment prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. on March 1, 2012)*** As required under the MSHCP, a habitat assessment prepared by a qualified biologist was prepared for the project. The habitat assessment finds the proposed project complies with Section 6.1.2 of the MSHCP, which outlines the requirements and protection of riparian/riverine areas and vernal pools within the plan area. Through compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.2 and other applicable requirements, impacts to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services are found to have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **4c. Response:** ***(Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)*** The project site is located within an urban built-up area, contains existing development, and has a long history of severe disturbance such that the project would not 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. Therefore, a **less than significant impact** will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively to 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 | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | | |

**4d. Response:** ***(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage and General Biological Assessment and Habitat Assessment prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. on March 1, 2012)***

The project site is located within an urban built-up area and is not within an MSHCP linkage area. The surrounding area is built up and has a history of disturbance such that there is little chance that the project would interfere 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. Therefore, a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur related to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites will occur with implementation of the proposed project.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**4e. Response:** ***(Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, and General Biological Assessment and Habitat Assessment prepared by Pacific Southwest Biological Services, Inc. on March 1, 2012)***

Implementation of the proposed project is subject to all applicable Federal, State, and local policies and regulations related to the protection of biological resources and tree preservation. In addition, the project is required to comply with Riverside Municipal Code Section 16.72.040 establishing the MSHCP mitigation fee and Section 16.40.040 establishing the Threatened and Endangered Species Fees.

Any project within the City of Riverside's boundaries that proposes planting a street tree within a City right-of-way must follow the Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual. The Manual documents guidelines for the planting, pruning, preservation, and removal of all trees in City rights-of-way. The specifications in the Manual are based on national standards for tree care established by the International Society of Arboriculture, the National Arborists Association, and the American National Standards Institute. Any future project will be in compliance with the Tree Policy Manual when planting a tree within a City right-of-way, and therefore, impacts will be **less than significant.**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**4f. Response:** ***(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephens' Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan, Lake Mathews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, and El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan)***

The proposed project is consistent with the guidelines of MSHCP, including Section 6.1.4, Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlife Interface and related policies in the General Plan 2025, including Policy LU-7.4. As well, the project is consistent with the SKR HCP and with General Plan Policy OS-5.3. Impacts will be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**5a. Response:** ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas***

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)*** | | | | |
| The project is located on a site where no historic resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, **no impacts** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected. | | | | |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **5b. Response:** ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study and Archeological/Historical Resources Survey Report prepared by CRM Tech, January 21, 2013)*** | | | | |
| The project is located within an urbanized area. Further, as per the Archeological/Cultural Resources report prepared by CRM Tech states that no historic resources exist within or adjacent to the project area as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The survey report also indicates that the project as proposed will not cause a substantial adverse change to any known historical resources. Archeological monitoring does not appear necessary during the proposed project. Therefore, **no impacts** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to archeological resources are expected. | | | | |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **5c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3, Archeological/Historical Resources Survey Report prepared by CRM Tech, January 21, 2013 )*** | | | | |
| A cultural resources survey prepared by CRM Tech on January 21, 2013 has determined that the proposed project is consistent with general Plan Policy HP-1.3 including compliance with the Federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and as such the project will have a **less than significant impact** directly or indirectly to a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. | | | | |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **5d. Response:** ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Archeological/Historical Resources Survey Report prepared by CRM Tech, January 21, 2013 )*** | | | | |
| The project is located within an urbanized area where no activities, such as new development involving grading/ground disturbance, are proposed that would create potential for disturbance of human remains. However, as noted in Section 5b above, with implementation of conditions requiring compliance with Health and Safety Code 7050.5, State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(e) and Public Resources Code 5097.98 regarding unanticipated buried materials and human remains found during construction and/or grading activities that require a stoppage of all work until a qualified archaeologist/tribal member can evaluate the nature and significance of any unanticipated finds, impacts to these any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, as a result of the project are **less than significant** level directly, indirectly, or cumulatively. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **6i. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report.)*** | | | | |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seismic activity is to be expected in Southern California. In the City of Riverside, there are no Alquist-Priolo zones. The project site does not contain any known fault lines and the potential for fault rupture or seismic shaking is low. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that **no impacts** related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **6ii. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)*** The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City's Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed project will comply with California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have **no impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **6iii. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E)*** The project is in an area with low potential for liquefaction as depicted in the General Plan 2025 Liquefaction Zones Map – Figure PS-2. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would have **no impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| iv. Landslides? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **6iv. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and for projects over 1 acre: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP)*** The project site is in an area where the possibility of unstable slope conditions could occur due to the overall 27% slope of the subject. Landslides may occur from heavy rainfall, erosion, and removal of vegetation, seismic activity or other factors. Slope stability depends on many factors and their interrelationships. All grading activity will be subject to the review and approval of the Public Works Department and will be in compliance with the California Building Code regulations and compliance with Title 17 – Grading Code will ensure that impacts related to strong landslides are reduced to **less than significant impact** levels directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **6b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and for projects over 1 acre: SWPPP)*** Erosion and loss of topsoil could occur as a result of the project. State and Federal requirements call for the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) establishing erosion and sediment controls for construction activities. The project must also comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations. In addition, with the erosion control standards for which all development activity must comply (Title 18), the Grading Code (Title 17) also requires the implementation of measures designed to minimize soil erosion. Compliance with State and Federal requirements as well as with Titles 18 and 17 will ensure that soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **6c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)*** The subject site features rolling hills with an average natural slope overall of 27%. Compliance with the City's existing codes and the policies contained in the General Plan 2025 help to ensure that impacts related to geologic conditions are reduced to **less than significant impacts** level directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| risks to life or property? | | | | |

**6d. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)***

The project is located on a site that does not have expansive soils and therefore there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**6e. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)***

The proposed project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have **no impact.**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**7a. Response:**

The project will complement the City's General Plan policies and statewide Building Code requirements designed to reduce GhG emissions. Since the project will not result in a net increase in GhG emissions, it will not interfere with the State's goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG's modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the RTP, the SCAQMD's AQMP, RTIP, and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 "Typical Growth Scenario." Therefore, this Project will have **less than significant** impacts with respect to GhG emissions directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**7b. Response:**

The SCAQMD supports State, Federal and international policies to reduce levels of ozone depleting gases through its Global Warming Policy and rules and has established an interim Greenhouse Gas (GHG) threshold. As indicated in Question A, above, the project would comply with the City's General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GHG emissions. In addition, the project would comply with all SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations during construction and will not interfere with the State's goals of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in the AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Based upon the CalEEMod analysis for this project and the discussion above, the project will not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction in the emissions of GHG and thus a **less than significant** impact will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively in this regard.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**8a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP,***

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM's Strategic Plan)*** | | | | |
| The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material because the use is a residential subdivision. As such, the project will have **no impact** related to the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **8b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7 A – D, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, City of Riverside's EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM's Strategic Plan)*** | | | | |
| The proposed project does not involve the use of any hazardous materials. As such the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively for creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. | | | | |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **8c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code)*** | | | | |
| The proposed project does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school because the proposed use is a residential subdivision. (The site is approximately 0.8 miles from Poly High School) Therefore, the project will have **no impact** regarding emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **8d. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)*** | | | | |
| A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the project site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **8e. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005)*** | | | | |
| The proposed project is located within the March Air Reserve Base Airport Influence Area. The project was reviewed by Planning staff to ensure that the project is consistent with the compatibility zone as well as in compliance with the land use standards in the MARB CLUP. Because the project has been found to be consistent with the RCALUCP by staff, impacts related to hazards from airports are **less than significant impacts** directly, indirectly. | | | | |

DRAFT

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

**8f. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP***

Because the proposed project is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**8g. Response:** ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials, City of Riverside's EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, and OEM's Strategic Plan)***

The project will be served by existing, fully improved street (Arlington Avenue) as well as a network of on-site local streets, including a proposed private cul-de-sac. All streets have been, or will be required to be designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments' specifications. As part of the project's construction, a temporary street closing will be necessary. Any street closing will be of short duration so as not to interfere or impede with any emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, the project will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**8h. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside's EOP, 2002***http://intranet/Portal/uploads/Riv City EOP complete.pdf***, Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and OEM's Strategic Plan)***

The proposed project is located in an urbanized area where no wildlands exist and the property is not located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a VHFSZ; therefore **no impact** regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**9a. Response:** ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Project Specific Hydrology Study and/or Water Quality Management Plan prepared by IW Consulting Engineers)***

The project incorporates site design, source controls and treatment control BMPs. A majority of the flows from the site will be captured in the on-street gutters and conveyed to retention basins for infiltration. However, yard filter drains will be installed on each lot that will drain to the proposed private street. The yard drains will then funnel flows to an underground infiltration trench where it will percolate through the soil. In addition to the treatment control mentioned above, the applicant is proposing site design techniques and BMPs including minimizing urban runoff, minimizing the impervious footprint, and removing directly connected impervious areas. These techniques were obtained by maximizing permeable area, constructing to the minimum width and minimizing hardscape, whenever possible. These BMPs combined with compliance of existing statutes will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively on to any water quality standards or waste discharge.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

**9b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan, WMWD Urban Water Management Plan)***

The proposed project is located within the Riverside South Water Supply Basin. This proposed project involves a residential subdivision. The project is required to connect to the City's sewer system and comply with all NPDES and WQMP requirements that will ensure the proposed project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, there will be **no impact** to groundwater supplies and recharge either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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

**9c. Response:** ***(Source: Preliminary grading plan, and Project Specific – Hydrology Study, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Water Quality Management Plan)***

The project is subject to NPDES requirements; areas of one acre or more of disturbance are subject to preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the prevention of runoff during construction. Erosion, siltation and other possible pollutants associated with long-term implementation of projects are addressed as part of the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) and grading permit process. Therefore, the project will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**9d. Response:** ***(Source: Preliminary grading plan, and Project Specific – Hydrology Study, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Water Quality Management Plan)***

The project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area, (i.e. through grading, ground disturbance, structures or additional paving) that would alter the existing drainage pattern of the site, alter the course of stream or river, or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site because the project consists of a residential subdivision. Therefore no flooding on or off-site as a result of the project will occur and there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively that would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**9e. Response:** ***(Source: Preliminary Grading Plan)***

Within the scope of the project is the installation of storm water drainage system. As the storm water drainage system will be installed concurrently with the construction of this project, the storm water drainage system will be adequately sized to accommodate the drainage created by this project. The project is expected to generate the following pollutants: sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, bacteria and viruses, oil & grease, and pesticides. These expected pollutants will be treated through the incorporation of the site design, source control and treatment control measures specified in the project specific WQMP. Therefore, as the expected pollutants will be mitigated through the project site design, source control, and treatment controls already integrated into the project design, the project will not create or contribute runoff water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and there will be a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| cumulatively. | | | | |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**9f. Response:** ***(Source: Project Specific – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and Water Quality Management Plan)***

The project is over one are in size and is required to have coverage under the State's General Permit for Construction Activities (SWPPP). As stated in the Permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. Furthermore, the City has ensured that the development does not cause adverse water quality impacts, pursuant to its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit through the project's WQMP.

The proposed development will increase the amount of impervious surface area in the City. This impervious area includes paved parking areas, sidewalks, roadways, and building rooftops; all sources of runoff that may carry pollutants and therefore has the potential to degrade water quality. This development has been required to prepare preliminary BMP's that have been reviewed and approved by Public Works. Final BMP's will be required prior to grading permit issuance. The purpose of this requirement is to insure treatment BMP's are installed/constructed as part of the project so that the pollutants generated by the project will be treated in perpetuity. Therefore, impacts related to degrading water quality are **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**9g. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Map Number 06065C0728G Effective Date August 28, 2008 )***

A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0728G Effective Date August 28, 2008) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the project is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area. There will be **no impact** caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**9h. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Map Number 06065C0728G Effective Date August 28, 2008 )***

The project site is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0728G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and **no impact** will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**9i. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Map Number 06065C0728G Effective Date August 28, 2008 )***

The project site is not located within or near a flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0728G Effective Date August 28, 2008) or subject to dam inundation as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas. Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a flood hazard or dam inundation area that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam and therefore **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**9j. Response:** ***(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality)***

Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, **no impacts** due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| **10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Physically divide an established community? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **10a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)*** The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with the fit into the pattern of development of the surrounding area providing adequate access, circulation and connectivity consistent with the General Plan 2025, and in compliance with the requirements of the Zoning and Subdivision Codes. Therefore, the project impacts related to the community are **less than significant**. | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **10b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)*** Although the project is located within the boundaries of the MSHCP & RCALUCP it has been designed to be consistent with these plans. As well, the project is with the General Plan 2025 and it is not a project of Statewide, Regional or Areawide Significance. As such, this project will have a **less than significant impact** on the MSHCP & RCALUCP directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **10c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 – Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, enter appropriate Specific Plan if one, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines*** The proposed project is consistent with the guidelines of MSHCP, including Section 6.1.4, Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlife Interface and related policies in the General Plan 2025, including Policy LU-7.4. As well, the project is consistent with the SKR HCP and with General Plan Policy OS-5.3. Impacts will be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **11a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)*** The formational material that underlies the project site is the rock products formation. This formation does not contain recoverable mineral resources or economic value. The loss of known mineral resources valuable locally or regionally would not occur because of the project and no further analysis is required. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **11b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)*** The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas with the City of Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is **no impact**. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **12. NOISE.** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **12a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code, Preliminary Noise Study prepared by Urban Crossroads dated February 13, 2012)*** The future development of up to 10 single family residences is not anticipated to cause long-term increases in ambient noise levels. However, development of the property in the manner proposed could result in temporary increases in noise levels, primarily during construction. Construction activities are subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. To decrease any potential for excessive noise from traffic along Arlington Avenue, a condition of approval has been added that would require a maximum 6-foot high decorative block wall along Arlington Avenue. In addition, a condition has been added that requires the installation of dual-glazed windows with a Sound Transmission Class rating of 26 or higher for first floor windows and all windows and doors shall be free of cut outs and openings. With these conditions in place, **no significant impacts** would occur. | | | | |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **12b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)*** A temporary increase in noise and vibration levels may be noticed during project construction; however, these activities will be subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and a **less than significant** short-term impact will occur. Also, with the development and use for up to ten single family residences no long-term vibration impacts will occur. | | | | |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **12c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)*** The future development of up to 10 single family residences is not anticipated to cause long-term increases in ambient noise levels. However, development of the property in the manner proposed could result in temporary increases in noise levels, primarily during construction. These activities will be subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and **no significant impacts** would occur. | | | | |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | |

**12d. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report )***

The future development of up to 10 single family residences is not anticipated to cause long-term increases in ambient noise levels. However, development of the property in the manner proposed could result in temporary increases in noise levels, primarily during construction. These activities will be subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and **no significant impacts** would occur.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**12e. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999),Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005)***

Although the proposed project is located within an airport land use plan, the proposed project is not located within any of the airport noise contour areas as depicted on Figures N-8 and N-9 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025. For this reason, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to airport noise. Therefore, impacts will be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**12f. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999)and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005)***

Per the GP 2025 Program FPEIR, there are no private airstrips within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Because the proposed project consists of development anticipated under the General Plan 2025, is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**13a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections– 2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG's RCP and RTP)***

The project involves the future construction of new homes that may directly induce population growth, and may involve additional infrastructure that could indirectly induce population growth. However, the project is consistent with the VLDR – Very Low Density Residential and HR – Hillside Residential land use designation established under the General Plan 2025 Program and the additional infrastructure is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program. The General Plan 2025 Final PEIR determined that Citywide, future development anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Typical scenario would not have significant population growth impacts. Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Typical growth scenario and population growth impacts were previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR the project does not result in new impacts beyond those previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR; therefore, the impacts will be **less than significant** both directly and indirectly. | | | | |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **13b. Response:** ***(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)*** The project will not displace existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed on vacant land that has no existing housing that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, there will be **no impact** on existing housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **13c. Response:** ***(Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)*** The project will not displace any people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the project site is proposed on vacant land that has no existing housing or residents that will be removed or affected by the proposed project. Therefore, this project will **have no impact** on people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **14. PUBLIC SERVICES.** | | | | |
| Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: | | | | |
| a. Fire protection? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **14a. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)*** The project consists of a 10 lot subdivision. Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by Station 9 located at 6674 Alessandro Boulevard to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Fire Department practices, there will be **no impacts** on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| b. Police protection? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **14b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)*** The project consists of a 10 lot subdivision. Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the Central Neighborhood Policing Center to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be **no impact** on the demand for additional police facilities of services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| c. Schools? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **14c. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries)*** The project consists of a 10 lot subdivision. Adequate school facilities and services are provided by the Riverside Unified School District to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Riverside Unified School District School District impact fees used to offset the impact of new development, there will be **less than significant impacts** on the demand for school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Parks? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**14d. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)***

The project consists of a 10 lot subdivision. Adequate park facilities and services are provided in the Canyon Crest Neighborhood to serve this project. In addition with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park, Recreation and Community Services practices, there will be **less than significant** impacts on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| e. Other public facilities? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**14e. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – Riverside Public Library Service Standards)***

The project consists of a 10 lot subdivision. Adequate public facilities and services, including libraries and community centers, are provided in the Ramona Neighborhood to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park and Recreation and Community Services and Library practices, there will be **no impacts** on the demand for additional public facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **15. RECREATION.** | | | | |
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**15a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)***

The General Plan 2025 analyzed the MDR – Medium Density Residential General Plan Land Use for this property. The project is consistent with the adopted General Plan 2025 and will pay applicable Park Development Impact Fees to the City of Riverside Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department therefore this project will have a **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**15b. Response:**

The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project result in: | | | | |
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **16a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG's RTP)*** This project involves the future construction of up to 10 new single family residences and thus will result in a minimal increase in vehicular trips onto existing local streets both during and after construction. The proposed project would not generate additional vehicular trips either directly or indirectly, other than what has already been considered under the City's General Plan. Also, since this proposal will not generate a significant number of additional vehicle trips, it is not anticipated that the LOS of any nearby intersection will be affected. Therefore, no significant change to the levels of service of nearby intersections and only an incremental increase of traffic load or capacity are expected with implementation of this project and the project's individual or cumulative impact to all applicable plans, ordinances or policies pertaining to the performance of the circulation system will be **less than significant.** | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **16b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG's RTP)*** This project involves the future construction of up to 10 new single family residences and thus will result in a minimal increase in vehicular trips onto existing local streets both during and after construction. The proposed project would not generate additional vehicular trips either directly or indirectly, other than what has already been considered under the City's General Plan. Also, since this proposal will not generate a significant number of additional vehicle trips, it is not anticipated that the LOS of any nearby intersection will be affected. Therefore, no significant change to the levels of service of nearby intersections and only an incremental increase of traffic load or capacity are expected with implementation of this project and the project's individual or cumulative impact to all applicable plans, ordinances or policies pertaining to the performance of the circulation system will be **less than significant.** | | | | |
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **16c. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999)and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))***<br>The proposed project is located within Safety and/or Airport Compatibility Zone E as depicted on Figure 5.7-2 of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR for March Air Reserve Base as noted in the Riverside County Airport Land use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP). The project was reviewed by Planning staff to ensure that the project is consistent with the compatibility zone as well as in compliance with the land use standards in the RCALUP. Because the project has been found to be consistent with the RCALUCP by staff, impacts related to hazards from airports are **less than significant impacts** directly, indirectly and cumulatively. | | | | |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **16d. Response:** ***(Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans)***<br>The proposed project is compatible with adjacent existing uses and street configurations. As well, it has been designed so as not to cause any incompatible use or additional or any hazards to the surrounding area or general public. As a condition of approval, the proposed private cul-de-sac, all proposed driveways, sidewalks, walls/fences, and landscaping will be required comply with the applicable development standards of the Riverside Municipal Code. Therefore, this project will have a **less than significant impact** on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **16e. Response:** ***(Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)***<br>The project has been developed in compliance with Title 18, Section 18.210.030 and the City's Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007); therefore, there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access. | | | | |
| 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)? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **16f. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!)***<br>The project, as designed, does not create conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). As such, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.**<br>Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **17a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside's Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD , Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)***<br>All new development is required to comply with all provisions of the NPDES program and the City's Municipal Separate Sewer Permit (MS4), as enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB with respect to discharges to the sewer system or stormwater system within the City. Because the proposed project is required to adhere to the above regulations related to wastewater treatment the project will have a **less than significant** impact. | | | | |
| 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 | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

DRAFT

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

**17b. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-I - Current and Projected Water Use WMWD, Table 5.16-J - General Plan Projected Water Demand for WMWD Including Water Reliability 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside's Sewer Service Area & Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)***

The project will not result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is consistent with the Typical Growth Scenario of the General Plan 2025 where future water and wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I, 5.16-J and 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have **no impact** resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**17c. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)***

The increase in impervious surface area resulting from construction of the 10 single family residences facilitated by this project will generate increased storm water flows with potential to impact drainage facilities and require the provision of additional facilities. However, the Subdivision Code (Title 18, Section 18.48.020) requires drainage fees to be paid to the City for new construction. Fees are transferred into a drainage facilities fund that is maintained by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. This Section also complies with the California Government Code (section 66483), which provides for the payment of fees for construction of drainage facilities. Fees are required to be paid as part of the conditions of approval/waiver for filing of a final map or parcel map.

General Plan 2025 Policies PF 4.1 and PF 4.3 require the City to continue to routinely monitor its storm drain system and to fund and improve those systems as identified in the City's Capital Improvement plan. Implementation of these policies will ensure that the City is adequately served by drainage systems. The General Plan 2025 also includes policies and programs that will minimize the environmental effects of the development of such facilities. Therefore, the project will have **less than significant on existing** storm water drainage facilities that would not require the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**17d. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service Areas, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities, Table 5.16-E – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR, Table 5.16-F – Projected Water Demand, Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-H – Current and Projected Domestic Water Supply (acre-ft/year) WMWD Table 5.16-I Current and Projected Water Use WMWD, Table 5.16-J – General Plan Projected Water Demand for WMWD Including Water Reliability 2025, RPU Master Plan, EMWD Master Plan, WMWD Master Plan, and Highgrove Water District Master Plan)***

The project will not exceed expected water supplies. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future water supplies were determined to be adequate (see Tables t.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I and 5.16-J of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have **no impact** resulting in the insufficient water supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**17e. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table***

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside's Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)*** The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, **no impact** to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur. | | | | |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **17f. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)*** The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Build-out Project level where future landfill capacity was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, **no impact** to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |
| **17g. Response:** ***(Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)*** The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% diversion rate, well above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building Code requires all developments to divert 50% of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for all projects and 100% of excavated soil and land clearing debris for all non-residential projects beginning January 1, 2011. The proposed project must comply with the City's waste disposal requirements as well as the California Green Building Code and as such would not conflict with any Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, **no impacts** related to solid waste statutes will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. | | | | |
| | | | | |
| **18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.** | | | | |
| a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **18a. Response:** ***(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, and Habitat Assessment prepared by Osborne Biological Consulting on January 25, 2013, FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity, Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)*** Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to be **less than significant**. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside's history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to **be less than significant**. | | | | |
| b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

DRAFT

| ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES): | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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)? | | | | |
| **18b. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)*** Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated and therefore cumulative impacts of the proposed project beyond those previously considered in the GP 2025 FPEIR are **less than significant**. | | | | |
| c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
| **18c. Response:** ***(Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)*** Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology & water quality, noise, population and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic sections of this initial study and found to be less than significant for each of the above sections. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the proposed project are **less than significant**. | | | | |
| | | | | |

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

DRAFT

DRAFT