



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

WARD: 2

1. **Case Number:** P12-0507 (Design Review)
2. **Project Title:** Cottonwood Building Expansion
3. **Hearing Date:** N/A
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Moises A. Lopez, Associate Planner
Phone Number: (951) 826-5264
6. **Project Location:** 2325 Cottonwood Avenue, situated on the southeasterly corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

<u>Applicant:</u> Panattoni Development Company, Inc. Jay Tanjuan 20411 SW Birch Street, Suite 200 Newport Beach, CA 92660	<u>Architect:</u> Carlile Coatsworth Architects, Inc. Cal Coatsworth, AIA, LEED AP 2495 Campus Drive, 2 nd Floor Irvine, CA 92612
--	--
8. **General Plan Designation:** B/OP – Business/Office Park
9. **Zoning:** BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
10. **Description of Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The proposed project entails the Design Review of building and plot plan elevations to facilitate the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building previously approved in 2001 under Planning Case DR-061-012. The proposed expansion will extend the existing building westerly toward Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and will include a total of 151 dock high doors, 128 trailer parking spaces, and 348 passenger vehicle parking spaces, primarily along the northerly side of the property fronting onto Cottonwood. When completed, the building will total approximately 636,321 square-feet in size and will consist of approximately 13,189 square-feet of office area and 623,132 square-feet of warehouse area.

Vehicular access to the site will be provided via five separate two-way driveways, two from Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and three from Cottonwood Avenue. The parking and truck loading/unloading areas will

be secured with perimeter fencing consisting of wrought iron and solid concrete walls. As well, a landscaped bioswale is proposed along the Sycamore Canyon Boulevard frontage.

The project site is tributary to the storm drain system for the Sycamore Canyon Business Park, with drainage from the site being split between two discharge locations. The northerly portion of the site discharges to an existing 42-inch storm drain pipe located at the northwest corner of the project site. The southerly portion of the site discharges to a 36-inch drain near the southerly driveway. The project’s runoff flow rate, volume velocity and duration for the post development condition do not exceed the predevelopment condition for the 2-year, 24-hour and 10-year 24-hour rainfall events. This condition has been achieved by minimizing impervious area on site and incorporating other site-design concepts that mimic pre-development conditions, including landscape buffer areas between the proposed building and curb-adjacent sidewalk, bio-retention facilities for the north and west parking areas, and a separate underground proprietary BMPs needed to treat roof drainage prior to connecting to the storm drain system. The bio-retention facilities proposed from the north and west parking areas – along the Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard frontages – will be vegetated and will be installed concurrently with the construction of the project.

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

	Existing Land Use	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation
Project Site	Partially Vacant/Warehouse Building	B/OP – Business/Office Park	BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
North <i>(across Cottonwood Avenue)</i>	Office, Warehouse, and Manufacturing Uses	B/OP – Business/Office Park	BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
East	Interstate 215 Freeway	Interstate 215 Freeway	Interstate 215 Freeway
South	Office, Warehouse, and Manufacturing Uses	B/OP – Business/Office Park	BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
West <i>(across Sycamore Canyon Boulevard)</i>	Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park	P – Public Parks	BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones and PF-SP – Public Facilities and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones

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

- a. None.

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

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR
- c. “Air Quality Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012.
- d. “Results of a Burrowing Owl Survey for the Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion Project,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., August 2012.
- e. “Cultural Resources Assessment – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., March 2012.
- f. “Noise Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012.
- g. “Traffic Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012.
- h. “Water Quality Management Plan – Preliminary for the 2325 Cottonwood Avenue Warehouse Building Expansion,” prepared by SB&O, Inc., October 4, 2012.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signature _____

Date _____

Printed Name & Title _____

For City of Riverside



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division

Environmental Initial Study

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1a. Response: <i>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)</i></p>				
<p>The City’s General Plan 2025 policies aim at balancing development interests with broader community preservation objectives. The proposed project consists of an infill project within an urbanized area surrounded by existing development, with the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park located westerly of the project site. The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building situated on the southeast corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The proposed expansion will extend the existing building westerly toward Sycamore Canyon Boulevard – closer to the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park – and will include a total of 151 dock high doors, 128 trailer parking spaces, and 348 passenger vehicle parking spaces. The proposed expansion will consist of concrete tilt-up construction that will provide for some building modulation and include the use of spandrel glass, sandblasted concrete, and an earth-tone color palate to augment its architectural detail. Further, the building expansion will include a substantial landscaped setback from Sycamore Canyon Boulevard that will provide for a combination of trees and rows of plants and shrubs that will further accent the aesthetic appearance of the proposed project. The proposed project has been designed to comply with the design policies included within the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan, the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and to be consistent with the existing development of the surrounding area. Therefore the proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character of the area and any potential substantial adverse direct, indirect, or cumulative impact on a scenic vista resulting from this project will be less than significant.</p>				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1b. Response: <i>(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)</i></p>				
<p>There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. In addition, the proposed project is not located along or within view of a scenic boulevard, parkway or special boulevard as designated by the City’s General Plan 2025 and therefore will not have any effect on any scenic resource within a scenic roadway. The closest Scenic Boulevard is Alessandro Boulevard, a 120-foot arterial, located south of the subject site. The project site is located easterly of the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park, which contains various rock outcroppings that will be visible from the project site. The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building situated on the southeast corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The proposed project has been designed to comply with the design policies included within the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan, the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and to complement the existing development of the surrounding area. Further, there are no historic buildings within view of this proposed project. This project complies with all applicable building setbacks, land use and other development standards. Where variances are requested for standards such as parking, they can be justified based on the findings contained in the case record. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from this project will be less than significant impact.</p>				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>1c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan)</p>				
<p>The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building situated on the southeast corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The proposed expansion will extend the existing building westerly toward Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and will include a total of 151 dock high doors, 128 trailer parking spaces, and 348 passenger vehicle parking spaces. The proposed expansion will consist of concrete tilt-up construction that will provide for some building modulation and include the use of spandrel glass, sandblasted concrete, and an earth-tone color palate to augment its architectural detail. Further, the building expansion will include a substantial landscaped setback from Sycamore Canyon Boulevard that will provide for a combination of trees and rows of plants and shrubs that will further accent the aesthetic appearance of the proposed project. This proposal meets the intent of the General Plan 2025 and aesthetically will improve the quality of the site and its surroundings. As well, the proposal has been analyzed for consistency with the established Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, as it relates to site design, building architecture, landscaping, exterior lighting, and parking, to ensure superior quality and design. Lastly, the proposed project will be complementary to the existing surrounding development. Given that the proposal will be complementary to the surrounding uses and architecture, the project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from this project will be less than significant impact.</p>				
<p>d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1d. Response: This proposal will create a new source of light in this neighborhood and to reduce impacts related to the creation of exterior lighting sources, an exterior lighting plan will be required prior to the issuance of building permits. The purpose of these plans will be to insure that all new light sources are adequately hooded or shielded downward as to not produce undesirable or dangerous levels of glare to motorists and surrounding uses as well as to ensure that all lighting complies with City policies regarding exterior illumination levels. Compliance with City policies regarding exterior lighting will reduce any impacts to less than significant levels.</p>				
<p>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</p>				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability) The proposed project consists of urban development. A review of Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability of the General Plan 2025 reveals that the project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance. The General Plan 2025 Program</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>concluded that implementation of the General Plan 2025 will influence the conversion of farmland by facilitating development, particularly on those sites designated Farmland of Local Importance but where land use and zoning designations preclude agriculture as a future use. To that end, impacts related to the conversion of Farmland of Local Importance were determined to be significant and unavoidable given that no feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce a project's impact to agricultural resources to a less than significant level. Given that a project of this scale at this location is consistent with the City's existing land use and zoning designations, impacts to agricultural resources were considered by the General Plan 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (GP2025 FPEIR) for which there was a Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted. Therefore, any impact to agricultural uses associated with a project of this scale at this location has already been analyzed and considered as part of the GP 2025 FPEIR.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)</p>				
<p>The site is within a built environment and no Williamson Act contracts are implemented on the site. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or any applicable Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data) The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data) The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, and GIS Map – Forest Data) See Responses 2a and 2d.</p>				
<p>3. AIR QUALITY.</p>				
<p>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP))</p>				
<p>The City's GP2025 anticipated the development of a project of this scale at this location consistent with the City's existing GP 2025 land use and zoning designations for the project site. To that end, the air quality cumulative impacts for a project of this scale were considered by the GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) for which there was a Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted. Therefore, any air quality impacts associated with a project of this</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
scale at this location have already been analyzed and considered as part of the GP 2025 FPEIR.				
<p>Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD’s AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TRIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.</p>				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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, Project Specific "Air Quality Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development," prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)

An Air Quality Analysis was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. to evaluate the proposed project's emission levels using CalEEMod. The results of the CalEEMod model determined that the proposed project would result in the following emission levels:

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS SHORT-TERM IMPACTS						
Activity	Peak Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Construction	75	100	550	150	150	55
Daily Project - Emissions Construction	51	98	56	0.11	11	7.8
Exceeds Y/N Threshold?	N	N	N	N	N	N

CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS LONG-TERM IMPACTS						
Activity	Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM-10	PM-2.5
SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Operation	55	55	550	150	150	55
Total Daily Project Emissions	44	150	260	0.51	59	6.8
Net Daily Project Emissions	15	53	100	0.19	22	2.5
Exceeds Y/N Threshold?	N	N	N	N	N	N

The results of the air quality model showed that the proposed project would generate net emissions lower than the SCAQMD thresholds for significance for air quality emissions. The City's GP2025 anticipated the development of a project of this scale at this location consistent with the City's existing GP 2025 land use and zoning designations for the project site. To that end, the air quality cumulative impacts for a project of this scale were considered by the GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) for which there was a Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted. Therefore, any air quality impacts associated with a project of this scale at this location have already been analyzed and considered as part of the GP 2025 FPEIR.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>In order to ensure that the State and Federal ambient air quality standards for CO are not violated, the SCAQMD recommends that projects with a potential to generate heavy volumes of traffic, and which can lead to high levels of CO, use hot spot modeling to determine the potential to create a CO “Hot Spot”. A CO “Hot Spot” is a localized concentration of CO that is above the State or Federal 1-hour or 8-hour ambient air standards. A localized high CO level is associated with traffic congestion and idling or slow-moving vehicles and requires additional analysis beyond total project emissions quantification. The analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. included a CO hot spot model using project-specific traffic data. The model determined that potential for a CO hot spot above State or Federal 1-hour or 8-hour ambient air standards as a result of the project directly, indirectly or cumulatively will be a less than significant impact.</p>				
<p>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, and Project Specific “Air Quality Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p>				
<p>Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, AQMP thresholds indicate future construction activities under the General Plan 2025 are projected to result in significant levels of NO_x 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.</p>				
<p>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.</p>				
<p>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, and Project Specific “Air Quality Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p>				
<p>Refer to Response 3b above. Furthermore, short-term impacts associated with construction will result in increased air emissions from grading, earthmoving, and construction activities. In conformance with the General Plan 2025 the CalEEMod computer model analyzed short-term construction and long-term operational related impacts of the project and determined that the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for short-term construction and long-term operational impacts. Therefore, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively for this project.</p>				
<p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>3e. Response: (Source: Project Specific “Air Quality Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p> <p>While exact quantification of objectionable odors cannot be determined due to the subjective nature of what is considered “objectionable,” the nature of the proposed project, associated infrastructure and related off-site improvements present a potential for the generation of objectionable odors associated with construction activities. The operational activities associated with the proposed project, however, are not typically associated with the generation of objectionable odors. The construction activities associated with the expected build out of the project site will generate airborne odors like diesel exhaust emissions, architectural coating applications, and on- and off-site improvement installations. However, said emissions would occur only during daylight hours, be short-term in duration, and would be isolated to the immediate vicinity of the construction site. Therefore, they would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors on a permanent basis. Therefore, the project will not cause objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur.</p>				
<p>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4a. Response: (Source: Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, and Project Specific “Results of a Burrowing Owl Survey for the Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion Project,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., August 2012)</p> <p>The project site is located within a built-up area and is generally surrounded by existing development and a search of the MSHCP database and other appropriate databases identified the project site as being potentially suitable for burrowing owl; the project site is also located easterly of Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park. A Habitat Assessment prepared by LSA Associates was prepared for the project. The findings of the habitat assessment concluded that no burrowing owls or burrows potentially occupied by burrowing owl were detected during the survey. Therefore, no additional site visits are required for the survey. Although burrowing owl does not currently utilize the site, habitat on the site is suitable for this species and could eventually become occupied. A pre-construction survey within 30-days prior to disturbance will be required in order to fulfill MSHCP requirements for avoiding take of owls or active owl nests. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact with mitigation directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4b. Response: (Source: 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)</p> <p>The project site is currently vacant and located within a built-up area where no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community exists on site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on 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 Service directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4c. Response: <i>(Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)</i></p> <p>The project is located within a built-up area where no federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) exist on site or within proximity to the project site. The project site does not contain any discernible drainage courses, inundated areas, wetland vegetation, or hydric soils and thus does not include USACOE jurisdictional drainages or wetlands. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4d. Response: <i>(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage)</i></p> <p>See Response 4a. The proposed project is subject to the MSHCP and is consistent with the General Plan 2025. The proposed project will not conflict with General Plan 2025 Policy OS-6.4 which requires the City to continue efforts to establish a wildlife movement corridor between Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park and the Box Springs Mountain Regional Park as identified in the MSHCP and the City’s General Plan 2025. The project is also consistent with General Plan 2025 Policy OS-6.1 which addresses preserving wildlife migration areas in general. Therefore, through implementation of the General Plan 2025 policies discussed here, as well as, those policies which preserve open space in general, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively for impacts to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or the establishment of native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4e. Response: <i>(Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, Project Specific “Results of a Burrowing Owl Survey for the Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion Project,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., August 2012)</i></p> <p>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. Further, as the subject site is identified in the MSHCP as potential habitat for the burrowing owl, a pre-construction survey within 30-days prior to disturbance will be required in order to fulfill MSHCP requirements for avoiding take of owls or active owl nests. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact with mitigation directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p> <p>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; therefore, impacts will be less than significant.</p> <p>In addition, the General Plan 2025 includes policies to ensure that future development would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies. This project has been reviewed</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
against these policies and found to be in compliance with the policies. For these reasons, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively on local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and tree preservation.				
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4f. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP))</p> <p>The proposed project is consistent with the guidelines of MSHCP, including Section 6.1.4, Guidelines Pertaining to the Urban/Wildlife Interface and related policies in the General Plan 2025, including Policy LU-7.4. As well, the project is consistent with the SKR HCP and with General Plan Policy OS-5.3. Therefore, impacts associated with potential inconsistencies with the MSHCP and SKR HCP will be less than significant impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>5a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, and Project Specific “Cultural Resources Assessment – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., March 2012)</p> <p>The project is located on a site where no historic resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. A cultural resources assessment was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. for the project that included a records search, literature review, and field survey for the project site. The cultural resources assessment concluded that no prehistoric or historic cultural resources have been previously documented within the project area and none were observed during the field survey. Due to the disturbed nature of the soils and the absence of cultural resources within the project site, sensitivity for subsurface resources is low and no further investigation or monitoring was recommended. Therefore, no impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.</p>				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5b. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study, and Project Specific “Cultural Resources Assessment – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., March 2012)</p> <p>A cultural resources assessment was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. for the project that included a records search, literature review, and field survey for the project site. The survey meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards and Guidelines (the survey should be reviewed by the City’s Historic Preservation Officer to determine this) and has found that there are no known archeological resources present on the site. Through implementation of appropriate mitigation measure MM Cultural 4 per the GP 2025 FPEIR, impacts to archeological resources directly, indirectly and cumulatively as a result of the project can be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)</p> <p>Activities including construction-related and earth-disturbing actions could damage or destroy fossils in rock units. As with archaeological resources, paleontological resources are generally considered to be historical resources, as defined in CEQA</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3)(D). Consequently, damage or destruction to these resources could cause a significant impact. A cultural resources assessment was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. for the project and 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>5d. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)</p> <p>Where construction is proposed in undeveloped areas, disturbance on vacant lands could have the potential to disturb or destroy buried Native American human remains as well as other human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Consistent with State laws protecting these remains, sites containing human remains must be identified and treated in a sensitive manner. In the event that Native American human remains are inadvertently discovered during project-related construction activities, there would be unavoidable significant adverse impacts to Native American resources, but implementation of State Laws, including Health and Safety Code 7050.5, State CEQA Guidelines 15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code 5097.98, impacts to human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries to a less than significant level.</p>				
<p>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:</p>				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>Seismic activity is to be expected in Southern California. In the City of Riverside, there are no Alquist-Priolo zones. The project site does not contain any known fault lines and the potential for fault rupture or seismic shaking is low. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that no impacts related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6ii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>The San Jacinto Fault Zone, located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City’s Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed project will be required to comply with California Building Code regulations, no impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking directly, indirectly and cumulatively are anticipated.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iii. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>The project site is located 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.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iv. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP)</p>				
<p>The project site and its surroundings have generally flat topography and are not located in an area prone to landslides per Figure 5.6-1 of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Therefore, there will be no impact related to landslides directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP)</p>				
<p>Erosion and loss of topsoil could occur as a result of the project. State and Federal requirements call for the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) establishing erosion and sediment controls for construction activities. The project must also comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations. In addition, with the erosion control standards for which all development activity must comply (Title 18), the Grading Code (Title 17) also requires the implementation of measures designed to minimize soil erosion. Compliance with State and Federal requirements as well as with Titles 18 and 17 will ensure that soil erosion or loss of topsoil will be less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones, Figure PS-2 – Liquefaction Zones, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure PS-3 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Figure 5.6-1 – Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, and Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)</p>				
<p>The topography of the subject site generally slopes slightly to the north, towards Cottonwood Avenue. For Landslides refer to response 6 a iv. For Lateral spreading, adherence to the City’s Grading and Subdivision Codes as well as the California Building Code in the design of this project will prevent lateral spreading. For Liquefaction, refer to response 6 a iii. For Collapse, adherence to the City’s grading and building requirements will ensure that the property is adequately prepared to prevent the collapse of the graded pad and/or slopes. Compliance with the City’s existing Codes and the policies contained in the General Plan 2025 will ensure impacts related to geologic conditions are reduced to less than significant impacts level directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 – Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code)</p>				
<p>Expansive soil is defined under <i>California Building Code</i>. The soil type of the subject site is Hanford (See Figure 5.6-4 – Soils of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Hanford soil is characterized by moderately rapid to rapid permeability and low swell-shrink potential. Compliance with the applicable provisions of the City’s Subdivision Code – Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard to soil hazards related to the expansive soils will be reduced to a less than significant impact level for this project directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6e. Response:</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The proposed project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have no impact .				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7a. Response: (Source: Project Specific “Air Quality Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p>				
<p>The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building situated on the southeast corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The proposed expansion will extend the existing building westerly toward Sycamore Canyon Boulevard and will include a total of 151 dock high doors, 128 trailer parking spaces, and 348 passenger vehicle parking spaces. The City’s GP2025 anticipated the development of a project of this scale at this location consistent with the City’s existing GP 2025 land use and zoning designations for the project site. To that end, the air quality cumulative impacts for a project of this scale were considered by the GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR) for which there was a Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted. Therefore, any air quality impacts associated with a project of this scale at this location have already been analyzed and considered as part of the GP 2025 FPEIR.</p>				
<p>Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the RTP, the SCAQMD’s AQMP, RTIP, and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the SCAG that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” However, due to the size and scope of the proposed project, a Climate Change Analysis was commissioned by the applicant to determine if the project related impacts (both construction and operational) would produce GHG emissions that would have a significant direct, indirect or cumulative impact on the environment.</p>				
<p>The results of the Climate Change Analysis indicate that the proposed project will result in a net increase in 14,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year. The City of Riverside has not adopted a threshold of significance for GHG emissions. Regional air districts, including the SCAQMD, have developed thresholds that may be relevant to the project. The total GHGs emitted by the proposed project are lower than the SCAQMD-proposed tiered residual GHG emissions threshold of 25,000 metric tons CO₂e per year for a project of this type. The project will also comply with the City’s General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GHGs. Finally, the Climate Change Analysis demonstrates that the project will not interfere with the state’s goals of reducing GHG 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. As described above, the project will not generate GHG above levels that would have a significant impact on the environment. Thus, a less than significant impact is expected directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7b. Response: (Source: Project Specific “Air Quality Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p>				
<p>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 response 7a above, the project will comply with the City’s General Plan policies and State Building Code provisions designed to reduce GHG emissions. In addition, the project will comply with all SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations during construction of the proposed approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building and will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing GHG emission to 1990 levels by the year 2020, as stated in AB 32, and an 80 percent reduction in GHG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050, as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Based upon the 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 is expected directly,</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
indirectly and cumulatively.				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8a. Response:</p> <p>The proposed project may include the transportation of hazardous materials: The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) Office of Hazardous Materials Safety prescribes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials, as described in Title 49 of the <i>Code of Federal Regulations</i>, and implemented by Title 13 of the CCR.</p> <p>Through the compliance with all applicable Federal and State laws, and the submittal of a business plan to the City’s Fire Department related to the transportation, storage and disposal of hazardous materials, the likelihood and severity of accidents would be reduced. Therefore, there would be less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>				
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8b. Response:</p> <p>The project may involve the use of hazardous materials but shall comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations pertaining to the transport, use, disposal, handling, and storage of hazardous waste, including but not limited to Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations implemented by Title 13 of the CCR, which describes strict regulations for the safe transportation of hazardous materials. (See response 7a above for more details).</p> <p>In addition, during construction there is a potential for hazardous materials to be used (i.e., petroleum products, thinners, paints, etc.). The project contractors are required to comply with all state and City regulations regarding the use, and temporary storage of these products at the site.</p> <p>Compliance with all applicable Federal, State and local laws related to the transportation, use and storage of hazardous materials would reduce the likelihood and severity of accidents during transit, use and storage to a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8c. Response: (Source: <i>General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools</i>)</p> <p>The project may produce hazardous materials and/or waste; however, all businesses that handle or have on-site transportation of hazardous materials are required to comply with the provisions of the City’s Fire Code and any additional regulations as required in the California Health and Safety Code Article 1 Chapter 6.95 for the Business Emergency Plan. Compliance with existing Federal and State regulations impacts associated with the exposure of schools to hazardous materials caused by this project will be a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8d. Response: (Source: <i>General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A –</i>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)</i></p>				
<p>A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the project site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have no impact to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8e. Response: <i>(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))</i></p>				
<p>The proposed project is located within March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan 1984 (CLUP), Area I and Accident Potential II Zone. The original project was reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on January 24, 2002 to ensure that the project was consistent with the land use standards in the MARB CLUP. The original project was found to be consistent by the ALUC at that time. Staff has reviewed the proposed addition against the requirements of the 1984 CLUP and has found that the addition is also consistent with the CLUP with the condition for a deed notice. Therefore, impacts related to hazards from airports are less than significant impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8f. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP)</i> Because the proposed project is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8g. Response: <i>(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, OEM’s Strategic Plan, and General Plan 2025 Figure PS 8.1 – Evacuation Routes)</i></p>				
<p>An existing network of fully improved streets that include Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard will serve the proposed approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building. All streets have been designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments’ specifications. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan.</p>				
<p>h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8h. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 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)</i></p>				
<p>The proposed project is located in an urbanized area where no wildlands exist and the property is no located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a VHFSZ; therefore, no impact regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9a. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by SB&O, Inc. on October 2012.)</p> <p>During the construction phase, a final approved WQMP will be required for the project, as well as coverage under the State’s General Permit for Construction Activities, administered by the Santa Ana RWQCB. Storm water management measures will be required to be implemented to effectively control erosion and sedimentation and other construction-related pollutants during construction. Given compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws regulating surface water quality and the fact that the project will not result in a net increase of surface water runoff, the proposed project as designed is anticipated to result in a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.</p>				
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9b. Response: (Source: Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), WMWD Urban Water Management Plan and projects of Statewide, Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by SB&O, Inc. on October 2012.)</p> <p>The proposed project is located within the Riverside South Water Supply Basin. 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.</p>				
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9c. Response: (Source: Preliminary grading plan and Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by SB&O, Inc. on October 2012.)</p> <p>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. Further, the drainage patterns on the site generally flow west, toward the landscaped bioswale along the Grand Avenue frontage. Therefore, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.</p>				
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9d. Response: (Source: Preliminary grading plan and Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by SB&O, Inc. on October 2012, General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas)</p> <p>The project site is not located within a flood plain. Underground storm drains and streets are designed to accommodate the 10-year storm flow from curb to curb, while 100-year storms are accommodated within street right-of-ways. The runoff</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
from the project in a developed condition has been studied and is required to be attenuated on-site, so although the drainage pattern will be altered the off-site discharge is the same as the undeveloped condition. Therefore, there will be less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively in the rate or amount of surface runoff that it will not 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9e. Response: (Source: Preliminary Grading Plan and Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by SB&O, Inc. on October 2012)				
<p>The project site is tributary to the storm drain system for the Sycamore Canyon Business Park, with drainage from the site being split between two discharge locations. The northerly portion of the site discharges to an existing 42-inch storm drain pipe located at the northwest corner of the project site. The southerly portion of the site discharges to a 36-inch drain near the southerly driveway. The project's runoff flow rate, volume velocity and duration for the post development condition do not exceed the predevelopment condition for the 2-year, 24-hour and 10-year 24-hour rainfall events. This condition has been achieved by minimizing impervious area on site and incorporating other site-design concepts that mimic pre-development conditions, including landscape buffer areas between the proposed building and curb-adjacent sidewalk, bio-retention facilities for the north and west parking areas, and a separate underground proprietary BMPs needed to treat roof drainage prior to connecting to the storm drain system. The bio-retention facilities proposed from the north and west parking areas – along the Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard frontages – will be vegetated and will be installed concurrently with the construction of the project. The project is expected to generate the following pollutants: sediment, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demand substances, bacteria and virus/ pathogens, oil & grease, pesticides, and organic compounds and metals. These expected pollutants will be treated through the incorporation of the site design, source control and treatment control measures specified in the project specific WQMP. Therefore, as the expected pollutants will be mitigated through the project site design, source control, and treatment controls already integrated into the project design, the project will not create or contribute runoff water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and there will be a less than significant impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9f. Response: (Source: Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by SB&O, Inc. on October 2012)				
<p>The project is over one acre in size and is required to have coverage under the State's General Permit for Construction Activities (SWPPP). As stated in the Permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. Furthermore, the City has ensured that the development does not cause adverse water quality impacts, pursuant to its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit through the project's WQMP.</p>				
<p>The proposed development will increase the amount of impervious surface area in the City. This impervious area includes paved parking areas, sidewalks, roadways, and building rooftops; all sources of runoff that may carry pollutants and therefore has the potential to degrade water quality. This development has been required to prepare preliminary BMP's that have been reviewed and accepted by Public Works. Final WQMP will be required prior to grading permit issuance. The purpose of this requirement is to insure treatment BMP's are installed/constructed as part of the project so that the pollutants generated by the project will be treated in perpetuity. Therefore, impacts related to degrading water quality are less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Map Number 06065C0745G)				
<p>A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0745G 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-</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
year flood hazard area and the project does not involve the construction of housing. There will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Map Number 06065C0745G)</p> <p>The project site is not located within or near a 1% 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 06065C0745G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a 100-year (1%) flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows and no impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Map Number 06065C0745G)</p> <p>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 06065C0745G 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.</p>				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9j. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 – Hydrology and Water Quality)</p> <p>Tsunamis are large waves that occur in coastal areas; therefore, since the City is not located in a coastal area, no impacts due to tsunamis will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively. Additionally, the proposed project site and its surroundings have generally flat topography. The City is requiring standard construction BMP's to control erosion as outlined in the recommended conditions of approval. Therefore, inundation from seiches and mudflows is deemed to be less than significant directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)</p> <p>The proposed project is an infill project that will be served by fully improved public streets and other infrastructure and does not involve subdivision of land or the creation of streets that could alter the existing surrounding pattern of development or an established community. Further the project has been designed to be consistent with and fit into the development pattern of the surrounding area and will provide adequate access, circulation, and connectivity consistent with the General Plan 2025, Zoning and Subdivision Codes, and the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly or cumulative to an established community will occur.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</p> <p>See response 8e. The project was also analyzed for consistency with the goals and policies of the General Plan 2025. In</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>fact, General Plan 2025 Policy LU-80.6 outlines the City’s intent to promote “the development of Sycamore Canyon to achieve economic success defined by a diverse and compatible industrial based that provides economic opportunities for all its citizens” and recognizes that “large big box distribution or warehouse facilities will be necessary...to create the critical mass required to solve infrastructure issues.” As designed, the proposed project is consistent with the City’s General Plan 2025 land use and zoning designations, as well as the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines. A variance related to the number of parking spaces provided has been requested to deviate from the standard established in the Zoning Code. In the judgment of the Planning Division, the potential environmental impacts of any variances are considered less than significant. Based on the above-referenced information, the proposed Design Review permit to allow development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building will have a less than significant impact on applicable land use policies directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines) Refer to Response 4f. above.</p>				
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources) State-classified MRZ-2 and MRZ-3 Mineral Resource Zones are shown in Figure OS-1, Mineral Resources of the General Plan 2025. The proposed project is located in MRZ-3, indicating that the area contains known or inferred mineral occurrences of undetermined mineral resource significance. No active mining under a valid permit currently occurs on site, and the project is not adjacent to areas supporting feldspar, silica, limestone and/or other rock products and does not meet necessary criteria for marketability and threshold values to support mineral resources as specified by the Department of Conservation; therefore, the impacts to known mineral resources are less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11b. Response: (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 directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>12. NOISE.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in:</p>				
<p>a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code and Project Specific Noise Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development, prepared by LSA Associates, Inc.,</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p align="center"><i>September 2012)</i></p> <p>A noise impact analysis was prepared for the project by LSA Associates, Inc. for the proposed project. The noise impact analysis concludes that the project does not have the potential to expose persons to or generate of noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan 2025 and/or Noise Code (Title 7) Therefore, the impacts are considered less than significant on the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of established City standards either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code and Project Specific Noise Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development, prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</i></p> <p>A noise impact analysis was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. for the proposed project. The noise impact analysis concludes that short-term construction-related impacts associated with worker commute and equipment transport to the project site would be less than significant. Construction of the proposed project is expected to require the use of earthmoving equipment. Assuming that each piece of construction equipment operates at some distance from the other equipment, the worst-case combined noise level during this phase would be 91 dBA Lmax. Land uses immediately adjacent to the project site include industrial uses and vacant land that are not considered noise-sensitive. The nearest noise sensitive residential uses are located more than 2,500 feet from the project site, which would result in 34 dBA of noise reduction from distance divergence alone. Therefore construction of the project site would not expose noise sensitive uses in the project vicinity to noise levels exceeding 57 dBA Lmax and the impact associated with construction activities is considered less than significant.</p> <p>For groundborne vibration the noise impact analysis notes that sensitive receptors located at 25, 100, 200, and 300 feet from the construction activity may be exposed to groundborne vibration up to 98, 86, 80, and 76 VdB, respectively. However, the nearest residential uses are more than 2,500 feet from the project site, and would not be exposed to vibration levels exceeding 58 VdB. This range of groundborne vibration levels is below the 80 VdB threshold for residences due to infrequent events and would not result in any potential vibration impacts the nearest residences in the project site vicinity.</p> <p>Construction related activities although short term, are the most common source of groundborne noise and vibration that could affect occupants of neighboring uses. Title 7 limits construction related activities from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction noise is permitted on Sundays or on Federal holidays. As construction activities are temporary and limited, the project will cause a less than significant exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels. This project is not expected to generate or be exposed to long-term vibration impacts during operation of the proposed use or during construction activities as no blasting or pile driving is foreseeable in conjunction with development of this project. Therefore, impacts are less than significant on the exposure of persons to or the generation of noise levels in excess of established City standards either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code and Project Specific Noise Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development, prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</i></p> <p>To determine whether the proposed project would result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels, a noise impact</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
analysis was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. to evaluate potential point sources of noise that could affect on-site and off-site noise-sensitive receptors such as residences. On-site noise-producing activities include doors slamming, vehicle engine start-ups, truck loading and unloading activities, and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning equipment. The noise impact analysis concludes that long-term on-site operational noise levels will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above the level existing without the project. The closest sensitive receptors are located more than 2,500 feet from the project site and would not be impacted by operational noise levels generated by the proposed project. Moreover, the project would comply with the provisions of Title 7. Therefore, this project will have less than significant impact on existing noise levels either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report and Project Specific Noise Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Industrial Development, prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p>				
<p>The primary source of temporary or periodic noise associated with the proposed project is from construction activity and maintenance work. Construction noise typically involves the loudest common urban noise events associated with building demolition, grading, construction, large diesel engines, truck deliveries and hauling</p>				
<p>Both the General Plan 2025 and the Municipal Code Title 7 (Noise Code) limit construction activities to specific times and days of the week and during those specified times, construction activity is subject to the noise standards provided in the Title 7. Considering the short-term nature of construction and the provisions of the Noise Code, the temporary and periodic increase in noise levels due the construction which may result from the project are considered less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP)</p>				
<p>See response 8e. The proposed project is located within the boundaries of the March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and within the 65 CNEL airport noise contour area of the March ARB as depicted on Figure N-9 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025. General Plan 2025 Policies N-1.5, CCM-11.7, N-2.1, N-2.2, N-2.5, N-3.2 through 3.4, LU-22.3 through 22.5 and Municipal Code regulations, Sections 19.58 and 12.14 restrict noise sensitive development within areas subject to high noise levels (over 65 dB CNEL) and limit the intensity and height of development within aircraft hazard zones. These controls are consistent with the CLUP. Further, the project is consistent with both the General Plan 2025 and the 1984 CLUP for MARB/MIP.</p>				
<p>The maximum threshold for the proposed use 80 dBA. Because the noise contour level for the project site is found to be a normally acceptable level for the proposed use per Figure N-10 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025, impacts related to exposure of people residing or working in an airport land use plan area to excessive noise is considered less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP) 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 is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Table LU-3 – Land Use Designations, FPEIR Table 5.12-A – SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B – General Plan Population and Employment Projections–2025, Table 5.12-C – 2025 General Plan and SCAG Comparisons, Table 5.12-D - General Plan Housing Projections 2025, Capital Improvement Program and SCAG’s RCP and RTP) The project involves a new business that may directly induce population growth, and may involve additional infrastructure that could indirectly induce population growth. However, the project is consistent with the Business/Office Park (B/OP) land use designation established under the General Plan 2025 Program and the additional infrastructure is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program. The General Plan 2025 Final PEIR determined that Citywide, future development anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Typical scenario would not have significant population growth impacts. Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical growth scenario and population growth impacts were previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR the project does not result in new impacts beyond those previously evaluated in the GP 2025 FPEIR; therefore, the impacts will be less than significant both directly and indirectly.</p>				
<p>b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13b. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2012 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.</p>				
<p>c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>13c. Response: (Source: CADME Land Use 2012 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.</p>				
<p>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p>				
<p>a. Fire protection?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>14a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)</p> <p>Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by Station #13 located at 6490 Sycamore Canyon 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.</p>				
<p>b. Police protection?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)</p> <p>Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the East Neighborhood Policing Center to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional police facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Schools?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level)</p> <p>Adequate school facilities and services are provided by Moreno Valley Unified School District to serve this project. The project is non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase numbers of school age children. Nonetheless, the proposed project will be required to pay any applicable school fees. Therefore there will be no impact on the demand for additional school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Parks?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)</p> <p>The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building situated on the southeast corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. Adequate park facilities and services are provided in the Sycamore Canyon Business Park – Canyon Springs Neighborhood to serve this project, including the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park near the project site. 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.</p>				
<p>e. Other public facilities?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 – Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F – Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H – Riverside Public Library Service Standards)</p> <p>The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building situated on the southeast corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. Adequate public facilities and services, including libraries and community centers, are provided by the City to serve this site. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Park, 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.</p>				
<p>15. RECREATION.</p>				
<p>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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>15a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><i>Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)</i></p>				
<p>The General Plan 2025 analyzed the proposed Business/Office Park (B/OP) General Plan Land Use for this property. The project is consistent with the adopted General Plan 2025 and will pay applicable Park Development Impact Fees to the City of Riverside Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department; therefore this project will have a no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>15b. Response: The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in:</p>				
<p>a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP, and Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</i></p>				
<p>Roadway capacity is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic volumes of the proposed project. A traffic impact analysis was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. to evaluate the potential traffic-related impacts associated with the approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building situated on the southeast corner of Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The study area intersections fall under the jurisdiction of the City of Riverside and Caltrans. The City uses level of service D as its minimum level of service objective for intersections and roadways of Collector or high classification; therefore, any intersection or roadway segment potentially operating at level of service E or F requires mitigation. Caltrans considers acceptable level of service to be between C and D for all intersections under its jurisdiction; therefore, all signalized intersections under Caltrans jurisdiction must operate with a weighted average delay of 45 seconds or less.</p>				
<p>The traffic impact analysis evaluated the impact of the proposed project on 11 intersections in the vicinity of the project site. An intersection level of service analysis was conducted for project completion to determine the projected intersection performance. As determined by the Traffic Impact Analysis, with completion of the proposed project, all eleven study intersections are projected to operate at satisfactory levels of service with the proposed project. No intersection is projected to be re-designated to a lower level of service, although the Interstate 215/Eucalyptus study intersection will remain at a level of service D. Therefore, the increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
street system is less than significant directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP, and Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p> <p>The project site does not include a state highway or principal arterial within Riverside County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) and the project is consistent with the Transportation Demand Management/Air Quality components of the Program. The roadway capacity of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic volumes of the proposed project. As determined by the traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed project, all eleven study intersections are projected to operate at satisfactory levels of service, is consistent with the CMP. In addition, the project is consistent with the Transportation Demand Management/Air Quality components of the Program. Therefore, increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999) and Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p> <p>See response 8e. The proposed project is located within March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and has been determined to be consistent with the Plan by the ALUC. The project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or change the location of air traffic patterns. As such, this project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on air traffic patterns.</p>				
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16d. Response: (Source: Project Site Plan, Lane Striping and Signing Plans, and Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., September 2012)</p> <p>The proposed project is compatible with adjacent streets and existing development in the surrounding area. As well, it has been designed so as not to cause any incompatible use or create any hazards to the surrounding area or general public. The proposed site plan indicates that access will be taken from both Cottonwood Avenue and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The proposed site design would not result in hazards due to design features such as driveways or intersection improvements, etc. As such, the project will have no impact on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16e. Response: (Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)</p> <p>The project has been developed in compliance with Title 18, Section 18.210.030 and the City’s Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007); therefore, there will be no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.</p>				
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)?				
<p>16f. Response: (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!)</p>				
<p>The project, as designed, does not create conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). In fact, the project will allow for the connection of sidewalks along each side of the site to improve the pedestrian accessibility. As such, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.</p>				
<p>17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p>				
<p>All new development is required to comply with all provisions of the NPDES program and the City’s Municipal Separate Sewer Permit (MS4), as enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB with respect to discharges to the sewer system or stormwater system within the City. Because the proposed project is required to adhere to the above regulations related to wastewater treatment the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17b. Response: (Source: Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), 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-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)</p>				
<p>The project will not result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The General Plan 2025 determined future water and wastewater generation 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). The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building, consistent with the density anticipated and analyzed by the General Plan 2025 for the project site. Therefore, the project will have less than significant impacts resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</p>				
<p>The proposed project will result in an increase of impervious surface areas. The increased in impervious surface area 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.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>General Plan 2025 Policies PF 4.1 and PF 4.3 require the City to continue to routinely monitor its storm drain system and to fund and improve those systems as identified in the City’s Capital Improvement Plan. Implementation of these policies will ensure that the City is adequately served by drainage systems. The General Plan 2025 also includes policies and programs that will minimize the environmental effects of the development of such facilities. Therefore, the project will have less than significant on existing storm water drainage facilities and would not require the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-3 – Water Service Areas, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities, 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, and WMWD Master Plan)</p> <p>The City’s Urban Water Management Plan must be updated every five years to include the most recent population trends. Similarly, the City must consult with the Riverside Public Utilities regarding development projects exceeding the thresholds noted in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15155 to ensure that sufficient water supplies are available and this review took place. The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building, consistent with the density anticipated and analyzed by the General Plan 2025 for the project site. The GP 2025 FPEIR found that water demand within RPU boundaries may exceed supply under the “worst case” analysis of Maximum population and Maximum population w/RPD. However, WMWD can sell water to RPU and as shown on Table 5.16-I of the GP 2025 FPEIR, WMWD will have 123,784 acre-feet annually to sell to other agencies like RPU. Therefore, even at the higher levels of development anticipated under the General Plan, water supply is available. Therefore, this project was found to have a less than significant impact on water supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</p> <p>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). The General Plan 2025 determined future wastewater generation was adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building, consistent with the density anticipated and analyzed by the General Plan 2025 for the project site. Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, this project was found to have a less than significant impact to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.</p>				
<p>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)</p> <p>The General Plan 2025 determined future landfill capacity to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). The proposed project entails the development of an approximately 235,741 square-foot expansion to an existing 400,580 square-foot warehouse industrial building, consistent with the density anticipated and analyzed by the General Plan 2025 for the project site. Therefore, this project was found to have a less than significant impact to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
regulations related to solid waste?				
<p>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.</p>				
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18a. Response: (Source: 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 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, and Project Specific Results of a Burrowing Owl Survey for the Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion Project,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., August 2012, 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, and Cultural Resources Assessment – Cottonwood Avenue Building Expansion,” prepared by LSA Associates, Inc., March 2012)</p> <p>Potential impacts related to habitat of fish or wildlife species were discussed in the Biological Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were all found to be less than significant with mitigation.</p>				
<p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)</p> <p>Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated and therefore cumulative impacts of the proposed project beyond those previously considered in the GP 2025 FPEIR are less than significant.</p>				
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18c. Response: (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</p>				

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

Staff Recommended Mitigation Measures

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Biological Resources	MM Biological 1: Although burrowing owl does not currently utilize the site, habitat on the site is suitable for this species and could eventually become occupied. A pre-construction survey within 30-days prior to disturbance will be required in order to fulfill MSHCP requirements for avoiding take of owls or active owl nests.	30-days prior to disturbance	Applicant	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval.

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