



City of Arts & Innovation

# COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division

## Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

WARD: 2

1. **Case Number:** P14-0517
2. **Project Title:** Investment Building Group – Mass Grading Project
3. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside  
Community Development Department  
Planning Division  
3900 Main Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Riverside, CA 92522
4. **Contact Person:** Brian Norton, Associate Planner  
**Phone Number:** (951) 826-2308  
**Email:** bnorton@riversideca.gov
5. **Project Location:** Assessor’s Parcel Number 263-050-074; the project is located on the westerly side of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard, between Eastridge Avenue and Alessandro Boulevard.
6. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**  
Brian Bargemann  
Investment Building Group  
5100 Campus Drive, Suite 300  
Newport Beach, CA 92660
7. **General Plan Designation:** B/OP – Business/Office Park and P – Public Park
8. **Zoning:** BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
9. **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 project includes construction of a 304,477 square foot warehouse building with a 10,000 square foot mezzanine, 56 truck bays, a 375 stall surface parking lot and site landscaping on 30.1 acres located on the westerly side of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard between Eastridge Avenue and Alessandro Boulevard (APNs 263-050-074). While the project site is currently vacant an approximately 15.8 acre segment of the parcel has previously been graded under Planning Case P13-0145 (Initial Study) to create the limits of the building pad. The graded pad served to accommodate the approximately 63,284 cubic yards of dirt that was excavated to create the Central Basin of the City of Riverside’s Sycamore Canyon Business Park Water Quality Basins Project. The approximately 1.68 acre Central Basin – located on the westernmost portion of the subject parcel is a component of the drainage plan for the Sycamore Canyon Business Park which is intended to treat runoff water from the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan area and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The limits of the proposed graded pad are shown on the Conceptual Grading Plans. Furthermore, the Conceptual Grading Plans indicate an additional 20,651 cubic yards of import will be placed on top of the existing

building pad to raise the level of the pad closer to the elevation of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. No grading is proposed within the delineated jurisdictional wetlands and waters.

The building is intended to be utilized as a high cube warehouse/distribution facility; however, an end user has not been identified at this time, as such, specific details about the future operation of the facility are not currently available. The project has included multiple parking configurations dependent upon the end user.

The buildings will be of concrete tilt up panel style construction with an architecturally enhanced main entrance along the easterly façade and a main entrance, or secondary entrance along the southwesterly façade of the building. The southerly façade of the building will have 35 dock doors and the westerly façade of the building will contain 21 loading dock doors. Loading dock doors on the southerly portion of the building will be partially screened with decorative tilt up concrete panels to match the building.

The project will have access to Sycamore Canyon Boulevard via two 40-foot wide driveways, located along the eastern boundary of the project site. Interior drive aisles along the northern, western, and southern sides of the building will have a width of between 26 to 40 feet to provide adequate truck and emergency access as required by the Fire Department. The interior drive aisles within the passenger vehicle parking areas will be 26-feet in width. Existing street improvements include street pavement and roadway striping. There are currently no curbs, gutters, sidewalks, or landscape improvements. The proposed project will include full improvements.

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

	<b>Existing Land Use</b>	<b>General Plan Designation</b>	<b>Zoning Designation</b>
<b>Project Site</b>	Vacant	B/OP – Business/Office Park	BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
<b>North</b>	Warehouses	B/OP – Business/Office Park	BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
<b>East</b>	Warehouses	B/OP – Business/Office Park	BMP-SP – Business and Manufacturing Park and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones
<b>South</b>	Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park and Warehouses	P – Public Park	PF-SP – Public Facilities and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay
<b>West</b>	Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park	P – Public Park	PF-SP – Public Facilities and Specific Plan (Sycamore Canyon Business Park) Overlay Zones

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

- a. Riverside Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) ZAP1130MA15

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

- a. General Plan 2025
- b. GP 2025 FPEIR
- c. Michael Brandman Associates – Field Verification of Jurisdictional Delineation of Waters and Wetlands Based on the Original Report Prepared by MBA and dated September 15, 2005, January 18, 2013.
- d. First Carbon Solutions – Review of Cultural Resource Record Search Associated with a Cultural Resource Survey of APN: 263-050-074. City of Riverside, California, July 10, 2013.
- e. Albert A. Webb Associates – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan – Sycamore Canyon Business Park (Mass Grading), May 2015
- f. Update to Geotechnical Investigation Prepared by Southern California Geotechnical, Inc., March 03, 2015
- g. Preliminary Hydrology Report prepared by Webb Associates, May 2014
- h. Air Quality Analysis prepared by LSA, April 2015
- i. Noise Impact Analysis prepared by LSA, April 2015

**13. Acronyms**

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

RUSD - Riverside Unified School District  
SCAG - Southern California Association of Governments  
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District  
SCH - State Clearinghouse  
SKR-HCP - Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan  
SWPPP - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan  
USGS - United States Geologic Survey  
WMWD - Western Municipal Water District  
WQMP - Water Quality Management Plan

DRAFT

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forest Resources | <input checked="" 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.

DRAFT

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>1. AESTHETICS.</b> 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><b>1a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, and Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways)</p> <p>The City’s General Plan 2025 policies aim at balancing development interests with broader community preservation objectives. The project site is currently vacant and is primarily surrounded by warehouses and the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park to the west. Views of a portion of the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park may be blocked; however, the project, a 304,477 square foot warehouse, with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, is proposed within an area designated for business/manufacturing park and the land to the north and the east are developed with warehouse developments of similar size. Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 19.130 requires that all development in the Business Manufacturing Park (BMP) zone have a maximum building height of 45 feet with no special restrictions for development along Special Boulevards. While the proposed building will have a maximum height of 45 feet at the corner office elements, a majority of the building will have a maximum height of 38 feet. The project site and vicinity are not designated by the City’s General Plan for the preservation or uniqueness of scenic views.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) found that impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant with implementation of General Plan’s policies supporting a balance between development interests and broader community preservation objective. This project does not require a general plan amendment and is consistent with the policies of the B/OP land use designation. Considering the project will not directly alter a scenic vista and is consistent with the General Plan EIR analysis, impacts will be less than significant. Through compliance and implementation of the General Plan 2025 and Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan’s policies and compliance with Zoning and Grading Code requirements, impacts related to scenic vistas, direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas are <b>less than significant impacts</b>.</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><b>1b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, Title 20 – Cultural Resources, Planning Case P13-0145 (Initial Study))</p> <p>As previously noted, the site was previously analyzed under Planning Case P13-0145 (Initial Study) for mass grading of a building pad and the Central Basin. The limits of the building pad was graded in early 2014, subsequently as part of this proposal, the applicant is placing 20,651 cubic yards of soil on top of the existing pad to raise it closer to street level and negate interior drive aisle slopes. As such the proposed 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, parking lot and landscaping will be placed on the existing graded pad and will avoid delineated jurisdictional wetlands and waters, trees and rock outcroppings. The site is not located around any defined historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from the project will be <b>less than significant impact</b>.</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"/>

<sup>1</sup> City of Riverside. General Plan Environmental Impact Report. November 2007

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><b>1c. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR, Zoning Code, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan)</p>				
<p>Degradation of visual character or quality is defined by substantial changes to the existing site appearance through construction of structures such that they are poorly designed or conflict with the site’s existing surroundings and development standards. Construction of the proposed warehouse will alter the existing visual character of the vacant site. However, the project site is located in an area designated for business/manufacturing and office park use. Sycamore Canyon Boulevard is developed with business park use to the north, south and east, of the project. The project, as proposed is located in the northeasterly portion of the 30.1 acre site, leaving 14.3 acres in open space and avoiding jurisdictional wetlands and waters. Furthermore, the project will comply with all development standards of the Zoning Code and Citywide Design Guidelines, to assure quality site design and building architecture, consistent with existing warehouses in the Sycamore Canyon Business Park. The City of Riverside General Plan EIR states that Citywide design guidelines prevent the use of highly reflective surfaces and metal siding. The building will be concrete tilt-up panel style construction with two architecturally enhanced main entrances, glazing and building articulation. With design features included, the project will have <b>less than significant impacts</b> on the visual character of the site and the surroundings.</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><b>1d. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-2 – Mount Palomar Lighting Area, Title 19 – Article VIII – Chapter 19.556 – Lighting, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines, and Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan)</p>				
<p>The project would not result in a new source of substantial light or glare which will not adversely affect day or nighttime views. Development of the proposed project will require installation of outdoor lighting necessary for public safety and maintenance, as well as to accommodate nighttime business operations. All lighting will comply with the development standards contained in the City’s Zoning Code and the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan. Municipal Code Chapter 19.590 (Performance Standards) requires that on-site lighting be arranged as to reflect away from adjoining property and public streets. With conditions of approval, including shielded perimeter lights and a photometric study on-site lights will have <b>a less than significant impact</b> on day or nighttime views in the area.</p>				
<p><b>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</b></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><b>2a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability &amp; General Plan 2025 FPEIR)</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>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 and Other Land. The General Plan 2025 Program 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 type 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><b>2b. Response:</b> (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, <b>no impacts</b> 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><b>2c. Response:</b> (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</p>				
<p>The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> 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><b>2d. Response:</b> (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)</p>				
<p>The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore <b>no impacts</b> 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><b>2e. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, GIS Map – Forest Data)</p>				
<p>See Responses 2a and 2d.</p>				
<p><b>3. AIR QUALITY.</b></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><b>3a. Response:</b> (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), LSA Air Quality Analysis April 2015)</p>				
<p>A significant impact could occur if the proposed project conflicts with or obstructs implementation of the South Coast Air Basin 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). Conflicts and obstructions that hinder implementation of the AQMP can delay efforts to meet attainment deadlines for criteria pollutants and maintaining existing compliance with applicable air</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>quality standards. Pursuant to the methodology provided in Chapter 12 of the 1993 South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook, consistency with the South Coast Air Basin 2012 AQMP is affirmed when a project (1) does not increase the frequency or severity of an air quality standards violation or cause a new violation and (2) is consistent with the growth assumptions in the AQMP.<sup>2</sup> A consistency review is presented below:</p>				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project will result in short-term construction and long-term pollutant emissions that are less than the CEQA significance emissions thresholds established by the SCAQMD, with mitigation incorporated, as demonstrated in Section 4.3(b) et seq of this report; therefore, the project could not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of any air quality standards violation and will not cause a new air quality standard violation.</li> <li>The CEQA Air Quality Handbook indicates that consistency with AQMP growth assumptions must be analyzed for new or amended General Plan elements, Specific Plans, and <i>significant projects</i>. <i>Significant projects</i> include airports, electrical generating facilities, petroleum and gas refineries, designation of oil drilling districts, water ports, solid waste disposal sites, and off-shore drilling facilities; therefore, the proposed project is not defined as <i>significant</i>. This project does not include a General Plan Amendment and therefore does not required consistency analysis with the AQMP.</li> </ol>				
<p>The Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) sets forth a comprehensive program that will lead the SCAB into compliance with all Federal and State air quality standards. The City of Riverside is located within the Riverside County sub region of the SCAG projections. The General Plan 2025 FPEIR determined that implementation of the General Plan 2025 would generally meet attainment forecasts and attainment of the standards of the AQMP. The General Plan 2025 contains policies to promote mixed use, pedestrian-friendly communities that serve to reduce air pollutant emissions over time and this project is consistent with these policies. Because the proposed project is consistent with the 2007 AQMP, the proposed project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan – AQMP and therefore this project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.</p>				
<p>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<sup>2</sup> South Coast Air Quality Management District. CEQA Air Quality Handbook. 1993

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	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, CalEEMod, LSA Air Quality Analysis April 2015)

Per General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM Air 1 and 7, a SCAQMD CalEEMod computer model analyzed both short-term construction related and long-term operational impacts. The results of the CalEEMod model determined that the proposed project would result in the following emission levels:

<b>CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS</b>						
<b>SHORT-TERM IMPACTS</b>						
Activity	Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM-10	PM-2.5
<b>SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Construction</b>	75	100	550	150	150	55
<b>Daily Project - Emissions Construction</b>	60	75	77	0.17	11	6.6
<b>Exceeds Y/N Threshold?</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N

<b>CalEEMod MODEL RESULTS</b>						
<b>LONG-TERM IMPACTS</b>						
Activity	Daily Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>2</sub>	PM-10	PM-2.5
<b>SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Operation</b>	55	55	550	150	150	55
<b>Daily Project - Emissions Operational</b>	40	30	98	0.21	15	4.2
<b>Exceeds Y/N Threshold?</b>	N	N	N	N	N	N

The above tables compare the project emissions (short-term and long-term) to the SCAQMD daily thresholds and shows that established thresholds will not be exceeded. To ensure short term emissions are further reduced, the General Plan 2025 Program required mitigation measures that have been applied to this project, MM AIR 5. Therefore, because the project will not violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and will be subject to further mitigation the impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively will be **less than significant impacts with mitigation** to ambient air quality and to contributing to an existing air quality violation.

**MM Air 1:** To reduce diesel emissions associated with construction, construction contractors shall provide temporary electricity to eliminate the need for diesel powered generators, or provide evidence that electrical hook ups at construction sites are not cost effective or feasible.

**MM Air 2:** To reduce construction related particulate matter air quality impacts of City projects the following measures

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>shall be required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the generation of dust shall be controlled as required by the AQMD;</li> <li>2. grading activities shall cease during period of high winds (greater than 25mph);</li> <li>3. trucks hauling soil, dirt or other emissive materials shall have their loads covered with a tarp or other protective cover as determined by the City Engineer; and</li> <li>4. the contractor shall prepare and maintain a traffic control plan, prepared, stamped and signed by either a licensed Traffic Engineer or a Civil Engineer. The preparation of the plan shall be in accordance with Chapter 5 of the latest edition of the Caltrans Traffic Manual and the State Standard Specifications. The plan shall be submitted for approval, by the engineer, at the preconstruction meeting. Work shall not commence without an approval traffic control plan.</li> </ol>				
<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><b>3c. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod 2007 Model, LSA Air Quality Analysis April 2015 )</p> <p>Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, AQMP thresholds indicate future construction activities under the General Plan are projected to result in significant levels of NOx and ROG, both ozone precursors, PM-10, PM-2.5 and CO. Although long-term emissions are expected to decrease by 2025, all criteria pollutants remain above the SCAQMD thresholds. The portion of the Basin within which the City is located is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM-10 and PM-2.5 under State standards, and as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, PM-10, and PM-2.5 under Federal standards.</p> <p>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 <b>less than significant</b>.</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><b>3d. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod, LSA Air Quality Analysis April 2015)</p> <p>Sensitive receptors are those segments of the population that are most susceptible to poor air quality such as children, the elderly, the sick, and athletes who perform outdoors. Land uses associated with sensitive receptors include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, athletic facilities, long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, and retirement homes. Therefore, <b>less than significant impacts</b> to the sensitive receptor will occur.</p>				
<p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>3e. Response:</b></p> <p>According to the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints include agricultural operations, wastewater treatment plants, landfills, and certain industrial operations (such as manufacturing uses that produce chemicals, paper, etc.). The proposed warehouse is sited within an existing industrial and commercial area. The proposed warehouse does not produce odors that would affect a substantial number of people considering that the proposed warehouse will not result in heavy manufacturing activities. <b>No impact</b> will occur.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.</b> Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area and Michael Brandman Associates – Sycamore Canyon Industrial Park Habitat Assessment (Burrowing Owl) and MSHCP Consistency Analysis, July 2, 2007.)</p> <p>As noted in the project description a building pad has been graded and assessed under Planning Case P13-0145. Habitat assessments and biological technical studies were prepared for that project, including a pre-grading burrowing owl study prepared by Michael Brandman Associates before grading of the building pad occurred. Although, the current project includes 20,651 cubic yards of fill, the soil will be placed on top of the existing building pad to raise the level of the pad closer to Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. Therefore the construction of the 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot and landscaping, which will be constructed on top of the existing building pad will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulate to endangered threatened, or rare species or their habitats.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, and Michael Brandman Associates – Sycamore Canyon Industrial Park Habitat Assessment (Burrowing Owl) and MSHCP Consistency Analysis, July 2, 2007.)</p> <p>The interface of the grading with the riparian habitat was assessed under Planning Case P13-0145 (Mass Grading), where drift fencing was erected to protect the riparian/riverine system.</p> <p>Although, the current proposal for a 304,477 square foot warehouse with mezzanine, surface parking lot, and landscaping in and of itself will not be impacting the mapped jurisdictional wetlands, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or the CDFW, there is a potential for the additional fill grading to have impacts, especially with the interface of the building pad slopes and the defined jurisdictional wetlands and waters. Through compliance with MSHCP Section 6.1.2 and other applicable requirements, impacts to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services are found to have a <b>less than significant impact with mitigation</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p> <p><b>MM Biology 1:</b> Jurisdictional areas, including riparian/riverine habitat shall be protected by erecting drift fencing prior to clearing and grubbing. However, should the final Grading Plan result in impacts to jurisdictional waters, regulatory permits will be required prior to initiation of grading activities. In addition, impacts to riparian/riverine habitat would require the preparation of a DBESP analysis.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4c. Response:</b> (Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer, and Michael Brandman Associates – Field Verification of Jurisdictional Delineation of Waters and Wetlands Based on the Original Report Prepared by MBA and dated September 15, 2005, January 18, 2013.)</p> <p>On-site grading was previously assessed under Planning Case P13-0145 (Mass Grading) as part of a larger project that included the Sycamore Canyon Central Basin project. The Mass Grading case assessed the interface of the grading with the defined on-site jurisdictional wetlands and waters. While the grading plan indicated avoidance of the feature a mitigation measure requiring silt fences and drainage controls were required during grading activities.</p> <p>The current proposal for a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot and landscaping will not be disturbing the mapped jurisdictional wetlands or water. While the warehouse will not have an effect on the riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or the CDFW, precise grading will occur in the form of raising the elevation of the pad. Additional grading activity could still have an impact on riparian/riverine habitat. Therefore the proposed project could have a <b>less than significant impact with mitigation</b> to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p> <p><b>MM Biology 2:</b> Silt fences and drainage controls shall be used to prevent water and sediment from entering jurisdictional areas from grading activities on the upland portions of the site.</p>				
<p>d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4d. Response:</b> (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage and Michael Brandman Associates – Sycamore Canyon Industrial Park Habitat Assessment (Burrowing Owl) and MSHCP Consistency Analysis, July 2, 2007.)</p> <p>Grading was previously assessed under Planning Case P13-0145 (Mass Grading), thus mitigation measures were assessed for biological resources under that case. The submitted project, a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot and landscaping will not disturb jurisdictional areas, including riparian/riverine as previously mapped in the Jurisdictional Delineation of Waters and Wetlands prepared by MBA and the Field Verification of Jurisdictional Delineation of Waters and Wetlands prepared by MBA in January of 2013. Additionally, the project is not located in the defined MSHCP Cores and Linkage as defined in the General Plan 2025, thus the project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish or wildlife species through wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>				
<p>e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4e. Response:</b> (Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, and Michael Brandman Associates – Sycamore Canyon Industrial Park Habitat Assessment (Burrowing Owl) and MSHCP Consistency Analysis, July 2, 2007.)</p> <p>The proposed project includes a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot and landscaping located on top of an existing graded pad. The project as proposed will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as tree preservation. Additionally, mass grading of the building pad was assessed under Planning Case P13-0145, where it was shown that 15.8 acres of the subject site will remain in its natural open</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
state with grasses, brush and isolated outcroppings of boulders and rocks.				
Implementation of the proposed project is subject to all applicable Federal, State, and local policies and regulations related to the protection of biological resources and tree preservation. In addition, the project is required to comply with Riverside Municipal Code Section 16.72.040 establishing the MSHCP mitigation fee and Section 16.40.040 establishing the Threatened and Endangered Species Fees.				
Any project within the City of Riverside’s boundaries that proposes planting a street tree within a City right-of-way must follow the Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual. The Manual documents guidelines for the planting, pruning, preservation, and removal of all trees in City rights-of-way. The specifications in the Manual are based on national standards for tree care established by the International Society of Arboriculture, the National Arborists Association, and the American National Standards Institute. Any future project will be in compliance with the Tree Policy Manual when planting a tree within a City right-of-way, and therefore, impacts will be less than significant.				
In addition, the General Plan 2025 includes policies to ensure that future development will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies. This project has been reviewed against these policies and found to be in compliance with the policies. For these reasons, the project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>4f. Response:</b> <i>(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat Habitat Conservation Plan, Lake Mathews Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan and Natural Community Conservation Plan, and El Sobrante Landfill Habitat Conservation Plan)</i>				
<p>The project site is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area and will not impact an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan directly, indirectly and cumulatively. Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> on the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.</p>				
<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</b>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>5a. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code, and First Carbon Solutions – Review of Cultural Resource Record Search Associated with a Cultural Resource Survey of APN: 263-050-074. City of Riverside, California, July 10, 2013)</i>				
<p>The project, as proposed is a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot and landscaping located on a building pad that was previously graded and assessed under Planning Case P13-0145 (Initial Study). The proposed project will require minimal grading to the existing pad in the form of 20,651 cubic yards of fill to raise the level of the existing pad closer to the elevation of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. While the Phase 1 Cultural Resources Assessment indicated a bedrock milling slick and two isolates on-site, Phase II testing, determined the bed-rock milling to be insignificant. Although, no other cultural resources were identified on-site and the 20,651 cubic yards of fill soil will be utilized to raise the existing pad elevation, the applicant, through consultation with the Native American Tribes, under Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) has agreed to the following mitigation measures such that the project will have a <b>less than significant impact with mitigation</b> on historical resources as defined under CEQA Guidelines.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><b>MM CR 1:</b> At least 30 days prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Applicant shall contact the Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe to notify the Tribes of grading, excavation, and the monitoring program and, if a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement has not been developed, to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement between the Applicant and the Tribes. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of professional Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site.</p> <p><b>MM CR 2:</b> If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are discovered during grading, the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method for archaeological resources. If the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the Community Development Director for decision. The Community Development Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to the archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Tribe(s). Notwithstanding any other rights available under the law, the decision of the Community Development Director shall be appealable to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.</p>				
<p>b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>5b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study and First Carbon Solutions – Review of Cultural Resource Record Search Associated with a Cultural Resource Survey of APN: 263-050-074. City of Riverside, California, July 10, 2013)</i></p> <p>Because the proposed Project involves ground disturbance and as part of the recently adopted, Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52), Tribal Consultation Notification was initiated by the City of Riverside. Pursuant to AB 52, seven tribes were notified regarding the project. Of those, two tribes requested consultation, the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians. While a majority of grading took place under previously approved Planning Case P13-0145 (Initial Study), the Native American Tribes reviewed the Phase 1 Cultural Resources report prepared by MBA in November 2006 and an updated Cultural Resource Record Search with Cultural Survey dated July 2013 and determined that further monitoring was required during the grading phase for the currently submitted warehouse project. While the project will require an additional 20,651 cubic yards of fill soil, there are areas around the existing pad that will require additional grading in order to raise the elevation of the pad, therefor, in order to address potential discoveries of Tribal Cultural Resources the following mitigation measures have been proposed so that the project, as proposed, will have a <b>less than significant impact with mitigation</b> to archeological resources.</p> <p><b>MM CR 1:</b> At least 30 days prior to beginning Project construction, the Project Applicant shall contact the Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians to notify the Tribes of grading, excavation, and the monitoring program and, if a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement has not been developed, to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement between the Applicant and the Tribes. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of professional Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site.</p> <p><b>MM CR 2:</b> If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are discovered during grading, the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method for archaeological resources. If the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the Community Development Director for decision. The Community and Economic Development Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to the archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Tribe(s). Notwithstanding any other rights available under the law, the decision of the Community Development Director shall be appealable to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.</p>				
<p>c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>5c. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)  As noted in the project description a building pad has been graded and analyzed under Planning Case P13-0145. A Cultural Resources Study Phase 1 and 2 was prepared for the building pad and assessed paleontological resources. A search of the regional Paleontological Locality Inventory at the SBCM indicated that no paleontologic resource localities are recorded within the boundaries of the Project Area or within 1 mile in any direction. Furthermore, the current proposed project will be adding fill on top of the existing pad and not excavating soil. The Cultural Resources Study went onto to indicate that monitoring should begin for paleontological resources 5-feet below the modern ground surface, which the proposed project will not be excavating. Therefore the construction of the 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot, landscaping and 20,651 cubic yards of soil, which will be constructed on top of the existing building pad will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulate to endangered threatened, or rare species or their habitats.</p>				
<p>d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>5d. Response:</b> (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)  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 the Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures will, however, reduce impacts to human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries to a <b>less than significant</b> level.</p>				
<p><b>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</b>  Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p>				
<p>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.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6i. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones &amp; General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Geotechnical Report and Site Plan Review prepared by Southern California Geotechnical dated March 03, 2015)  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 <b>no impacts</b> related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6ii. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, Geotechnical Report and Site Plan Review prepared by Southern California Geotechnical dated March 03, 2015)</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 complies with California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6iii. Response:</b> (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, Geotechnical Report and Site Plan Review prepared by Southern California Geotechnical dated March 03, 2015)</p>				
<p>The project site is located in an area with a high potential for liquefaction. A geotechnical study has been prepared to determine the soil properties and specific potential for liquefaction for the proposed development. Incorporation of the recommended design measures of the geotechnical study/preliminary soils report prepared by Southern California Geotechnical, Inc. for compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, are reduced to <b>less than significant impact</b> levels directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6iv. Response:</b> (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>Landslides typically occur from heavy rainfall, erosion, and removal of vegetation, seismic activity or other factors. Slope stability depends on many factors and their interrelationships. 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. The project as proposed includes a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking and landscape. Additional grading will occur that will raise the elevation of the existing pad closer to the existing elevation of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The remaining ungraded portion of the subject site, aside from the graded pad and the central retention basin, will be left in its natural state with grasses, brush and isolated outcroppings of boulders and rocks. As noted the project is designed to avoid impacting the jurisdictional drainage feature. Additionally, the applicant has proposed to direct onsite flow into onsite basins for water treatment before it enters the jurisdictional wetlands. Compliance with the Zoning and Grading Codes, as well as California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to strong landslides are reduced to <b>less than significant impact</b> levels 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><b>6b. Response:</b> (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 that include the development of a written plan to sequence grading activities and the implementation of BMPs, hydro-seeding native plant species, the use of soil binders, dike and drainage swales, and wind erosion controls. 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 <b>less than significant impact</b> 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"/>

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><b>6c. Response:</b> (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, Geotechnical Investigation by Southern California Geotechnical, Inc.)</p>				
<p>The topography of the subject site generally slopes to the southwest, away from Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. 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. In addition, the Geotechnical Investigation contains recommendations as to grading, foundation and construction methods for the proposed building that will in compliance with the City’s existing Codes and the policies contained in the General Plan 2025 which will ensure impacts related to geologic conditions are reduced to <b>less than significant impacts</b> level directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6d. Response:</b> (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 California Building Code. The soil type of the subject site is Monserate, Fallbrook, and Cieneba (See Figure 5.6-4 – Soils of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Monserate soil is characterized by moderately slow to over very slow permeability and a moderate shrink-swell potential. Fallbrook soil is characterized by Moderate permeability and a moderate shrink-swell potential. Cieneba soil is characterized by rapid permeability and low shrink-swell potential. The proposed 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot, landscaping and additional grading within the confines of the approved grading plans will primarily occur over the existing building pad, largely situated towards the northeast portion of the subject parcel; the remaining ungraded portions of the subject parcel will be left in its natural state with grasses, brush, and isolated outcroppings of boulders and rocks. The project has been proposed to avoid impacting the jurisdictional drainage feature. Compliance with the recommendations found in the Geotechnical Investigation and applicable provisions of the City’s Grading Code – Title 17, Subdivision Code – Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard to soil hazards related to the expansive soils will be reduced to a <b>less than significant impact</b> level for this project directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p>e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6e. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 – Soils, Table 5.6-B – Soil Types)</p> <p>The proposed project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b>.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</b> 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><b>7a. Response:</b></p> <p>The project includes construction of a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, 56 truck bays, a 375 stall surface parking lot, site landscaping and 20,651 cubic yards of fill soil to raise the existing building pad in elevation.</p> <p>A SCAQMD CalEEMod computer model analyzed both short-term construction related and long-term operational impacts, including estimating GHGs (MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/Year). The model estimated that 4,300 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year will occur as a result of the proposed project. The GHG threshold from CARB set a GHG emissions threshold for industrial sources of 10,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year. Therefore, a <b>less than significant impact</b> is expected.</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><b>7b. Response:</b></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 grading activities 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 <b>less than significant impact</b> is expected directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<b>8. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</b> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8a. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, Riverside Fire Department EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM's Strategic Plan)</i></p> <p>The project entails the construction of a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot and landscaping. The building is currently being constructed as a speculative high cube warehouse building. The warehouse building in and of itself will not pose a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. However, the construction facilitated by the warehouse building has the potential to create a hazard to the public or environment through the routine transportation, use and disposal of construction related hazardous materials as the project would include the delivery and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other materials. These materials are typical of materials delivered to construction sites.</p> <p>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. 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 <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7 A – D, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, OEM’s Strategic Plan)</i></p> <p>The project entails the construction of a 304,477 square foot warehouse with 10,000 square foot mezzanine, surface parking lot and landscaping. The building is currently being constructed as a speculative high cube warehouse building. The warehouse building in and of itself will not pose a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. However, the construction facilitated by the warehouse building has the potential to create a hazard to the public or environment through the routine transportation, use and disposal of construction related hazardous materials as the project would include the delivery and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other materials. These materials are typical of materials delivered to construction sites.</p> <p>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. 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 <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p>				
<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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8c. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code)</i></p> <p>The proposed project does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school as this proposal involves the construction of a warehouse building, surface parking lot and landscaping. Moreover, there are no schools within one-quarter mile of the project site; the closest school to the project site is Edgemont Elementary School (21790 Eucalyptus Avenue, Moreno Valley Unified School District) which is located approximately one mile northeast of the project site. Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> regarding emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8d. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)</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 <b>no impact</b> 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</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
<p><b>8e. Response:</b> (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))</p>				
<p>The proposed project is located within March Air Reserve Base Land Use Compatibility Zone B1. The Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) reviewed the project on August 13, 2015 and found the project to be consistent with the 2014 March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, subject to conditions of approval. Therefore, impacts related to hazards from airports are <b>less than significant</b> impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8f. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP)</p> <p>Because the proposed project is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8g. Response:</b> (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 and Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1, and OEM’s Strategic Plan)</p>				
<p>An existing network of fully improved streets that include Sycamore Canyon Boulevard, Eastridge Avenue, and Alessandro Boulevard will continue to serve the project site. All streets have been designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments’ specifications. Internal drive-aisles will be compliant with the Zoning Code and will allow sufficient room for emergency vehicles to enter the site should they require. Therefore, the project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8h. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 – Fire Hazard Areas, GIS Map Layer VHFSZ 2010, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002, Riverside Operational Area – Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP, 2004 Part 1/Part 2 and OEM’s Strategic Plan)</p>				
<p>The proposed project is located within and adjacent to the hills and canyons urban/rural interface area of fire risk as depicted in Figure 5.7-3 of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR but not within a Very High Fire Severity Zones (VHFSZ). The project has provided the required access roads around the proposed structures, meeting the minimum roadway widths of Title 18 (Subdivision Code) and the City’s Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007). Clearance around the proposed structures has been reviewed by the Fire Department and determined to be adequate. With implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Fire Department practices, impacts from wildland fires due to this project are <b>less than significant</b> directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</p>				
<p><b>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</b></p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9a. Response:</b> (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP, Preliminary Hydrology Report prepared by Webb Associates in May 2014)</p>				
<p>The project site is currently a vacant site with no development. A preliminary WQMP has been submitted and approved by</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>the Public Works Department for this project. Furthermore, under the NPDES permit managed by the RWQCB, the project is not required to institute new water quality BMPs, as no new runoff will be generated from the project. Urban runoff is currently and will continue to be conveyed by local drainage facilities developed throughout the City to regional drainage facilities, and then ultimately to the receiving waters. To address potential water contaminants, the project is required to comply with applicable Federal, State, and local water quality regulations.</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 <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.</p>				
<p>b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, Table PF-3 – Western Municipal Water District Projected Domestic Water Supply (AC-FT/YR), RPU Map of Water Supply Basins, RPU Urban Water Management Plan, WMWD Urban Water Management Plan, Preliminary Hydrology Report prepared by Webb Associates in May 2014)</i></p> <p>The proposed project is located within the Riverside South Water Supply Basin. The project, a 314,000 square foot speculative warehouse, surface parking lot and landscaping will not directly or indirectly deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with ground water 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 <b>no impact</b> to groundwater supplies and recharge either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9c. Response:</b> <i>(Source: Preliminary grading plan and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP and Water Quality Management Plan, Preliminary Hydrology Report prepared by Webb Associates in May 2014)</i></p> <p>This proposal involves construction of a warehouse, surface parking lot and landscaping. The proposal also requires an additional 20,651 cubic yards of import soil, primarily to raise the elevation of the existing pad. The proposal including additional grading, will not impact the jurisdictional wetlands and waters as mapped on the conceptual grading plan and denoted on Exhibit 2 within the Jurisdictional Delineation of Waters and Wetlands study prepared and updated by MBA on January 2013.</p> <p>State and Federal requirements call for the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) establishing erosion and sediment controls that include the implementation of BMPs, the use of soil binders, dike and drainage swales, silt fence and basin, and wind erosion controls. 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. Therefore, the project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively to existing drainage patterns.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in</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
flooding on- or off-site?				
<p><b>9d. Response: (Source: Preliminary grading plan)</b></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 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 <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively in the rate or amount of surface runoff that it will not result in flooding on- or off-site.</p>				
e. Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9e. Response: (Source: Preliminary Grading Plan and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP and Water Quality Management Plan)</b></p> <p>Within the scope of the project is the installation of storm water drainage system, specifically as described within the project description portion of this project. As the storm water drainage system will be installed concurrently with the construction of this project, the storm water drainage system will be adequately sized to accommodate the drainage created by this project. The project is expected to generate the following pollutants: sediment/turbidity, nutrients, trash and debris, oxygen demanding substances, bacteria and viruses, oil &amp; grease, and pesticides. These expected pollutants will be treated through the incorporation of the site design, source control and treatment control measures specified in the project specific WQMP. Therefore, as the expected pollutants will be mitigated through the project site design, source control, and treatment controls already integrated into the project design, the project will not create or contribute runoff water exceeding capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff and there will be a <b>less than significant impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9f. Response: (Source: Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan SWPPP and Water Quality Management Plan)</b></p> <p>The project will not directly or indirectly result in any activity or physical alteration of the site or surrounding area that would create or contribute runoff water which would substantially degrade water quality. State and Federal requirements call for the preparation and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) establishing erosion and sediment controls. Final BMP's will be required prior to grading permit issuance. The purpose of this requirement is to insure treatment BMP's are installed/constructed as part of the project so that the pollutants generated by the project will be treated in perpetuity. Therefore, impacts related to degrading water quality are <b>less than significant</b> 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"/>
<p><b>9g. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Map Number 06065C0745G)</b></p> <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-year flood hazard area and the project does not involve the construction of housing. There will be <b>no impact</b> caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.</p>				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>9h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Map Number 06065C0745G)</b></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 <b>no impact</b> will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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><b>9i. Response:</b> (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 <b>no impact</b> 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><b>9j. Response:</b> (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, <b>no impacts</b> 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 <b>less than significant</b> directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.</p>				
<p><b>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</b></p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>10a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project Grading Plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)</p>				
<p>The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with the existing development in the surrounding area. The project is providing adequate access, circulation and connectivity consistent with the General Plan 2025, and in compliance with the requirements of the Specific Plan, Grading, Zoning, and Subdivision Codes and will not divide an established community. Therefore, the project impacts related to the community are <b>less than significant</b>.</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><b>10b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</p>				
<p>Although, the project is located within the boundaries of the MSHCP and the RCALUC (See Response 8e), this proposal has been designed to be consistent with these plans. As well, the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 through land use policies, the Zoning Code through development standards and the Citywide Design Guidelines. Further, the project is not a project of Statewide, Regional or Areawide Significance. As such, this project will have a <b>less than significant impact</b> on the MSHCP and RCALUC directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>10c. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 – Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, enter appropriate Specific Plan if one, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><i>Guidelines)</i> Refer to Response 4f. above.</p>				
<p><b>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</b></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><b>11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</b></p>				
<p>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 this proposal 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. The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources or grading activity. No mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. The project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the General Plan 2025, Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the impacts to known mineral resources are <b>less than significant</b> 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><b>11b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)</b></p>				
<p>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 <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly, or cumulatively.</p>				
<p><b>12. NOISE.</b></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><b>12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code, Noise Impact Analysis prepared by LSA in April 2015)</b></p>				
<p>The project includes construction of a 304,477 square foot warehouse building with a 10,000 square foot mezzanine, 56 truck bays, a 375 stall surface parking lot and site landscaping on 30.1 acres located on the westerly side of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard between Eastridge Avenue and Alessandro Boulevard (APNs 263-050-070). While the project site is currently vacant an approximately 15.8 acre segment of the parcel has previously been graded under Planning Case P13-0145 (Initial Study) to create the limits of the building pad. The graded pad served to accommodate the approximately 63,284 cubic yards of dirt that was excavated to create the Central Basin of the City of Riverside’s Sycamore Canyon Business Park Water Quality Basins Project. The approximately 1.68 acre Central Basin – located on the westernmost portion of the subject parcel is a component of the drainage plan for the Sycamore Canyon Business Park which is intended to treat runoff water from the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific Plan area and Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. The limits of the proposed graded pad are shown on the Conceptual Grading Plans. Furthermore, the Conceptual Grading Plans</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p>indicate an additional 20,651 cubic yards of import will be placed on top of the existing building pad to raise the level of the pad closer to the elevation of Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. No grading is proposed within the delineated jurisdictional wetlands and waters.</p> <p>A Noise Impact Analysis was prepared by LSA to assess short and long term construction noise related impacts on the project.</p> <p>Short-term analysis was performed for potential construction related noise impacts from earthmoving activities. Although surrounding developments are primarily industrial uses, there is an existing creek to the south of the proposed project. The creek is situated 70 to 80 feet below the project site, therefore noise attenuation from on-site construction would be shielded by the top of the hill, similar to a noise wall. Noise from on-site construction would be reduced to 57dba Lmax intermittently. As a worst case scenario, even if construction noise occurs continuously for hours, the resulting noise level at the creek level would be below the normally acceptable 60 dba Leq for bird nests during the breeding season. Therefore, <b>less than significant impacts</b> related to short-term construction noise would occur for the proposed project.</p> <p>Long-term operation impacts were also assessed as part of the Noise Study and multiple aspects of the operation were assessed as follows.</p> <p>Slow-Moving Trucks on Driveways: The open space, especially the creek located 70 to 80 feet below the project site, to the south of the project site, is approximately 280 feet from the truck parking area. The area near the creek would be exposed to intermittent truck pass by noise near the southern project driveway and drive aisles. With the distance attenuation and noise shielding, due to elevation difference, truck pass by noise would be reduced to 50 Dba or lower and would not result in any significant noise impacts.</p> <p>Loading/Unloading at the Docks: Although a typical truck unloading process takes an average of 10 to 15 minutes, this maximum noise level occurs in a much shorter period of time. It is not expected that truck loading/unloading activities would result in this maximum noise level lasting more than 5 minutes in any hour when it occurs. It is not expected that due to the loading/unloading operations on the loading docks alone, the CNEL level would reach or exceed the City's 65 dBA CNEL noise standard for residential uses. Further, The open space, especially the creek located 70 to 80 feet below the project site, to the south of the project site, is approximately 280 feet from the truck parking area. The area near the creek would be exposed to intermittent truck pass by noise near the southern project driveway and drive aisles. With the distance attenuation and noise shielding, due to elevation difference, truck pass by noise would be reduced to 50 Dba or lower and would not result in any significant noise impacts.</p> <p>Parking Lot Activity Noise: While some parking is located in proximity to the creek a majority of parking that will be utilized on a regular basis is located approximately 280 feet from the creek, which is 70 to 80 below the grade of the parking area. The area near the creek would be exposed to intermittent parking lot activity noise near the southern project driveway and drive aisles. With the distance attenuation and noise shielding, due to elevation difference, parking lot activity noise would be reduced to 45 Dba or lower and would not result in any significant noise impacts.</p> <p>As noted, all operational characteristics will be below the 60 dBA for bird nests during breeding season, therefore operational noise impacts will have a <b>less than significant impact</b>.</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><b>12b. Response:</b> <i>(Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</i></p> <p>Vibration is the movement of mass over time. It is described in terms of frequency and amplitude and unlike sound; there is no standard way of measuring and reporting amplitude. Vibration can be described in units of velocity (inches per second) or discussed in decibel (dB) units in order to compress the range of numbers required to describe vibration. Vibration impacts to buildings are generally discussed in terms of peak particle velocity (PPV) that describes particle movement over time (in terms of physical displacement of mass). For purposes of this analysis, PPV will be used to describe all vibration for ease of reading and comparison. Vibration can impact people, structures, and sensitive equipment. The primary concern related to vibration and people is the potential to annoy those working and residing in the area. Vibration with high enough amplitudes can damage structures (such as crack plaster or destroy windows). Groundborne vibration can also disrupt the use of sensitive medical and scientific instruments such as electron microscopes. Common sources of vibration within communities include construction activities and railroads.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>According to the Caltrans vibration manual, large bulldozers, vibratory rollers (used to compact earth), and loaded trucks utilized during grading activities can produce vibration, and depending on the level of vibration, could cause annoyance at uses within the project vicinity or damage structures. Caltrans has developed a screening tool to determine if vibration from construction equipment is substantial enough to impact surrounding uses.</p>				
<p>The Caltrans vibration manual establishes thresholds for vibration impacts on buildings and humans. These thresholds are summarized in Tables 12 (Vibration Damage Potential Threshold Criteria) and 13 (Vibration Annoyance Potential Threshold Criteria).</p>				
<p>Construction related vibration would generate around 92VdB of groundborne vibration. Based upon CalTrans threshold, vibration level at 80VdB for residential uses. The closest residential use is approximately 3,170 feet away from the project site. Thus, vibrations would not exceed 60 VbD, below the threshold of 80VdB set by CalTrans. Operationally, the project will not have any vibration sources that would cause exposure of persons to or generate excessive groundborne noise levels. Vehicles used in operations would not exceed the 65VbD perception threshold. Therefore, vibrations affecting persons or generating excessive groundbourne vibrations will be <b>less than significant</b>.</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>12c. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)</p>				
<p>A substantial increase in ambient noise is an increase that is <i>barely perceptible</i> (3 dBA). Operationally, the proposed project will result in periodic landscaping and other occasional noise generating activities. These activities are common in urban uses and do not represent a substantial increase in periodic noise in consideration that the project site is located in an industrialized area. Traffic noise levels will not increase more than 3 dBA as a result of the proposed project as shown in Table 16 (Peak Hour Change in Noise Levels). Therefore, will be <b>no impact</b> to ambient noise level.</p>				
<p>d. A substantial temporary or periodic 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><b>12d. Response:</b> (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J – Construction Equipment Noise Levels, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)</p>				
<p>As discussed in question 12 a) above, implementation of Conditions of Approval will help in further reducing temporary construction noise levels. While, operationally, the project will result in periodic landscaping and other occasional noise generating activities. These activities are common in industrial uses and do not represent a substantial increase in periodic noise in consideration that the project vicinity is characterized primarily by industrial uses. Furthermore, the project is subject to Zoning Code Section 7.25.010 that limits noise levels to 70 dBA for industrial land uses. With compliance with this existing regulation, periodic operational noise increases will be <b>less than significant</b>.</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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>12e. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))</p>				
<p>The proposed project is within the March Air Reserve Base (March ARB) influence area. According to the Riverside General Plan EIR, the project site is within the 65 CNEL noise contour for March ARB. Section 7.35.010 of the Riverside</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Municipal Code allows an exterior noise level of 70 dBA for industrial uses. Therefore, <b>no impact</b> will result.				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>12f. Response:</b> (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>Per the GP 2025 Program FPEIR, there are no private airstrips within the City that would expose people working or residing in the City to excessive noise levels. Because the proposed project consists of development anticipated under the General Plan 2025, is not located within proximity of a private airstrip, and does not propose a private airstrip, the project will not expose people residing or working in the City to excessive noise levels related to a private airstrip and would have <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<b>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</b>				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>13a. Response:</b> (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)</p> <p>The project is in an urbanized area and does not propose new homes or businesses that would directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth. This proposal involves the construction of a warehouse building, surface parking, landscaping and grading. The scope of the project is reflected on the Conceptual Grading Plan and Site Plan. The proposed project has been designed to avoid impacting the jurisdictional drainage features. Notwithstanding, this proposal is consistent with the General Plan 2025. 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 <b>less than significant</b> both directly and indirectly.</p>				
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>13b. Response:</b> (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</p> <p>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 <b>no impact</b> on existing housing directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>13c. Response:</b> (Source: CADME Land Use 2003 Layer)</p> <p>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 <b>no impact</b> on people, necessitating the need for replacement housing either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>14. PUBLIC SERVICES.</b>				
<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>				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14a. Response:</b> (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)</p>				
<p>The proposed project, which involves the construction of a warehouse, surface parking lot, landscaping and grading is located within and adjacent to the hills and canyons urban/rural interface area of fire risk as depicted in Figure 5.7-3 of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR but not within a Very High Fire Severity Zones (VHFSZ). 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 <b>no impacts</b> on the demand for additional fire facilities or services directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)</p>				
<p>The proposed project consists, of the construction of a warehouse, surface parking lot, landscaping and grading. 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 <b>no impacts</b> on the demand for additional police facilities or services directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14c. Response:</b> (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries)</p>				
<p>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 <b>no impact</b> on the demand for additional school facilities or services directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14d. Response:</b> (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 project is a non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population. 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, which is adjacent to 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 <b>no impacts</b> on the demand for additional park facilities or services directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>14e. Response:</b> (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>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</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
through Park, Recreation and Community Services and Library practices, there will be <b>no impacts</b> on the demand for additional public facilities or services directly, indirectly or cumulatively.				
<b>15. RECREATION.</b>				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>15a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)</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 <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>15b. Response:</b></p> <p>The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<b>16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</b>				
Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>16a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP)</p> <p>Roadway capacity is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic volumes, of the proposed project. As determined by the City Traffic Engineer prepared for the proposed project, the proposed project will operate at an acceptable LOS level as all roadways and intersection in the immediate area have been upgraded and improved to be consistent with the General Plan 2025 circulation element. As noted, the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use policies, the Zoning Code development standards and standards set forth by the Sycamore Canyon Business Park Specific plan. Therefore, the increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is <b>less than significant</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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?				
<p><b>16b. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15.-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP)</p> <p>The proposed project could result in significant impacts if it conflicts with the Riverside County Congestion Management Program (CMP) through reducing the Level of Service of a non-exempt segment to fall to “F”. If LOS for a non-exempt segment is reduced to “F”, a deficiency plan outlining specific mitigation measure and a schedule for mitigating the deficiency will be required. The nearest affected CMP designated freeways are I-215, SR-60, and SR-91 and the nearest arterial links are Sycamore Canyon Boulevard, Eastridge Avenue and Alessandro Boulevard. A traffic study was not required because the proposed project will result in less than 50 peak hour trips; therefore, LOS on CMP designated freeways and roadways will not occur. Impacts will be less than significant.</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><b>16c. Response:</b> (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 Riverside Airport Land Use Commission (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 <b>no impact</b> 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><b>16d. Response:</b> (Source: Project Site Plans, Lane Striping and Signing Plans)</p> <p>If the project will substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, a significant impact could occur. No existing traffic hazards are known to exist in the immediate vicinity of the project. Roadways and intersections provide sufficient sight distance to limit the potential of any hazards and stop signs and traffic signals are placed at intersections to safely control traffic movements. Impacts from the project will be less than significant to any potentially existing or future traffic hazard. As such, the project will have <b>no impact</b> on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses 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><b>16e. Response:</b> (Source: California Department of Transportation Highway Design Manual, Municipal Code, and Fire Code)</p> <p>The proposed project will be accessible via two 40-foot wide driveways on Sycamore Canyon Boulevard. Interior drive aisles along the northern, southern, and western sides of the building will have minimum widths of 26-40 feet to provide adequate truck and emergency access as required by the Fire Department. The interior drive aisle within the passenger car parking areas in the northeastern and southeastern portions of the site will be 26 feet wide. Access and turning radii entering the site and within the site are adequate to serve the site in case of an emergency.</p>				
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>16f. Response:</b> (Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p align="center"><i>Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe! – Drive Safe!</i></p> <p>The project will not result in conflicts with adopted policies or plans related to alternative modes of travel, such as bus transit, bicycles or walking paths. The project is not located adjacent to or near an existing bike path or pedestrian facilities it could conflict with, nor does the City have adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities that apply to the proposed project site. The proposed project has been designed to avoid impacting the jurisdictional drainage feature. Additionally, no designated trails in the Parks and Recreation plan have been denoted on the applicants property. However, trails have been created on the parcel over time connecting Sycamore Canyon Boulevard with Sycamore Canyon Wilderness Park to the west. The project, as proposed does not intend to affect the dirt trails that have primarily been used for transient uses. As such, the project will have <b>no impact</b> directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.</p>				
<p><b>17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.</b> Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</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 <b>less than significant</b> impact.</p>				
<p>b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17b. Response:</b> (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-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area &amp; 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 project is consistent with the Typical Growth Scenario of the General Plan 2025 where future water and wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I, 5.16-J and 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> resulting in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
<p>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17c. Response:</b> (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities)</p> <p>Potentially significant impacts could occur as a result of this project if storm water runoff was increased to a level that would require construction of new storm drainage facilities. As discussed in the Hydrology section, the proposed project would not generate any increased runoff from the site that would require construction of new storm drainage facilities. The City’s NPDES permit requires most new development projects to incorporate best management practices to minimize pollutant levels in runoff. Pursuant to Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 14.12 (Discharge of Wastes into Public Sewer and Storm Drain Systems), all construction projects shall apply Best Management Practices (BMPs) such as sediment</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
barriers, plastic sheeting, detention ponds, filters and berms to prevent erosion. Implementation of BMPs would reduce pollutants in stormwater and urban runoff from the project site. The proposed storm drainage system and BMPs must be designed to the satisfaction of the City’s Public Works Director and in conformance with all applicable permits and regulations. The project applicant/developer would be required to provide all necessary on-site infrastructure. The project will have a less than significant impact on requiring the construction of new facilities or expansion of existing storm drainage facilities.				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17d. Response:</b> (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 project will not exceed expected water supplies. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future water supplies were determined to be adequate (see Tables t.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I and 5.16-J of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, the project will have <b>no impact</b> resulting in the insufficient water supplies either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17e. Response:</b> (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 project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, <b>no impact</b> to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.</p>				
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17f. Response:</b> (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)</p> <p>The project, is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Build-out Project level where future landfill capacity was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, <b>no impact</b> to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>17g. Response:</b> (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)</p> <p>The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% diversion rate, well above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building Code requires all developments to divert 50% of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for all projects and 100% of excavated soil and land clearing debris for all non-residential projects beginning January 1, 2011. The proposed project must comply with the City’s waste disposal requirements as well as the California Green Building Code and as such would not conflict with any Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, <b>no impacts</b> related to solid waste statutes will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				

<b>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</b>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>18a. Response:</b> (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, 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)</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 <b>less than significant with mitigation</b>. Additionally, potential impacts to cultural, archaeological and paleontological resources related to major periods of California and the City of Riverside’s history or prehistory were discussed in the Cultural Resources Section of this Initial Study, and were found to be <b>less than significant</b> with mitigation.</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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>18b. Response:</b> (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 <b>less than significant</b>.</p>				
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>18c. Response:</b> (Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)</p> <p>Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology &amp; water quality, noise, population and housing, public facilities, hazards and hazardous materials, recreation, and transportation traffic sections of this initial study. Project impacts related to air quality have been found to be less than significant, however, mitigation measures were added to further reduce impacts. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the proposed project are <b>less than significant</b>.</p>				

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

**Staff Recommended Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party <sup>3</sup>	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Air Quality	<p><b>MM Air 1:</b> To reduce diesel emissions associated with construction, construction contractors shall provide temporary electricity to eliminate the need for diesel powered generators, or provide evidence that electrical hook ups at construction sites are not cost effective or feasible.</p>	Prior to issuance of grading permit.	Applicant	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval
Air Quality	<p><b>MM Air 2:</b> To reduce construction related particulate matter air quality impacts of projects the following measures shall be required:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the generation of dust shall be controlled as required by the AQMD;</li> <li>2. grading activities shall cease during periods of high winds (greater than 25 mph);</li> <li>3. trucks hauling soil, dirt or other emissive materials shall have their loads covered with a tarp or other protective cover as determined by the City Engineer; and</li> <li>4. the contractor shall prepare and maintain a traffic control plan, prepared, stamped and signed by either a licensed Traffic Engineer or a Civil Engineer. The preparation of the plan shall be in accordance with Chapter 5 of the latest edition of the Caltrans Traffic Manual and the State Standard Specifications. The plan shall be submitted for approval, by the engineer, at the preconstruction meeting. Work shall not commence without an approved traffic control plan.</li> </ol>	During Grading Activities	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Individual Grading Contractors</p>	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval

<sup>3</sup> All agencies are City of Riverside Departments/Divisions unless otherwise noted.

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party <sup>3</sup>	Monitoring/Reporting Method
<b>Biological Resources</b>	<b>MM Biology 1:</b> Jurisdictional areas, including riparian/riverine habitat shall be protected by erecting drift fencing prior to clearing and grubbing. However, should the final Grading Plan result in impacts to jurisdictional waters, regulatory permits will be required prior to initiation of grading activities. In addition, impacts to riparian/riverine habitat would require the preparation of a DBESP analysis.	Site-Specific Environmental Review.  Prior to Grading and During Grading Activities	Applicant  Individual Grading Contractor	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval.
<b>Biological Resources</b>	<b>MM Biology 2:</b> Silt fences and drainage controls shall be used to prevent water and sediment from entering jurisdictional areas from grading activities on the upland portions of the site.	Site-Specific Environmental Review.  Prior to Grading and During Grading Activities	Applicant  Individual Grading Contractor	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval.
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	<b>MM CR 1:</b> At least 30 days prior to beginning Project grading, the Project Applicant shall contact the Soboba Tribe, and Morongo Tribe to notify the Tribes of grading, excavation, and the monitoring program and, if a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement has not been developed, to develop a Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement between the Applicant and the Tribes. The Agreement shall address the treatment of known cultural resources, the designation, responsibilities, and participation of professional Native American Tribal monitors during grading, excavation and ground disturbing activities; project grading and development scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; and treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site.	Prior to Grading	Applicant  Individual Native American Tribes  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Morongo Band of Mission Indians</li> <li>• Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians</li> </ul>	Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval.

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party <sup>3</sup>	Monitoring/Reporting Method
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	<p><b>MM CR 2:</b> If inadvertent discoveries of subsurface archaeological/cultural resources are discovered during grading, the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) shall assess the significance of such resources and shall meet and confer regarding the mitigation for such resources. Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method for archaeological resources. If the developer, the project archaeologist, and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for such resources, these issues will be presented to the Community and Economic Development Director for decision. The Community and Economic Development Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of CEQA with respect to the archaeological resources and shall take into account the religious beliefs, customs, and practices of the Tribe(s). Notwithstanding any other rights available under the law, the decision of the Community Development Director shall be appealable to the Planning Commission and/or City Council.</p>	During Grading Activity	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Individual Grading Contractor</p> <p>Tribal Cultural Monitor</p> <p>Community and Economic Development Director</p>	<p>Individual Grading Contractor</p> <p>Tribal Cultural Monitor</p>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	<p><b>MM CR 3:</b> If buried archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, all work must be halted in the vicinity of the discovery until a registered professional archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and assess the significance and origin of the archaeological resource. If the resource is determined to be of Native American origin, the Tribe shall be consulted. If the archaeological resource is determined to be a potentially significant cultural resource, the City, in consultation with the project archaeologist and the Tribe, shall determine the course of action which may include data recovery, retention in situ, or other appropriate treatment and mitigation depending on the resources discovered.</p> <p>In the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery, the steps and procedures specified in</p>	Prior to Issuance of Grading Permit	<p>Individual grading contractors</p> <p>Registered Professional Archaeologist</p>	<p>Compliance with Project Conditions of Approval.</p> <p>Final report to City Planning Division from archeologist; if resources are found.</p>

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party <sup>3</sup>	Monitoring/Reporting Method
	<p>Health and Safety Code 7050.5, <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> 15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code 5097.98 <u>must</u> be implemented. Specifically, in accordance with Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5097.98, the Riverside County Coroner must be notified within 24 hours of the discovery of potentially human remains. The Coroner will then determine within two working days of being notified if the remains are subject to his or her authority. If the Coroner recognizes the remains to be Native American, he or she shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) by phone within 24 hours, in accordance with PRC Section 5097.98. The NAHC will then designate a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) with respect to the human remains within 48 hours of notification. The MLD then has the opportunity to recommend to the property owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and associated grave goods within 24 hours of notification. Whenever the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD fails to make a recommendation, or the landowner or his or her authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and the mediation provided for in subdivision (k) of PRC Section 5097.94 fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, the landowner or his or her authorized representative shall re-inter the human remains and items associated with Native American burials with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.</p>			