



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT Planning Division

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

WARD: 6

1. **Case Number:** P12-0021 (GPA), P12-0022 (RZ), P12-0072 (DR), P12-0073 (SP), and P12-0074 (PM)
2. **Project Title:** Cedar Glen Project
3. **Hearing Date:** May 3, 2012
4. **Lead Agency:** City of Riverside
Community Development Department
Planning Division
3900 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Riverside, CA 92522
5. **Contact Person:** Yvette Sennewald, Planner
Phone Number: 951.826.5168
6. **Project Location:** 3990 County Farm Road (APNs 145-260-011 and 145-260-020), City of Riverside
7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Adrian J. Peters, AICP Director of Land Development
Southern California Design
44139 Monterey Avenue, Suite A
Palm Desert, CA 92261
Phone: 760.565.5500
8. **General Plan Designation:** C- Commercial
9. **Zoning:** O-S-4 - Office with Four-Story Building Height Overlay Zone
10. **Description of Project:** (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The project site currently has a General Plan designation of Commercial (C) and a Zoning designation of Office with Four-Story Height of Buildings Overlay Zone (O-S-4). The project includes a Design Review application and a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from Commercial (C) to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR). The project also includes the proposed re-zoning of the site from the Office with Four-Story Height of Buildings Overlay Zone (O-

S-4) Zone to the R-3-3000 Multiple-Family Residential Zone. Additionally a Site Plan Review application for the review of the plot plan and a Tentative Parcel Map will also be submitted for this project.

The Cedar Glen project contains 102 residential units on 9.72 gross acres for a gross density of 10.5 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). It will contain two phases each made up of 50 affordable apartment units and one manager's unit. Each Phase will constitute its own numbered parcel and County Farm Road and Reynolds Road are proposed to remain as public streets and will be designed as a lettered lot on the parcel map.

The main project entry will be in Phase I and will service four residential buildings plus the community building, pool and other recreational amenities. Phase I will consist of 14 Plan I (one-bedroom) units, 14 Plan 2 (two-bedroom) units, 17 Plan 3 (three-bedroom) units (including the manager's apartment) and 6 Plan 4 (four-bedroom) units. This Phase will require 95 parking spaces (1.86/du) per code and 101 are provided, including 20 garage spaces, 53 carport spaces, and 28 open spaces.

Phase II has the same unit count and bedroom mix. Phase II is required to provide 95 spaces, yet it offers 100 comprised of 20 garage spaces, 53 carports, and 27 open stalls.

Landscaping

The conceptual landscape planting palette for the Cedar Glen Project is a mix of medium and low water use California-friendly plantings that satisfy water saving requirements while enhancing the architecture on the site. A weather based "smart" irrigation controller will be used in conjunction with City guidelines known as the "Riverside Guide to California Friendly Landscaping" to create a water conscious facility. Small demonstration gardens in the project will lead one to a larger focal demonstration garden at a key point in site circulation. Artistic installations in the pavement at these gardens such as a compass rose or rain cross symbol will add interest and community pride. Dry cobble streambeds throughout the site will serve as aesthetic features while doubling as bio-swales for the percolation of water onsite.

Project Amenities

The amenities present in this design will facilitate community gathering and physical activity for the health and enjoyment of its residents. These amenities will include an exercise circuit throughout the site with outdoor exercise equipment, two play areas to facilitate the needs of multiple-age-groups of children, a basketball half-court, and striped hard court activities such as foursquare and hop scotch. As far as gathering spaces, there will be two passive seating areas with fireplaces, a large shade pavilion with barbecues, smaller individual picnic areas with tables and barbecues throughout the site, and an extensive open lawn area for field sports that has an adjoining tiered amphitheater so that the field may also be used as a gathering space for activities like outdoor movies. The property will also have an expansive pool area adjacent to the community center and rental office. Lastly, all drive isles and entryways will be constructed using permeable interlocking pavers with strategically placed areas of higher percolation to satisfy storm water requirements.

Sustainable Building/Green Building Practices

The Cedar Glen project will implement building technologies to produce "Green" and sustainable development. This project will exceed California Code of regulations Title 24 building standards and will use sustainable and "Green" building standards and practices as a baseline level of quality and performance. This project will utilize the following sustainable elements:

- Energy Star appliances
- Water Saving Faucets and Fixtures
- Low VOC Paint & Glues
- Fluorescent Lighting
- No Construction Materials May Contain Formaldehyde
- Low E energy efficient window
- Recycled construction materials

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

Adjacent Existing Land Use:

North: Residential/Institutional (Orangetree Nursing Center)
East: Institutional (Riverside County Probation Dept. Juvenile Hall Detention/Treatment facility)
South: Commercial (Lowes Home Center)
West: Institutional (Riverside County Adult Services Facility)

Adjacent zoning:

North: Public Facilities (PF) and R-1-7000
East: Public Facilities (PF)
South: CR
West: Public Facilities (PF)

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

a. none

13. Documents used and/or referenced in this review:

- a. General Plan 2025.
- b. GP 2025 Final Project Environmental Impact Report (FPEIR).
- c. SCS Engineers Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. November 11, 2010.
- d. RBF Consulting Drainage Study for Cedar Glen. January 16, 2012.
- e. RBF Consulting Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan for Cedar Glen. December 15, 2011.
- f. RBF Consulting Cedar Glen Residential Project Traffic Impact Analysis Report. February 22, 2012.
- g. Michael Brandman Associates Air Quality Assessment, Cedar Glen Project, March 22, 2012.
- h. Michael Brandman Associates Noise Impact Assessment, Cedar Glen Project, March 22, 2012.
- i. Michael Brandman Associates Cultural Resource Survey. April 30, 2010.

14. Acronyms

ADT average daily traffic
AICUZ Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study
APN Assessor's Parcel Number
AQMP Air Quality Management Plan
AUSD Alvord Unified School District
BMP Best Management Practice
CDG Citywide Design Guidelines
CEQA California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CERCLIS Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System

cfs	cubic feet per second
CMP	Congestion Management Plan
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CRWQCB	California Regional Water Quality Control Board
dBA	A-weighted decibel
EMWD	Eastern Municipal Water District
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FPEIR	GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
GHG	Greenhouse gases
GIS	Geographic Information System
GP 2025	General Plan 2025
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plans
L _{dn}	Day-Night Average Noise Level
LHMP	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
LOS	Level of Service
L _{max}	Maximum Noise Level
MARB/MIP	March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
MBA	Michael Brandman Associates
mgd	million gallons per day
MJPA-JLUS	March Joint Powers Authority - JointLand Use Study
mph	miles per hour
MSHCP	Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MVUSD	Moreno Valley Unified School District
NCCP	Natural Communities Conservation Plan
NPC	Neighborhood Policing Center
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
OEM	Office of Emergency Services
RCALUC	Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
RCALUCP	Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
RCNM	Roadway Construction Noise Model
RCP	Regional Comprehensive Plan
RCTC	Riverside County Transportation Commission
RMC	Riverside Municipal Code
RPD	Riverside Police Department
RPU	Riverside Public Utilities
RPW	Riverside Public Works
RTA	Riverside Transit Agency
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan

RUSD	Riverside Unified School District
SARWQCB	Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCAG	Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SKR	Stephens' Kangaroo Rat
SKR-HCP	Stephens' Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan
SRA	source receptor area
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TRI	toxic release inventory
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
USGS	United States Geologic Survey
WMWD	Western Municipal Water District
WQMP	Water Quality Management Plan

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DRAFT

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 offsite as well as onsite, 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.

DRAFT

- c. **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measure which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>1a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 - Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 - Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways, Table 5.1-A - Scenic and Special Boulevards, and Table 5.1-B - Scenic Parkways)</p> <p>Per GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 - Scenic and Special Boulevards and Parkways and per Table 5.1-A, Scenic and Special Boulevards, in the GP 2025 FPEIR, the proposed project is located near (approximately 0.17 mile north of) but not adjacent to Magnolia Avenue, which is a special and scenic boulevard and near (approximately 0.4 mile west of) but not adjacent to Van Buren Boulevard, which is a scenic boulevard and parkway. Per Figure CCM-4, Master Plan of Roadways, in the City's 2025 GP, the project site is not adjacent to any roads that are designated as scenic boulevards. Figure LU-3, in the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Element shows natural and scenic vistas within the City of Riverside. Per Figure LU-3, there are no scenic vistas in the immediate vicinity of the project site. In sum, the project is anticipated to have no impacts on a scenic vista because the area in which the project is proposed is highly urbanized.</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>1b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR- Aesthetics Section)</p> <p>Per page 5.1-4 of the PEIR for the City of Riverside General Plan, no officially designated State scenic highways or any eligible State scenic highways traverse the City of Riverside or its Sphere of Influence. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact in this regard.</p>				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1c. Response: (Source: SCS Engineers 2010 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment November 11, General Plan 2025, Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</p> <p>Short-Term Construction Impacts</p> <p>Construction activities for the project would result in a short-term degradation of visual and aesthetic characteristics of the project site. Construction activities would alter views across the project site from surrounding locations, including views from surrounding use areas, such as the multi-family development across Reynolds Drive from the project site and existing views of the project site from motorists traveling along Harrison Road, County Farm Road, and Reynolds Drive.</p> <p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-1 requiring the project site itself and any equipment staging areas to have appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material), potentially significant short-term visual impacts to surrounding uses would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p>MM AES-1 Construction equipment staging areas shall use appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) to buffer views of construction equipment and material, and stockpiled soil.</p> <p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-1, temporary construction impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.</p> <p>Long-Term Operational Impacts</p> <p>Land uses near the project site include institutional, commercial, and multi-family residential uses. The project site's visual quality is generally considered low due to the vacant nature of the project site in that it is not maintained with any</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>landscaping or visual amenities. Per the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, debris piles were observed in several locations at the site. Implementation of the project would alter the existing visual character of the project site, as the project proposes the construction of 8 multi-story apartment buildings with 102 apartment units as well as a community center, various recreational amenities and landscaping. The project includes a design review application, which is being reviewed concurrently. The proposed project will be a multi-family residential project, which is the same land use as the existing Geel Place multi-family development that currently exists across Reynolds Drive from the project site. Thus, the project will blend into the existing fabric of the project area.</p> <p>The proposed project is subject to the City of Riverside Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines (Guidelines) which are intended to promote quality, well-designed development throughout the City, which address aesthetic aspects of projects. Both the Riverside Zoning Code (Title 19 of the Municipal Code) and Citywide Design Guidelines are implementing tools of the General Plan and apply to all properties in Riverside. The Design Guidelines are intended to improve overall urban design. The provisions in the Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines are applicable to the proposed development of all Residential, Commercial/Mixed Use, Industrial, and Public Facilities uses within the City of Riverside. Thus, the proposed project is subject to the Guidelines. Design review is required for any proposed building, structure, or sign, or for any new landscaping associated with such improvements as visible from the public right-of-way and, therefore, shall adhere to these guidelines, as applicable. Applicants of new development or rehabilitation must follow a development review process administered by City Planning staff in order to complete site and building improvements (Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines). The project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact regarding visual character because it is consistent with the City's Guidelines.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>1d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, Chapter 19.556 - Lighting)</i></p> <p>The introduction of light from interior and outdoor uses can be a nuisance to adjacent residential areas and can diminish the view of the clear night sky. Perceived glare is the unwanted and potentially objectionable sensation as observed by a person as they look directly into a light source. Light spill is typically defined as the presence of unwanted light on properties adjacent to the property being illuminated. The project site is currently vacant and as such, there are no existing sources of light and glare produced at the project site.</p> <p>The area surrounding the project site consists of developed land, with predominantly institutional uses (Orangetree Nursing Center, Riverside County Probation Department Juvenile Hall Detention/Treatment facility, and Riverside County Adult Services Facility) adjacent to the project site. Light and glare from offsite uses include lighting from the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Night lighting of the Lowes parking lot. • Traffic traveling along Harrison Street, County Farm Road and Reynolds Drive • Lighting from the multi-family residential development (Geel Place) west of the project site <p>The City's Municipal Code establishes hours during which construction work can be done, therefore because construction activities would only occur as early as 7:00 a.m. and as late as 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and would occur as early as 8:00 a.m. and as late as 5 p.m. on Saturdays, short-term light/glare impacts associated with construction would be less than significant because light and glare would not be produced very early in the morning or very late at night.</p> <p>There may be security lighting at night on the construction site and there may be an onsite security trailer with lights. This will be determined closer to the time of construction. However, no significant impacts are anticipated from onsite security lighting during construction because 1) light fixtures must be shielded or directed downwards consistent with City Standards; and 2) perimeter construction fencing will be used to further reduce the potential for any significant offsite glare effects.</p> <p>Implementation of the project would introduce additional sources of light and glare including light from the new residential buildings, new street lighting, and resident vehicle headlights. The proposed multi-family project would introduce new sources of light in the area; however, because the proposed residential units are similar to those located adjacent to the project site, across Reynolds Drive, light levels from new residential units would be similar to the light levels of Geel Place</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>and of surrounding uses such the Orangetree Senior facility located north of the project site, across County Farm Road. Mitigation Measure AES-2 will reduce any potential lighting impacts from the proposed project to a less than significant level.</p> <p>MM AES- 2: To further reduce impacts related to light pollution, the City shall require at the time of issuance of building permits all development which introduces light sources, or modifications to existing light sources, to have shielding devices or other light pollution limiting characteristics such as hoods or lumen restrictions.</p> <p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-2, the project will have a less than significant impact regarding light and glare.</p>				
<p>2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:</p>				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effect, 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 - Figure OS-2 - Agricultural Suitability)</i></p> <p>Per Figure OS-2, Agricultural Suitability, in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the project site is located on urban and built-up land. Therefore, implementation of the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Thus, the project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2b. Response: <i>(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)</i></p> <p>Per Figure OS-3, Williamson Act Preserves, in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the project site is not designated as Williamson Act Preserve and contracted land nor is it designated as a Williamson Act Preserve. Per Figure 5.2-4, Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, the City zoning for the project site does not designate the site as being agriculturally zoned. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Zoning Map of the City of Riverside)</p> <p>The proposed project is located in the O-S-4- Office and Four-Story Building Height Overlay Zone and as such not zoned as forestland, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Zoning Map of the City of Riverside, project site visit by Michael Brandman Associates' Staff)</p> <p>The proposed project will have no impact in this regard because the project site is currently vacant land and is not forestland. The project site is located within an urban/developed area of the City of Riverside. Thus, the proposed project will not result in the loss of forestland, nor will it convert forestland to non-forest use.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2e. Response: (Source: General Plan - Figure OS-2 - Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, Title 19 - Article V - Chapter 19.100 - Residential Zones - RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map - Forest Data, MBA site visit, and site specific Cultural Resources Survey prepared by Michael Brandman Associates dated April 30, 2010)</p> <p>Per Figure OS-2, Agricultural Suitability, in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the project site is located on urban and built-up land that has not been farmed for many years (per Cultural Resources Report prepared for the project site). Per Figure OS-3, Williamson Act Preserve, the project site is not located on land that is designated with Williamson Act lands. Thus, the project will have no impact regarding the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.</p> <p>The proposed project site is currently vacant and is surrounded by urban development and does not contain forestland. Thus, the project would not convert forestland to non-forest use. Thus, the project will have no impacts in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), Brandman 2012)				
<p>The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has established the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) to achieve State and federal air quality standards. The AQMP is the primary planning document by which air quality standards and objectives are monitored. Projects that comply with their jurisdiction's general plan are also considered to be consistent with the air quality plan, as set forth by SCAQMD.</p>				
<p>The project is located in the Arlington Neighborhood within the City of Riverside and is within the Galleria District of the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan area. In 2011, the City of Riverside adopted a revised Arlington Community Plan. With the adoption of the General Plan 2025, the City's Community Plans no longer exist in that form and will be replaced over time with Neighborhood Plans. Therefore, the policies of the Arlington Community Plan have been incorporated into General Plan 2025, as well as into the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan. In addition, the Specific Plan reflects the design direction of the Arlington Community Plan and includes many of its recommendations (Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan).</p>				
<p>The vision, goals, and implementation measures of the Specific Plan are based on the direction given in the City of Riverside's General Plan 2025, adopted in 2007. Adoption of the Specific Plan establishes the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan Overlay Zone, which incorporates all of the standards for land use and development set forth in this Plan. The regulations of this Specific Plan are in addition to those set forth in the planning and zoning provisions of the Riverside Zoning Code, and any other applicable ordinances (Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan).</p>				
<p>The General Plan designation for the project site is C (commercial) and the Zoning designation is Office (O) with an O-S-4 (Office and Four-Story Building Height Overlay Zone). The project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from C- Commercial to MHDR- Medium High Density Residential and includes a request to rezone the project site from the O-Office with O-S-4 Zone to the R-3-3000- Multiple-Family Residential Zone.</p>				
<p>The project is currently not consistent with the existing General Plan and Zoning designations for the site; however, with approval of the requested General Plan Amendment and Zone Change, the discrepancy between General Plan and Zoning designations would be remedied.</p>				
<p>Furthermore, according to the SCAQMD, the project is consistent with the AQMP if the project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP. As shown in the response to 3 b), the proposed project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations and the emissions from the proposed project would be less than if the General Plan-approved commercial land use was built out.</p>				
<p>Therefore, with approval of the proposed project and the General Plan Amendment (to change the Land Use Designation from C- Commercial to MHDR- Medium High Density Residential and grant the request to rezone the project site from the O Office with O-S-4 Zone to the R-3-3000- Multiple Family Residential Zone), the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the air quality plan established for this region; impacts would be less than significant.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 AQMP, CalEEMod, and Air Quality Assessment prepared by MBA on March 2012)</i></p> <p>Air quality impacts can be described in a short-term and long-term perspective. Short-term impacts would occur during demolition, site grading, and project construction and consist of fugitive dust and other particulate matter, as well as exhaust emissions generated by construction-related vehicles. Long-term air quality impacts would occur once the proposed project is in operation.</p> <p>The proposed project would be required to comply with existing SCAQMD rules for the reduction of fugitive dust emissions. SCAQMD Rule 403 establishes these procedures. Compliance with Rule 403 is achieved through application of standard best management practices (BMPs) during construction and operation activities. These BMPs can include the application of water or chemical stabilizers to disturbed soils, managing haul road dust by application of water, covering haul vehicles, restricting vehicle speeds on unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour (mph), sweeping loose dirt from paved site access roadways, cessation of construction activities when winds exceed 25 mph, and establishing a permanent, stabilizing ground cover on finished sites. In addition, projects that disturb 50 acres or more of soil or move 5,000 cubic yards of materials per day are required to submit a Fugitive Dust Control Plan or a Large Operation Notification Form to SCAQMD. Based on the size of the project area (approximately 9.27 acres), a Fugitive Dust Control Plan or Large Operation Notification would not be required.</p> <p>Short-term emissions were evaluated using the CalEEMod version 2011.1.1 computer program. The model evaluated emissions resulting from fugitive dust, as well as exhaust emissions generated by earthmoving and grading activities, and subsequent painting/coating and paving. Results from the CalEEMod modeling can be found in Cedar Glen Air Quality Assessment (MBA 2012). Table 1 summarizes these construction-related emissions (using the BMPs from SCAQMD Rule 403 of watering the site 3-times daily).</p>				

Table 1: Maximum Daily Construction Emissions

Source	Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Grading	6.51	49.89	32.44	0.05	6.64	4.08
Construction	5.67	36.83	29.18	0.05	2.37	2.41
Architectural Coating	4.23	3.05	2.94	0.00	0.47	0.28
Paving	5.60	33.90	21.89	0.03	2.94	2.94
Maximum Daily Emissions	15.50	73.78	54.01	0.08	6.64	5.63
Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	150	55
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
<p>Note: The maximum daily emissions refer to the maximum emissions that would occur in one day; the maximum emissions are the greater either of the grading phase or of construction plus architectural coating plus paving (as those phases may overlap). VOC = volatile organic compounds NO_x = nitrogen oxides CO = carbon monoxide SO_x = sulfur oxides PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} = particulate matter Source: Appendix A: CalEEMod Output. Source of thresholds: South Coast Air Quality Management District 2011a.</p>						

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

As shown by the results in the Table 1, construction of the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD's regional thresholds for construction. As stated in the Traffic Study (RBF 2012), the project is anticipated to be operational in 2015. The Traffic Study also analyzed the potential for traffic to be generated by the current General Plan-designated commercial use. The site is currently vacant and no commercial uses are onsite; however, if a commercial land use were to be constructed instead of the proposed residential use (which would require a General Plan amendment and zone change) the commercial use would generate more traffic than the proposed residential use. The trip generation rate for the commercial use would be 42.94 per thousand square feet (sq ft); the trip generation rate for the proposed multi-family residential use would be 6.65 per dwelling unit, which would generate 9,090 daily trips and 678 daily trips respectively. Operational emissions from the commercial use were also analyzed and included in the table below.

Operational emissions values (the higher of either summer or winter) are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Unmitigated Maximum Daily Operational Emissions

Source	Emissions (lbs/day)					
	ROG	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Significance Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Motor vehicles	3.19	8.30	34.63	0.06	6.74	0.58
Natural Gas	0.05	0.39	0.17	0.00	0.03	0.03
Landscape	0.28	0.10	8.68	0.00	0.05	0.05
Hearth	10.86	0.50	33.76	0.08	5.39	5.39
Architectural Coating	0.22	—	—	—	—	—
Consumer Products	2.02	—	—	—	—	—
Total Emissions	16.61	9.29	77.24	0.14	12.21	6.05
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No
<i>Emissions from GP commercial land use</i>	<i>36.35</i>	<i>71.84</i>	<i>285.98</i>	<i>0.44</i>	<i>49.23</i>	<i>4.43</i>
<i>Significant Impact?</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>No</i>
Notes: ROG/VOC = volatile organic compounds NO _x = nitrogen oxides CO = carbon monoxide SO _x = sulfur oxides PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} = particulate matter lbs/day = pounds per day Source of emissions: See CalEEMod output in Appendix of AQA.						

As shown in Table 2 above, emissions from operation of the project will be below the significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD for the project; therefore, impacts to air quality during operation are considered less than significant. Furthermore, as shown in the italicized rows in the table above, if the General Plan-approved commercial land use were to operate at the site instead of the proposed project, the NO_x emissions generated by the commercial use would exceed the SCAQMD regional threshold for that criteria pollutant.

Therefore, emissions from both the construction and operation of the proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3c. Response: (Source: SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District's 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, Air Quality Assessment prepared by MBA on March 2012)</p> <p>As shown in the response to 3b., the proposed project's emissions would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds during either construction or operation of the project. Furthermore, the proposed project would have fewer emissions for the criteria pollutants than if a commercial use was built, thus, the project's emissions are not considered to be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts associated with a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant would be less than significant.</p>				
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3d. Response: (Source: SCAQMD LST Thresholds, Air Quality Assessment prepared by MBA on March 2012)</p> <p>As part of the SCAQMD's environmental justice program, attention has been focused on localized effects of air quality. Staff at SCAQMD has developed localized significance threshold (LST) methodology that can be used by public agencies to determine whether a project may generate significant adverse localized air quality impacts (both short-term and long-term). LSTs represent the maximum emissions from a project that would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the most stringent applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard, and are developed based on the ambient concentrations of that pollutant for each source receptor area (SRA). The project site is located within SRA 23.</p> <p>The localized assessment methodology limits the emissions in the analysis to those generated from onsite activities. The onsite construction emissions are compared with the localized significance thresholds and are summarized in Table 3.</p>				

Table 3: Localized Significance Analysis (Construction)

Activity	Onsite Emissions (pounds per day)			
	NO_x	CO	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
Grading	48.4	25.4	3.6	2.5
Construction	34.5	19.4	2.0	1.8
Architectural Coating and Paving	37.3	22.2	2.6	2.4
Localized Significance Threshold	170	883	7	4
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No
<p>Notes: Construction emissions estimated using SCAQMD worksheet for 2-acre site available at http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/LST/LST.html Source of thresholds: South Coast Air Quality Management District 2009a, for Source Receptor Area 23, 2-acre site at a distance of 25 meters.</p>				

Emissions from construction of the proposed project would be below the localized significance thresholds established by SCAQMD for the project. Therefore, impact associated with construction activities potentially exposing sensitive receptors

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.				
<p>This project involves the construction of a residential land use. The long-term emissions, as discussed previously, from the operation of the facility are mainly in the form of mobile source emissions, without any stationary sources present. According to SCAQMD LST methodology, LSTs would apply to the operational phase of a project, if the project includes stationary sources, or attracts mobile sources that may spend long periods queuing and idling at the site; such as warehouse/transfer facilities. The proposed project does not include such uses. Therefore; due to the lack of stationary source emissions, no long-term (operational) localized significance threshold analysis is needed. Therefore, impacts associated with operation activities potentially exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be less than significant.</p>				
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3e. Response: (Source: Project description)				
<p>During construction, certain operations such as laying asphalt pavement, applying paint/protective coatings, and applying some roofing materials, would generate odors that may be noticeable to nearby residents/landowners. Such odors are not unusual when residential projects are constructed and last only a matter of a few days, therefore, they will not result in significant nuisance or health risk. Because the project will result in the construction of an apartment complex, it is not anticipated that upon project completion there would be activities, materials, or chemicals that would have the potential to cause odor impact affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts are less than significant, and no further study of this issue is required.</p>				
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 - Figure OS-6 - Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-8 - MSHCP Cell Areas, and MSHCP Conservation Report Summary Generator Website http://www.rcilma.org/online/content/rcip_report_generator.aspx Accessed February 23, 2012)				
A report was run using the Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Conservation Report Summary Generator, which yielded the following in Table 4:				

Table 4: Western Riverside County Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) Conservation Report Information

APN	Cell	Cell Group	Acres	Area Plan	Sub Unit
145260011	Not A Part	Independent	9.71	Cities of Riverside and Norco	Not a Part
145260020	Not A Part	Independent	0.03	Cities of Riverside and Norco	Not a Part

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Based on the information provided in the table above, the proposed project site is not a special species status cell, is not located in a cell and therefore would not impact species covered in the MSHCP. Additionally, per Figure OS-8, MSHCP Cell Areas, the project is not located within an MSHCP cell area. Per Figure OS-6, Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserves and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the proposed project is not located in an area with SKR core reserves nor is the project located within a Habitat Conservation Plan. Thus, the proposed project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				
<p>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4b. Response: (Source: Riverside West, CA. USGS 7.5-minute Topographic Quadrangle Map, SCS Engineers 2010 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment November 11, Figure OS-8 - MSHCP Cell Areas and MSHCP Conservation Report Summary Generator Website http://www.rctlma.org/online/content/rcip_report_generator.aspx Accessed February 23, 2012.)</p> <p>Per Figure OS-8, MSHCP Cell Areas, the project is not located within an MSHCP cell area. The project site is undeveloped and is surrounded by urban development on all sides and is in a developed area of the City of Riverside. Per the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, the project site consists of vacant land with low-lying natural vegetation. Per the Riverside West, California USGS 7.5-minute Topographic Quadrangle Map, there are no bloodline stream channels on or near the project site.</p> <p>The project site is currently vacant and is surrounded by urban development. Per Figure OS-5, Habitat Areas and Vegetation Communities, in the Open Space and conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the project site does not contain any habitat areas or vegetation communities. No wetlands are located onsite. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				
<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 - Figure OS-5 - Habitat Areas and Vegetation Communities)</p> <p>The project site is currently vacant and is surrounded by urban development. Per Figure OS-5, Habitat Areas and Vegetation Communities, in the Open Space and conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the project site does not contain any habitat areas or vegetation communities. No wetlands are located onsite therefore the project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4d. Response: (Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 -Figure OS-7 - MSHCP Cores and Linkage)</p> <p>The project site is located in a developed/urban area of the City of Riverside and is not located within an MSHCP cell. Due to the developed nature area surrounding the site, the proposed project will not interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The project site is surrounded by developed land and as such is not located in an area that facilitates the movement of resident or migratory species. Per Figure OS-7, MSHCP Cores and Linkages, in the Open Space and conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the project site is not designated as an existing core or linkage, and is not designated as a proposed core and habitat block nor is it designated as a proposed linkage. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4e. Response: (Source: City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual and MSHCP Conservation Report Summary Generator Website http://www.rctlma.org/online/content/rcip_report_generator.aspx Accessed February 23, 2012.)</p> <p>The proposed project will have a less than significant impact regarding conflicting with local policies and ordinances. As described in response 4a. above, the proposed project will not conflict with the MSHCP because it is not located in a cell. A few palm trees currently exist on the Harrison Street side of the site. The removal of the few existing trees onsite is anticipated to have a less than significant impact regarding conflict with the City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual because the proposed project will develop the site with landscaping and trees, which will provide a net increase in the plantings, landscaping and trees onsite. Thus, a less than significant impact is anticipated in this regard.</p>				
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"/>
<p>4f. Response: (Source: Figure OS-6 - Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-8 - MSHCP Cell Areas)</p> <p>As described above, per Figure OS-8, MSHCP Cell Areas, the project is not located within an MSHCP cell area. In addition, per Figure OS-6, Stephens' Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserves and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), in the Open Space and conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the proposed project is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan. Thus, the project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5a. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and site specific Cultural Resources Survey prepared by Michael Brandman Associates dated April 30, 2010)</i>				
<p>In April 2010, Michael Brandman Associates (MBA) conducted a Cultural Resources Survey of the project site (Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 145-260-011 and 145-260-020) and assessed the effects of future development in the proposed project area. Although the Cultural Resources report lists one APN, per an interview with MBA Senior Archaeologist Michael Dice, M.A., the survey covered both parcels in the project site. The conclusions contained in the report apply to the entire project site, despite the listing of one APN in the report. Additionally, per Table 5.5-A, Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, of the City of Riverside General Plan 2025 FPEIR, the project is not located in a Historical District or Neighborhood Conservation Area.</p>				
<p>The MBA study found that there shall be no substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5, and that it is not anticipated that any significant historical resource shall be uncovered during construction. Thus, the project will have a less than significant impact in this regard.</p>				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5b. Response: <i>(Source: Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, and site specific Cultural Resources Survey prepared by Michael Brandman Associates dated April 30, 2010)</i>				
<p>The MBA study found that there shall be no substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5, and that it is not anticipated that any significant archaeological resource shall be uncovered during construction. Thus, the project will have a less than significant impact in this regard.</p>				
<p>It is always possible that ground-disturbing activities during construction will uncover previously unknown, buried cultural resources. In the event that buried cultural resources are discovered during construction of the project, operations shall stop in the immediate vicinity of the find and a qualified archaeologist shall be consulted to determine whether the discovered resource requires further study. The qualified archeologist shall make recommendations to the City on the measures that shall be implemented to mitigate for the discovered resource(s), including but not limited to excavation of the finds and evaluation of the finds in accordance with § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.</p>				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3, Riverside County Land Information System 2012 website: http://www3.tlma.co.riverside.ca.us/pa/rclis/index.html accessed March 13, 2012.)</i>				
<p>Per Historic Preservation Policy HP-1.3 (on page HP-24) in the City of Riverside 2025 General Plan: "The City shall protect sites of archaeological and paleontological significance and ensure compliance with all applicable State and federal cultural resources protection and management laws in its planning and project review process."</p>				
<p>Per the Paleontological Sensitivity Map produced in the Riverside County Land Information System for the project site, generally speaking, the eastern portion of the project site is in an area with high potential/sensitivity and the western portion</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>of the project site is in an area with low potential for paleontological sensitivity. As described in the Phase I ESA for the project site, the site was previously developed (between 1960 and 2000) with medical facilities associated with the Riverside Community Hospital. Additionally, the project will be required to comply with all applicable State and federal cultural resources protection laws. Therefore, impacts from development of the proposed project on paleontological resources are anticipated to be less than significant. Refer to response 5b. above.</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>5d. Response: <i>(Source: Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, site specific Cultural Resources Survey prepared by Michael Brandman Associates dated April 30, 2010)</i></p> <p>Per Figure 5.5-2, Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, in the City 2025 General Plan, the project site is located in an area with medium sensitivity for prehistoric cultural resources. As discussed in the Cultural Resources Survey report prepared for the project site, there are no known human remains on or near the project site.</p> <p>It is always a possibility that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown buried human remains. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, State law (California State Health and Safety Code § 7050.5) requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) § 5097.98.</p> <p>Therefore, the potential for impacts to unknown buried human remains is considered low, and compliance with California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5 and Public Resources Code § 5097.98 must take place if human remains are uncovered. In sum, project development will result in less than significant impacts in this regard.</p>				
<p>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</p>				
<p>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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6i. Response: <i>(Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 - Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E - Geotechnical Report)</i></p> <p>Per the Geotechnical Report for the FPEIR for the City's 2025 General Plan, no active or potentially active fault has been mapped at the surface within the City of Riverside. Per the City of Riverside General Plan, no known faults traverse the area, however several faults in the region have the potential to produce seismic impacts within the City of Riverside and its sphere of influence. Three significant faults pass within twenty miles of Riverside: 1) The San Andreas Fault, located 11 miles from Downtown Riverside and is estimated to be able to produce an earthquake with a magnitude up to 8.3; 2) The San Jacinto Fault, located 7 miles from Downtown Riverside which has the capability to produce an earthquake up to a 7.0 magnitude; 3) The Elsinore Fault, located four miles west of Lake Mathews and Corona which could produce up to a 6.0 magnitude earth quake. A less than significant impact is anticipated in this regard because no known faults traverse the project site.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6ii. Response: (Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E - Geotechnical Report)</p> <p>Ground shaking, which can seriously affect the integrity of structures, is an important consideration in the City of Riverside due to the proximity of major faults and the preponderance of loose alluvial soils (City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025). Per the Geotechnical Report in Appendix E of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR, The State of California has the following seismic and geologic hazard elements, which apply to the City: the California Building Code; the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act; and the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act. Implementation of seismic design criteria within the current Uniform Building Code is anticipated to be sufficient to avoid significant impacts due to seismic events, therefore impacts from ground shaking to a less than significant level.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iii. Response: (Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, 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, City of Riverside Municipal Code Section 16.08)</p> <p>Per General Plan Figure PS-1, Regional Fault Zones, the San Jacinto and Elsinore Faults are located outside of the City of Riverside. Within Riverside, the four primary liquefaction areas include the area along the Santa Ana River, a broad area south and west of the Riverside Municipal Airport, a portion in western Riverside spanning La Sierra Avenue and a smaller area along the City’s southern boundary (City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025). Per Figure PS-3, Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, in the Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, the project site is not within an area that contains soils with high shrink swell potential. Per Figure PS-2 in the City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, the project site is located in an area designated as high/very high for liquefaction zones.</p> <p>Per Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.08.020, the City of Riverside has adopted the Uniform Building Code for its geology and geotechnical investigation and mitigation standards. The State of California has the following seismic and geologic hazard elements, which apply to the City: the California Building Code; the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act; and the Seismic Hazard Mapping Act (General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E - Geotechnical Report, pgs 7-8) The proposed project will be required by the City of Riverside to comply with the above listed regulations.</p> <p>More specifically, per Section 16.08.185 a Geologic investigation required, as detailed below. As a prerequisite to the issuance of building permits for any property identified by the seismic safety element of the Riverside general plan as being potentially subject to liquefaction during a groundshaking episode, a thorough geologic analysis by an expert in the field shall be made identifying the specific potential of the subject property for liquefaction and prescribing specific construction measures to eliminate or substantially reduce the possibility of structural failure from this cause. Said analysis shall be subject to approval by the Building Official and prescribed mitigating measures shall be incorporated into building plans submitted for permits.</p> <p>Compliance with City Municipal Code Section 16.08.185, and compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, are reduced to less than significant levels.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6iv. Response: (Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope)</p> <p>Per Figure 5.6-1, Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, the project site is in an area designated as having a 0 to 10 percent slope. The project site is currently vacant and is relatively flat, with no steep slopes and the land surrounding the project site is developed and is also flat. No hills or steep slopes are located onsite. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated to occur regarding landslides on or near the project site.</p>				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6b. Response: (Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-1 - Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, MBA site visit)</p> <p>Within Riverside, most natural slopes are relatively flat, generally less than 15 percent, with some slopes ranging from fifteen to in excess of thirty percent in the southeastern and western portions of Riverside.</p> <p>Principal areas of steep slopes include the Box Springs Mountains, Alessandro Heights, Hawarden Hills and the east-facing slopes of the Norco Hills (City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, RBF Consulting Cedar Glen Drainage Study (2012)).</p> <p>Per Figure 5.6-1, Areas Underlain by Steep Slope, the project site is in an area designated as having a 0 to 10 percent slope and our site visit confirms this. Based on the conceptual grading plan (dated 02/01/2011) the project will require a net import of 400 cubic yards of soil. As the project includes grading, excavation, and other necessary improvements, the potential exists for short-term soil erosion during such activities. However, this is not considered a potentially significant impact given the project will comply with local National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) has been prepared for the project. With implementation of the grading measures contained in the Riverside Municipal Code (Title 17, Grading and Chapter 18.200, Grading and Soil Erosion), which sets forth rules and regulations intended to further implement the goals and objectives of the General Plan, to control excavation, grading and earthwork construction, including fills and embankments, as well as construction NPDES requirements, the impacts due to potential erosion and sedimentation during construction are anticipated to be less than significant.</p> <p>With project buildout, the project site will include permeable pavement sections, which are proposed to mitigate the 100-year peak flow rate to less than pre-development conditions (Cedar Glen Drainage Study 2012). Design requirements, water quality requirements, and handling of flows will be specified in the plans, specifications and Water Quality Management Plan, which are subject to review and approval of the City of Riverside. Adherence to the above-referenced regulatory requirements would ensure that impacts associated with erosion would be less than significant.</p>				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>6c. Response: (Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025)</p> <p>The project is located on flat terrain and as such is not subject to landslides. As described in more detail in response 6d below, per Figure PS-3 in the City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, the proposed project site is not located in an area with soils with high shrink-swell potential. Therefore, expansive soils are not an issue for the project. Per Figure PS-3, Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential, in the Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, the project site is not within an area that contains soils with high shrink swell potential. Per Figure PS-2 in the City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, the project site is located in an area designated as high/very high for liquefaction</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
zones. Per the discussion in Response 6iii above, with compliance with City Municipal Code Section 16.08.185 and compliance with California Building Code Regulations, less than significant impacts are anticipated due to liquefaction.				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6d. Response: (Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.6-4 - Soils, Table 5.6-B - Soil Types, Figure 5.6-5 - Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential,)</p> <p>Expansive soils are soils with a significant amount of clay particles that have the ability to give up water (shrink) or take on water (swell). When soils swell, the change in volume exerts significant pressures on loads that are placed on them. This shrink/swell movement can detrimentally impact building foundations (General Plan 2025 FPEIR). Per Figure 5.6-4, Soils, in the General Plan 2025 FPEIR, the project site is underlain by Hanford soil, which has low shrink swell potential (as indicated in Table 5.6-B, Soil Types in the General Plan 2025 FPEIR). The project site is not located in a part of the City which has soils with high shrink-swell potential (Figure 5.6-5 - Soils with High Shrink-Swell Potential from the General Plan 2025 FPEIR). Additionally, per Figure PS-3 in the City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, the proposed project site is not located in an area with soils with high shrink-swell potential. Thus, no impact is anticipated in this regard.</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>6e. Response: (Source: Cedar Glen project description/plans)</p> <p>The proposed project does not include the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The proposed project would be connected to the existing sewer network and therefore the proposed project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				
<p>7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>7a. Response: (Source: Air Quality Assessment prepared by MBA on March 2012)</p> <p>Greenhouse gases (GHG) are not presented in lbs/day like criteria pollutants; they are typically evaluated on an annual basis using the metric system. The SCAQMD is in the process of preparing recommended significance thresholds for greenhouse gases for local lead agency consideration (SCAQMD Draft Local Agency Threshold); however, the SCAQMD Board has not approved the thresholds as of the date of this IS. The current draft thresholds consist of the following tiered approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1 consists of evaluating whether or not the project qualifies for any applicable exemption under CEQA. • Tier 2 consists of determining whether the project is consistent with a greenhouse gas reduction plan. If a project is consistent with a qualifying local greenhouse gas reduction plan, it does not have significant greenhouse gas emissions. • Tier 3 consists of screening values, which the lead agency can choose but must be consistent. A project's construction emissions are averaged over 30 years and are added to a project's operational emissions. Where 				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>SCAQMD is the lead agency on industrial projects, a threshold of 10,000 MTCO₂e per year applies. SCAQMD is also encouraging other lead agencies to use the 10,000 MTCO₂e per year for industrial projects. If a project's commercial/residential emissions are under one of the following screening thresholds, then the project is less than significant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ All land use types: 3,000 MTCO₂e per year ○ Based on land use type: residential: 3,500 MTCO₂e per year; commercial: 1,400 MTCO₂e per year; or mixed use: 3,000 MTCO₂e per year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tier 4 has the following options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Option 1: Reduce emissions from business as usual by a certain percentage ○ Option 2: Early implementation of applicable AB 32 Scoping Plan measures ○ Option 3, 2020 efficiency target: 4.8 MTCO₂e/SP/year for projects and 6.6 MTCO₂e/SP/year for plans; ○ Option 3, 2035 target: 3.0 MTCO₂e/SP/year for projects and 4.1 MTCO₂e/SP/year for plans ● Tier 5 would allow the purchase of mitigation offsets to achieve target significance threshold. <p>To determine whether the project is significant, this project utilizes the SCAQMD draft local agency threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year.</p> <p>Construction</p> <p>The proposed project would emit greenhouse gases from upstream emission sources and direct sources (combustion of fuels from worker vehicles and construction equipment Table 5 summarizes the output results.</p>				

Table 5: Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Phase	Annual Emissions (MTCO₂e)		
	Onsite	Offsite	Total
Grading - 2013	61.92	3.58	65.5
Building construction - 2013	389.38	96.76	486.14
Architectural coating - 2013	13.94	7.20	21.14
Paving - 2013	201.82	10.04	211.86
Building construction - 2014	198.32	48.72	247.04
Architectural coating -2014	13.81	7.01	20.82
Paving - 2014	114.17	5.58	119.75
Total			1,172.25
<p>Notes: MTCO₂e = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (includes carbon dioxide, methane, and/or nitrous oxide). Source: CalEEMod output (Appendix A).</p>			

<p>Operation</p> <p>Operational or long-term emissions occur over the life of a project. The operational and amortized construction emissions for the proposed project are shown in Table 6. As shown in Table 6, the major sources of operational greenhouse gases are from vehicles, contributing approximately 91 percent of the subtotal emissions.</p>
--

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

Table 6: Project Operational Greenhouse Gases

Source	Emissions (MTCO ₂ e per year)
Construction	39.1
Mobile Sources	904.46
Area	77.05
Energy	345.19
Water	87.40
Waste	21.34
Total	1,474.54
<i>Potential emissions generated by operation of commercial land use</i>	<i>9,130.69</i>
Notes: MTCO ₂ e = metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (includes carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and/or hydrofluorocarbons). Source: CalEEMod output (Appendix A).	

As shown by Table 6 above, the proposed project will generate approximately 1,474 MTCO₂e per year. These emissions are well below the SCAQMD draft threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year. Impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, if a commercial land use (as allowed by the General Plan) was developed in the project's place, the GHG emissions from such a use would be more than six times greater than the emissions from the proposed project and would exceed the SCAQMD draft threshold of 3,000 MTCO₂e per year for residential, commercial and mixed-use projects. Therefore, impacts associated with the generation of greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant.

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

7b. Response: (Source: Air Quality Assessment prepared by MBA on March 2012)

Although the project's GHG emissions are less than significant. The project is anticipated to implement building technologies to produce "Green" and sustainable developments. This project will exceed California Code of regulations building standards Title 24 by 17.5 percent or more and utilize sustainable and "Green" building standards and practices as a baseline level of quality and performance. This project will use the following sustainable elements:

- Energy Star appliances
- Water Saving Faucets and Fixtures
- Low Volatile Organic Compounds, Paint, and Glues
- Fluorescent Lighting
- No Construction Materials May Contain Formaldehyde
- Low E energy efficient window
- Recycled construction materials

The City has adopted policies and programs in the GP 2025 to promote the use of clean and renewable energy sources, facilitate alternative modes of transportation and reduction in vehicle miles traveled, waste reduction, water conservation,

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>and for the efficient and sustainable use of energy. Additionally, the City recently updated its Green Action Plan. Although the goals contained in the updated Green Action Plan are actions to be taken by the City, the Project has implemented numerous measures that support the goals identified in the Green Action Plan related to energy efficiency, waste reduction, and water conservation. However, there are no local or regional plans (Climate Action Plan or GHG Reduction Plan) specifically adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Statewide, the CARB Scoping Plan calls for a reduction in California's GHG emissions of approximately 30 percent from business - as - usual emission levels projected for 2020.</p> <p>The proposed project's emissions are well within SCAQMD draft thresholds and the level of GHG emissions generated by the project would not conflict with the goals of the State's Scoping Plan, adopted pursuant to AB 32. Therefore, impacts associated with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy or regulation would be less than significant.</p>				
<p>8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety Element, and SCS Engineers 2010 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment November 11.)</i></p>				
<p>Per the City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, hazardous materials are those that because of their quality, concentration or physical or chemical characteristics, pose a significant potential hazard to human health or safety or to the environment. The proposed residential project would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials in any significant quantities during operation of the proposed project. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted for the project site in 2010, which accesses the likelihood that recognized environmental conditions are present at the project site as a result of the current or historical site land use or from a known and reported offsite source. According to the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, no obvious indications of the storage or use of hazardous materials and /or petroleum products were observed at the site during the site reconnaissance done as part of the Phase I ESA. Based on observations and research, there is a low likelihood that a recognized environmental condition exists at the site as a result of the current site land use (SCS Engineers 2010).</p>				
<p>Per the Phase I ESA, based on a review of historical resources, the project site and site vicinity were interpreted to have been used for agricultural purposes from prior to 1931 to circa 1963. The use of the project site and site vicinity for possible agricultural purposes was interpreted to have taken place at the time when organochlorine and metal-based pesticides such as DDT, copper, arsenic, and others were in wide use. If the site was, in fact, used for agricultural purposes, there is a moderate likelihood that residual concentrations of pesticides are present in the shallow surface soil beneath the project site. Based on the interpreted land use, SCS's experience with agricultural properties, and a review of the available literature, SCS judges that trace concentrations of organochlorine or metallic pesticides are likely to be present in the soil at the project site and in the site vicinity as a result of the interpreted historic agricultural land use. However, it has generally been SCS's experience that, unless a pesticide mixing, storage, or disposal area was present, concentration of organochlorine pesticides in the subsurface in general agricultural areas tend to be low. No such areas were reported or are known to have existed at the project site and site vicinity (SCS Engineers 2010).</p>				
<p>The existing Lowes, located at 9851 Magnolia Avenue, adjacent to the southern boundary of the project site contained some contamination that has since been re-mediated. Based on the most recent groundwater monitoring activities (April 5, 2004), no hydrocarbon concentrations were reported in monitoring well MW-4, which is closest to the project site. Therefore, there is a low likelihood that groundwater beneath the project site is impacted as a result of the release at the Lowes site. However, based on the fact that a portion of the project site was used as a temporary bioremediation treatment area, the reported concentrations of TPHd- bearing soil left in place, the proposed redevelopment of the project site, and the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB), the Phase I ESA recommends that the CRWQCB be notified of the proposed change in land use and redevelopment plans. Based on the fact that the proposed site redevelopment will likely include disturbance and /or excavation of soil, the Phase I ESA recommends that a Soil Management Plan be prepared to develop procedures to deal with the TPHd-bearing soil prior or during redevelopment activities (SCS Engineers 2010). In sum, Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 and HAZ-2 below are anticipated to reduce potential</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall prepare a Soil Management Plan to develop procedures to deal with the TPHd-bearing soil prior to/during redevelopment activities.</p> <p>MM HAZ-2 If the project is approved by the City of Riverside, the CRWQCB shall be notified of the proposed change in land use and redevelopment plans.</p> <p>With implementation of the mitigation measures above, it is anticipated that the project will have a less than significant impact in this regard.</p>				
<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>8b. Response: <i>(Source: SCS Engineers 2010 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment November 11)</i></p> <p>Operation of residential development proposed typically involves the use and storage of small quantities of potentially hazardous materials in the form of cleaning solvents and pesticides. Although small amounts of hazardous materials may be used during construction, the residential development is not expected to use hazardous materials during long-term operation in significant quantity and concentrations to pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Use of any hazardous materials during construction activities would be conducted in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Therefore, impacts related to reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>8c. Response: <i>(Source: Mission Bell Academy Website http://missionbellacademy.com/?page_id=566 accessed February 27, 2012, and SCS Engineers 2010 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment November 11.)</i></p> <p>Mission Bell Academy at 9994 County Farm Road is approximately .08 mile west of the project site. This school is a non-public special education school providing educational services to students identified with emotional disturbance, autism and developmental delays. Mission Bell Academy is a community-based day school serving students grades 1 through 12 (Mission Bell Academy 2012). Liberty Elementary School is located approximately 0.20 mile northeast of the project site at 9631 Hayes Street.</p> <p>Although a small amount of hazardous materials may be used during construction, the proposed multifamily residential development is not expected to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substance, or waste in sufficient quantity and concentrations to pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Use of any hazardous materials during construction would be conducted in compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local regulations. Operation of residential development proposed typically involves the use and storage of small quantities of potentially hazardous materials in the form of cleaning solvents and pesticides. However, such materials are anticipated to be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions. Additionally, the proposed residential land use would not involve handling acutely hazardous substances. Therefore, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 - Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A - CERCLIS Facility Information, Table 5.7-B - Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and SCS Engineers 2010 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment November 11.)</p> <p>Per Figure PS-5, Hazardous Waste Sites in the City’s 2025 General Plan, the project site is not located on a hazardous waste site. The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) was developed to protect the water, air, and land resources from the risk created by past chemical disposal practices. This act is also referred to as the Superfund Act, and the sites listed under it are referred to as Superfund sites. Under CERCLA, the EPA maintains a list, known as CERCLIS, of all contaminated sites in the nation that have in part or are currently undergoing clean-up activities (GP 2025 FPEIR, pg 5.7-3)</p> <p>Per the City’s 2025 General Plan FPEIR, Table 5.7-A - CERCLIS Facility Information, the proposed project site is not a Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) site. Additionally, the project site is not listed in Table 5.7-B, Regulated Facilities in Tri Information, in the City’s FPEIR for the 2025 General Plan. Thus, the project site is not listed in the Environmental Protection Agency’s toxic release inventory (TRI) database.</p> <p>As detailed in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared for the project, an Environmental Database Site Assessment Report was prepared by the Environmental Data Resources, Inc. for the project site. Local, state and federal regulatory databases were reviewed for the site and for those facilities within up to one mile of the site. Per the Phase I report, the project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Thus, there will be no impact in this regard.</p>				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 - Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan dated October 14, 2004 and Google Earth (2012))</p> <p>The closest airport to the project site is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.9 miles northeast of the project site. Per the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan dated October 14, 2004, the project site is located outside of the airport’s compatibility zones. Additionally, per Figure PS-6, Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, in the Public Safety Element of the City’s 2025 General Plan, the project site is located outside of the airport safety zones for the Riverside Municipal Airport. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this regard due to its distance from the Riverside Municipal Airport.</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>8f. Response: (Source: AirNav website http://www.airnav.com/airports/get accessed February 27, 2012 and Google Earth 2012)</p> <p>Per the AirNav website and Google Earth, the proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. As described in response 8e above, the closest airport to the project site is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.9 miles northeast of the project site. Thus, there will be no impact in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8g. Response: (Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.7 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials,)</p> <p>Per the FPEIR for the City 2025 General Plan, Chapter 5.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the City of Riverside has developed an extensive Emergency Operations Plan, created by the Emergency Management Office. The City’s Fire Department promotes a high level of multi-jurisdictional cooperation and communication for emergency planning and response management through activation of the Standardized Emergency Management System. Additionally, the General Plan also provides policies to identify methods of implementing the emergency plan.</p> <p>Primary site access is proposed to be provided via gated access along County Farm Road, approximately 200 feet west of Harrison Street and secondary access is proposed via remote entry along Reynolds Drive, at the southwest portion of the project site. Compliance with City Fire codes, regulations, and conditions will ensure that implementation of the proposed project will not interfere or impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Thus, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>8h. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-7 - Fire Hazard Areas, City of Riverside’s EOP, 2002 http://intranet/Portal/uploads/Riv_City_EOP_complete.pdf)</p> <p>The proposed project is located in an urbanized area and is surrounded by development. Per Figure PS-7, Fire Hazard Areas, in the Public Safety Element of the City of Riverside 2025 General Plan, the project site is not located in a fire hazard area. The vicinity of the project site is considered to have a low fire risk and is not identified in the City’s General Plan as a high fire severity zone. Fire risk is dependant upon the moisture level in the plans and the presence of incendiary sources.</p> <p>Although any type of structure is subject to fire risk, the proposed project would not be at any greater risk than other uses adjacent to the site. Project design will include adequate emergency access, and the proposed structures will be reviewed by the City of Riverside Fire Department to ensure the design meets the Fire Department standards, including those for building materials, sprinklers, internal firewalls, access for emergency vehicles, etcetera. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No wildland fire impacts would occur.</p>				
<p>9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</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>9a. Response: (Source: State and Regional Water Boards Map 2012 http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterboards_map.shtml Accessed March 2, 2012. GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A - Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Cedar Glen Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by RBF Consulting dated 12/15/2011)</p>				
<p>The project site is within and, therefore, subject to the water quality regulations of the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (SARWQCB). The Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board is authorized to implement a municipal</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>stormwater permitting program as part of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) authority granted under the federal Clean Water Act. The general permit applicable to this project is the “Statewide General Construction Stormwater Permit” which addresses waste discharge requirements for discharges of stormwater runoff associated with construction activities. Amendments adopted in 1972 to the Clean Water Act prohibit the discharge of pollutants to navigable waters from a point source (discharge from a single conveyance such as a pipe) unless the discharge is authorized by an NPDES permit. The purpose of the NPDES program is to establish a comprehensive water quality program to manage stormwater in order to minimize pollution of the environment to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>A water quality management plan (WQMP) has been prepared for the project. The WQMP identifies the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be used on the site, including site design BMPs (to minimize urban runoff, minimize impervious footprint, provide drought tolerant landscaping and minimize directly connected impervious areas), source control BMPs (such as non-structural source control BMPs, and structural source control BMPs), and a treatment control BMP (permeable pavement, located throughout the parking area).</p> <p>More specifically, BMPs in the WQMP for the project that pertain to water quality are source control BMPs which include non-structural source control BMPs such as: education for property owners, operators, tenants, occupants or employees; common area litter control; activity restrictions; irrigation system and landscape maintenance; street sweeping private streets and parking lots; and drainage facility inspection and maintenance. Structural source control BMPs include landscape and irrigation system design and trash storage areas. The project WQMP includes Best Management Practices to improve the quality of the water that drains from the project site. The WQMP also provides BMPs to minimize urban runoff such as BMPs which maximizing permeable area and constructing onsite ponding areas or retention facilities to increase opportunities for infiltration.</p> <p>Implementation of the BMPs identified in the WQMP are anticipated to reduce impacts in this regard to a less than significant level.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9b. Response: <i>(Source: Report of Soil Percolation Testing dated December 16, 2011 prepared by Soils Southwest Inc., Cedar Glen Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by RBF Consulting dated 12/15/2011)</i></p> <p>As detailed in the Soil Percolation Testing Report prepared for the project site, the presence of groundwater was discovered approximately 43 feet below existing grade. Development of the project is unlikely to result in a net loss of groundwater supplies because the project is an urban infill residential project and does not require the construction of wells. Because landscaping and percolation sites are being built as a part of the project, recharge of ground water below the proposed project will take place. Therefore, the construction of the project is likely to result in a less than significant impact to groundwater depletion or recharge.</p> <p>The project proposes the use of permeable pavement, which will allow for infiltration of water onsite.</p> <p>The WQMP calls for project site design BMPs which will minimize impervious footprints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize the permeable area: This development includes various landscaping areas and permeable pavement sections throughout the vehicle access and parking areas. • Construct walkways, trails, patios, overflow parking lots, alleys, driveways, low-traffic streets and other low -traffic areas with open-jointed paving materials or permeable surfaces, such as pervious concrete, porous asphalt, unit pavers, and granular materials: Permeable pavement is utilized throughout vehicle access and parking areas. 				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimize the use of impervious surfaces, such as decorative concrete, in the landscape design: The landscaping areas do not contain any impervious surfaces. <p>The BMPs described above will increase groundwater recharge because the site will not be covered with impermeable pavements, which would prohibit or greatly reduce the ability of water to recharge. In addition, the project proposes to obtain water from a domestic water supply and as such will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. No wells are located onsite nor are any proposed as part of the project. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.</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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9c. Response: (Source: Preliminary grading plan, and RBF Consulting 2012. Drainage Study for Cedar Glen. January 16.)</p> <p>The project is located in an urban area of the City of Riverside and as such, the project will not alter the course of a stream or river. Thus, there are no impacts regarding the alternation of a stream or river. Per the grading plan for the project, there will be a slight change in grade (2:1) between the existing block wall that borders the Lowes site to the south of the project site, however, no steep hills or slopes will be located onsite and thus the potential for erosion or siltation is reduced. Thus, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or offsite. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.</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 flooding on- or off-site?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9d. Response: (Source: Drainage Study for Cedar Glen. January 16.)</p> <p>The project is located in an urban area of the City of Riverside and as such, the project will not alter the course of a stream or river. Thus, there are no impacts regarding the alternation of the course of a stream or river.</p> <p>Per the Drainage Study prepared for the project, permeable pavement sections have been proposed to mitigate the 100-year peak flow rate to less than the pre-development condition. Additionally, the proposed permeable pavement sections onsite will effectively handle nuisance flows, roof runoff, and all other runoff from the project site. As detailed in the Drainage Study for the project, the developed condition analysis shows that the entire peak flow rate is mitigated to below the pre-development condition with the use of permeable pavement. With current onsite (pre-development) conditions, the 100-year peak flow rate in cubic feet per second (cfs) is 3.7. However, with inclusion of permeable pavement (post-development with permeable pavement-mitigated), the 100-year peak flow rate is 3.6 (cfs). Therefore, with the proposed project and implementation of permeable pavement onsite, the 100-year peak flow rate will be reduced compared to the pre-development condition. Thus, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site in a manner which would result in a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding onsite or offsite. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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>9e. Response: <i>(Source: Drainage Study for Cedar Glen. January 16. and Cedar Glen Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by RBF Consulting dated 12/15/2011)</i></p> <p>As detailed in the Drainage Study for the project, permeable pavement sections have been proposed to mitigate the 100-year peak flow rate to less than the pre-development condition. Additionally, the proposed permeable pavement sections onsite will effectively handle nuisance flows, roof runoff, and all other runoff from the project site. As detailed in the Drainage Study for the project, the developed condition analysis shows that the entire peak flow rate is mitigated to below the pre-development condition with the use of permeable pavement. Therefore, with the proposed project and implementation of permeable pavement onsite, the 100-year peak flow rate will be reduced compared to the pre-development condition. Thus, the project will not 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. Under post-development conditions, the inclusion of permeable pavement will reduce the 100-year peak flow rate compared to existing (pre-development conditions), thus the project will not result in an increase in 100-year peak flow rate compared to current site conditions.</p> <p>A Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) has been prepared for the project which includes Best Management Practices to improve the quality of the water that drains from the project site. The WQMP also provides BMPs to minimize urban runoff such as BMPs which maximizing permeable area and constructing onsite ponding areas or retention facilities to increase opportunities for infiltration. Per the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) prepared for the project, the following Project Site Design Best Management Practices (BMPs) will minimize urban runoff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximize the permeable area: This development includes various landscaping areas and permeable pavement sections throughout the vehicle access and parking areas. • Maximize canopy interception and water conservation by planting additional native or drought tolerant trees and large shrubs: Native/drought tolerant landscaping will be included in this project as appropriate. • Construct onsite ponding areas or retention facilities to increase opportunities for infiltration consistent with vector control objectives: The permeable pavement areas will retain and infiltrate runoff. <p>Therefore, with implementation of BMPs in the WQMP for the proposed project, less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.</p>				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>9f. Response: <i>(Source Cedar Glen Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by RBF Consulting dated 12/15/2011)</i></p> <p>A Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) has been prepared for the project. The WQMP identifies the Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be used on the site, including site design BMPs, source control BMPs, and a treatment control BMP. The proposed treatment control BMP for the project is permeable pavement, which will be located throughout the parking area. Indicator bacteria are the one potential pollutant of concern that causes an impairment in receiving waters associated with the project. To reduce this pollutant, the inclusion of permeable pavement sections allows for a high removal efficiency of bacteria and viruses.</p> <p>The WQMP also includes source control BMPs which include non-structural source control BMPs such as: education for property owners, operators, tenants, occupants or employees; common area litter control; activity restrictions; irrigation system and landscape maintenance; street sweeping private streets and parking lots; and drainage facility inspection and maintenance. Structural source control BMPs include landscape and irrigation system design and trash storage areas. Implementation of the BMPs identified in the WQMP are anticipated to reduce impacts in this regard to a less than significant level.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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>9g. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 - Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Panel 0715G)</i></p> <p>Per Figure PS-4, Flood Hazard Areas, which shows the potential dam inundation zones throughout the City, the project site is not located in a dam inundation area. Additionally, per Figure PS-4, the project site is not located in a flood hazard area for either a 100-year or 500-year flood zone.</p> <p>Per Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Hazard map Panel 0715G, the project site is located in Flood Zone X (other areas), which is an area determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance flood plain. Therefore, the project is anticipated to have no impact regarding placing 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>9h. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 - Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Panel 0715G)</i></p> <p>Per Figure PS-4, Flood Hazard Areas, which shows the potential dam inundation zones throughout the City, the project site is not located in a dam inundation area. Additionally, per Figure PS-4, the project site is not located in a flood hazard area for either a 100-year or 500-year flood zone.</p> <p>Per Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Hazard map Panel 0715G, the project site is located in Flood Zone X (other areas), which is an area determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance flood plain. Therefore, the project is anticipated to have no impact regarding placing structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows. Therefore, no impact is anticipated in this regard.</p>				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9i. Response: <i>(Source: City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 - Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps Zone X, Panel 0715G and panel number)</i></p> <p>Per the City of Riverside Public Safety Element of the General Plan 2025, the flood risk areas within the City of Riverside include the area adjacent to the Santa Ana River; lands alongside arroyos, washes and drainage channels; and lands in the vicinity of several dams, including the Harrison Dam, Woodcrest Dam, Mary Street Dam, Prenda Dam, Box Springs Dam, Mockingbird Canyon Dam, Alessandro Dam, Cajalco Dam and Lake Evans Dam. Areas near dams are considered to be at risk in the event of dam failure. Riverside lies downstream from several dams and debris basins whose drainages ultimately flow into the Santa Ana River or its tributaries. Inundation hazards range from high to low with distance away from Lake Mathews and other reservoirs, such as Harrison and Mockingbird Reservoirs. Per Figure PS-4, Flood Hazard Areas, which shows the potential dam inundation zones throughout the City, the project site is not located in a dam inundation area. Additionally, per Figure PS-4, the project site is not located in a flood hazard area for either a 100-year or 500-year flood zone.</p> <p>Per Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Hazard map Panel 0715G, the project site is located in Flood Zone X (other areas), which is an area determined to be outside the 0.2 percent annual chance flood plain. Therefore the project is anticipated to have no impact regarding the exposure of people or structures to a significant loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>9j. Response: <i>(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Chapter 7.5.8 - Hydrology and Water Quality)</i></p> <p>Per Chapter 7.5.8 of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR because of the City’s distance from the ocean, there is no foreseeable risk of tsunami (tidal wave) inundation. Seiches are oscillations in enclosed bodies of water caused by seismic waves. Existing development is subject to hazards from seiches in reservoirs such as Lake Mathews and Lake Evans and other small water bodies. Mudflows associated with erosion may also occur in portions of the community.</p> <p>The proposed project is located approximately 30 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. There are no creeks, lakes streams or small bodies of water located in the vicinity of the project site. The site is relatively flat and surrounded by level terrain. Therefore, no impact regarding inundation by seismic seiche, tsunami, or mudflow is anticipated.</p>				
<p>10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan (2009))</i></p> <p>The project is located in the Arlington Neighborhood (General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element) within the City of Riverside and is within the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan area. The proposed project will not physically divide an established community because it will be infill development located adjacent to an existing Lowes store. The project is surrounded by predominantly institutional land uses such as care homes and detention facilities, thus development of the proposed project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.</p>				
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>10b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 - Land Use Policy Map, Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan (November 2009))</i></p> <p>The project is located in the Arlington Neighborhood within the City of Riverside and is within the Galleria District of the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan area. In 2011, the City of Riverside adopted a revised Arlington Community Plan. With the adoption of the General Plan 2025, the City’s Community Plans no longer exist in that form and will be replaced over time with Neighborhood Plans. Therefore, the policies of the Arlington Community Plan have been incorporated into General Plan 2025, as well as into the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan. In addition, the Specific Plan reflects the design direction of the Arlington Community Plan and includes many of its recommendations (Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan).</p> <p>The vision, goals, and implementation measures of the Specific Plan are based on the direction given in the City of Riverside’s General Plan 2025, adopted in 2007. Adoption of the Specific Plan establishes the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan Overlay Zone, which incorporates all of the standards for land use and development set forth in this Plan. The regulations of this Specific Plan are in addition to those set forth in the planning and zoning provisions of the Riverside Zoning Code, and any other applicable ordinances (Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan).</p> <p>The proposed project is located within the Galleria District of the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan (MASP). The project site is currently vacant and undeveloped and the proposed project will develop the site with apartments. The proposed project is consistent with the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan (MASP) because, as stated on page 3-14 of the MASP, "While the</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>District should continue to accommodate the automobile because of the nature of its land uses, improvements and amenities that support transit, pedestrians and bicyclists are needed." The proposed project enables pedestrian/bicycle access to and from the project site, enabling residents to walk/ride to the nearby retail establishments located in the Galleria District. Additionally, the proposed project complies with Policy 1.4 of the MASP: "Through consistent landscaping, improved pedestrian amenities, quality infill development, and other urban design elements, create a sense of place for the Galleria District." The proposed project is a quality infill development that includes a landscape planting palette which will enhance the architecture on the project site. Additionally, the proposed project will add residents to the Galleria District and in doing so it is anticipated that those who reside in the proposed development will access the local retail centers and shops. Therefore, the proposed project is in conformance with the Magnolia Avenue Specific Plan.</p> <p>The General Plan designation for the project site is C (commercial) and the Zoning designation is Office (O) with a O-S-4 (Office and Four-Story Building Height Overlay Zone). The project includes a General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation from C- Commercial to Medium High Density Residential (MHDR) and includes a request to rezone the project site from the O-Office with O-S-4 Zone to the R-3-3000- Multiple-Family Residential Zone.</p> <p>The following impact is considered less than significant because the Project includes a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact LUP-1 The Project is not consistent with the existing General Plan and Zoning designations for the site. <p>With approval of the requested General Plan Amendment and Zone Change the discrepancy between General Plan and Zoning designations would be remedied.</p>				
<p>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>10c. Response: <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)</i></p> <p>See Response 4f above.</p>				
<p>11. MINERAL RESOURCES.</p>				
<p>Would the project:</p>				
<p>a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11a. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure - OS-1 - Mineral Resources)</i></p> <p>Per Figure OS-1, Mineral Resources, in the Open Space and Conservation Element of the City of Riverside General Plan, the project site is not a mineral resource site. The project site falls within Mineral Resource Zone 4 (MRZ-4), which, per the City's General Plan indicates that the area has available geologic information that indicates that mineral deposits exist or are likely to exist, however, the significance of the deposits are undetermined. Thus, the proposed project is not anticipated to have an impact in this regard because it does not fall within a state-classified mineral resource zone and because the site is not indicated in the City's General Plan as being within a specific mineral resource site.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>11b. Response: (<i>Source: General Plan 2025 Figure - OS-1 - Mineral Resources</i>)</p> <p>See response 11a above.</p>				
<p>12. NOISE.</p>				
<p>Would the project result in:</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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12a. Response: (<i>Source: 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, Table 5.11-E - Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Title 7 - Noise Code, and Acoustical Impact Assessment prepared by MBA on March 16, 2012</i>)</p> <p>Noise exposure standards have been developed by the State of California and are recommended for inclusion into the Noise Element of local General Plans. The guidelines adopted by the City of Riverside are included in the City’s General Plan 2025 Noise Element in Figure N-10, Noise/Land Use Compatibility Criteria (see Appendix A of Noise Impact Assessment); these guidelines are mainly advisory. If noise levels are estimated to exceed these guidelines, noise mitigation must be evaluated and implemented, where feasible.</p> <p>According to the data provided in Figure N-10, noise impacts upon residential uses are normally acceptable up to 60 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL; conditionally acceptable up to 65 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL; normally unacceptable between 65 and 70 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL; and conditionally unacceptable above 70 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL. In this regard, the phrase “normally acceptable” is defined by the City as, “specific land use is satisfactory, based on the assumption that any building is of normal conventional construction, without any special noise insulation requirements.” Conditionally acceptable is defined as “new construction or development should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design. Conventional construction but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning, will normally suffice.” Likewise, the phrase “normally unacceptable” is defined as “new construction or development should generally be discouraged. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in design.” And, the phrase “conditionally unacceptable” is defined as “new construction or development should generally not be undertaken, unless it can be demonstrated that noise reduction requirements can be employed to reduce noise impacts to an acceptable level. If new construction or development does proceed, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.” Noise impacts upon infill residential uses are normally acceptable up to 65dBA L_{dn}/CNEL; conditionally acceptable up to 75 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL; normally unacceptable up to 80 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL; and conditionally unacceptable above 80 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL.</p> <p>Therefore, as the project is a residential infill project, the applicable noise standard for determining land use compatibility, with regard to noise impacts upon the project site, is 65 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL. The noise standard for impacts to the adjacent nursing home and County buildings would be 60 dBA and 65 dBA L_{dn}/CNEL respectively.</p> <p>Sections 7.25.010 and 7.35.010, of the Riverside Municipal Code, provide general noise regulations regarding noise that is produced onsite and projected onto surrounding land uses; these limits apply to noise generated by onsite activity and construction. Based on Section 7.25.010 of the Municipal Code, the maximum noise level that can be emitted from the project site upon the nearest point of any neighboring land use is provided in Table 7, Exterior Nuisance Sound Level Limits.</p>				

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

Table 7: Exterior Nuisance Sound Level Limits

Land Use Category	Time Period	Noise Level
Residential	Night (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)	45 dBA
	Day (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	55 dBA
Commercial	Any time	65 dBA

Section 7.25.010 also provides criteria that apply to any exceedance of the limits that are provided in Table 2; these criteria are primarily used for the purposes of code enforcement, but are provided here to outline the parameters by which a noise exceedance would be evaluated. The applicable criteria state:

- A. Unless a variance has been granted as provided in this chapter, it shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow the creation of any noise which exceeds the following:
 - 1. The exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, up to five decibels, for a cumulative period of more than thirty minutes in any hour; or
 - 2. The exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, plus five decibels, for a cumulative period of more than fifteen minutes in any hour; or
 - 3. The exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, plus ten decibels, for a cumulative period of more than five minutes in any hour; or
 - 4. The exterior noise standard of the applicable land use category, plus fifteen decibels, for the cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or
 - 5. The exterior noise standard for the applicable land use category, plus twenty decibels or the maximum measured ambient noise level, for any period of time.
- B. If the measured ambient noise level exceeds that permissible within any of the first four noise limit categories, the allowable noise exposure standard shall be increased in five-decibel increments in each category as appropriate to encompass the ambient noise level. In the event the ambient noise level exceeds the fifth noise limit category, the maximum allowable noise level under said category shall be increased to reflect the maximum ambient noise level.
- C. If possible, the ambient noise level shall be measured at the same location along the property line with the alleged offending noise source inoperative. If for any reason the alleged offending noise source cannot be shut down, then the ambient noise must be estimated by performing a measurement in the same general area of the source but at a sufficient distance that the offending noise is inaudible. If the measurement location is on the boundary between two different districts, the noise shall be the arithmetic mean of the two districts.

Chapter 7.35 of the Riverside Municipal Code provides general noise regulations. Section 7.35.010 (B) states it is unlawful for any person to make, continue, or cause to be made or continued any disturbing, excessive, or offensive noise which causes discomfort or annoyance to reasonable persons of normal sensitivity. The following acts, among others, are declared to be disturbing, excessive, and offensive noises in violation of this section: using or operating, or permitting to be used or operated, for any purpose, any loud speaker, loudspeaker system, or similar device between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. such that the sound therefrom creates a noise disturbance across a residential property line, or at any time exceeds the maximum permitted noise level for the underlying land use category, except for any non-commercial public speaking, public assembly or other activity for which a variance has been issued; loading, unloading, opening, closing, or other handling of boxes, crates, containers, building materials, garbage cans, or similar objects, or permitting these activities between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. in such a manner as to cause a noise disturbance across a residential property line or at any time exceeds the maximum permitted noise level for the underlying land use category; and operating or causing the operation of any tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, grading or demolition work between the hours of 7 p.m. and 7 a.m. on week days and between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. on Saturdays or at any time on Sunday or federal holidays such

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>that the sound therefrom creates a noise disturbance across a residential or commercial property line or at any time exceeds the maximum permitted noise level for the underlying land use category, except for emergency work or by variance. This section does not apply to the use of domestic power tools.</p> <p>Section 7.35.020 of the Riverside Municipal Code provides exemptions to Title 7 - Noise. Section 7.35.020 (B) states the provisions of Title 7 shall not apply to those reasonable sounds emanating from authorized school bands, school athletic, and school entertainment events and occasional public and private outdoor or indoor gatherings, public dances, shows, bands, sporting and entertainment events conducted between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m.</p> <p>It must be noted that the intent of Title 7 is to protect one neighbor from another with respect to nuisance noise and not for establishment of land use compatibility.</p> <p>Therefore, the regulations that apply to project-sourced noise are summarized below:</p> <p>Reasonable sounds emanating from authorized public and private outdoor events are exempted from regulation between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.</p> <p>The use of amplified sounds (e.g., loud speakers) are restricted to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.; however, during those permitted hours, amplified sounds are restricted to levels that do not exceed the maximum allowable noise level standard at the property line of any surrounding land use.</p> <p>Construction-related activity is limited to weekdays, from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., and Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., excluding federal holidays, such that the construction noise does not, at any time, exceed any surrounding land use's maximum allowable noise level standard at the property line.</p> <p>The construction activities associated with the proposed project would be consistent with the above guidelines. In addition, as discussed in Items 12 c) and 12 d), long-term noise and construction noise impacts, respectively, would be less than significant. However, to further reduce construction noise levels, the following mitigation measures are recommended.</p> <p>MM NOI-1 All construction equipment shall use available noise suppression devices and properly maintained mufflers. All internal combustion engines used in the project area shall be equipped with the type of muffler recommended by the vehicle manufacturer. In addition, all equipment shall be maintained in good mechanical condition to minimize noise created by faulty or poorly maintained engine, drive train, and other components.</p> <p>MM NOI-2 During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receptors and as far as possible from the boundary of the sensitive use.</p>				
<p>b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-G - Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment)</p>				
<p>The human response to vibration greatly depends on whether the source is continuous or transient. Continuous sources of vibration include certain construction activities, while transient sources include large vehicle movements. Generally, thresholds of perception and agitation are higher for continuous sources.</p> <p>Table 8 illustrates the human response to both continuous and transient sources of groundborne vibration.</p>				

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

Table 8: Human Response to Groundborne Vibration

Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second)		Human Response
Continuous	Transient	
0.40	2.00	Severe
0.10	0.90	Strongly perceptible
0.04	0.25	Distinctly perceptible
0.01	0.04	Barely perceptible

Source: California Department of Transportation, 2004.

Typically, developed areas are continuously affected by vibration velocities of 50 VdB or lower. These continuous vibrations are not noticeable to humans whose threshold of perception is around 65 VdB. Offsite sources that may produce perceptible vibrations are usually caused by construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads, while smooth roads rarely produce perceptible groundborne noise or vibration (Table 9). Acceptable vibration levels for an office environment would be 84 VdB, while levels for a residential use would be 78 VdB.

Table 9: Vibration Levels Generated by Construction Equipment

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity (inches/second) at 25 feet	Approximate Vibration Level (Lv) at 25 feet
Pile driver (impact)	1.518 (upper range) 0.644 (typical)	112 104
Pile driver (sonic)	0.734 upper range 0.170 typical	105 93
Clam shovel drop (slurry wall)	0.202	94
Hydromill (slurry wall)	0.008 in soil 0.017 in rock	66 75
Vibratory Roller	0.210	94
Hoe Ram	0.089	87
Large bulldozer	0.089	87
Caisson drill	0.089	87
Loaded trucks	0.076	86
Jackhammer	0.035	79
Small bulldozer	0.003	58

Source: Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Federal Transit Administration, May 2006.

While long-term operations of the proposed project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels, short-term construction could potentially introduce groundborne vibration to the project site and the surrounding area. Specialty construction equipment such as pile drivers or large earthmovers, as well as construction activities such as well drilling, can be a continuous source of excessive groundborne vibration.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Construction activities can produce vibration that may be felt by adjacent uses. The construction of the proposed project would not require the use of equipment such as pile drivers, which are known to generate substantial construction vibration levels. The primary source of vibration during project construction would likely be from a bulldozer (tractor), which would generate 0.089 inch per second PPV at 25 feet with an approximate vibration level of 87 VdB. The vibration from the bulldozer would be intermittent and not a source of continual vibration.</p> <p>The closest sensitive receptor to the project site is the nursing home 80 feet north of the site boundary. It is anticipated that vibration levels generated by a bulldozer and experienced at the nearest offsite structure would be approximately 71 VdB, which is below the acceptable level of 78 VdB for residential (sensitive) uses during the day.</p> <p>While grading and earthmoving activities would occur on the project site, the use of pile drivers, large earthmovers, and other construction equipment and activities associated with groundborne vibration are not expected to occur. Therefore, impacts associated with the vibration from construction equipment are considered to be less than significant.</p>				
<p>c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>12c. Response: <i>(Source: Acoustical Impact Assessment prepared by MBA on March 16, 2012)</i></p>				
<p>The primary source of project-related noise impacts would be generated by project-related traffic. Noise from passenger vehicles occurs mainly from the tire-roadway interface and is therefore located at ground level; noise from heavy trucks is produced by a combination of noise from tires, engine, and exhaust, resulting in a noise source that is approximately 8 feet above the ground. The traffic study shows that the amount of traffic generated by the General Plan-approved commercial land use would be greater than the amount of traffic anticipated from the proposed residential project, with 9,090 and 678 daily trips generated respectfully.</p> <p>The Traffic Study performed for the project determined which roadways are likely to be used by vehicles accessing the project. Average daily traffic (ADT) volumes for those roadways under various scenarios were calculated and offsite noise levels were calculated along road segments in the project vicinity for the following scenarios: existing conditions; existing plus project conditions; year 2015 conditions, with and without project; and Year 2015 cumulative projects, with and without project. A maximum noise increase of 0.1 dBA due to project-related traffic would occur along all the road segments analyzed (see Appendix A for calculation table). An increase of 3 dBA is considered barely perceivable to most healthy ears. Typically an increase of 5 dBA or greater is considered one of significance, as it is considered readily perceptible. This increase in noise over existing conditions is less than the 5 dBA threshold of significance.</p> <p>The proposed project includes amenities that will facilitate community gathering and physical activity for the health and enjoyment of its residents. These amenities will include an exercise circuit throughout the site with outdoor exercise equipment, two play areas to facilitate the needs of multiple age groups of children, a half basketball court, and striped hard court activities such as foursquare and hop scotch. There will be two passive seating areas with fireplaces, a large shade pavilion with barbecues, smaller individual picnic areas with tables and barbecues throughout the site, and an extensive open lawn area for field sports that has an adjoining tiered amphitheater so that the field may also be used as a gathering space for activities such as outdoor movies. The property will also have an expansive pool area adjacent to the community center and rental office. These amenities are centrally located within the project and the proposed buildings will shield both the residents using the facilities from adjacent roadway noise and adjacent land uses from the minimal noise generated by residents using the amenities.</p> <p>Therefore, the project will not cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project and impacts are less than significant.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12d. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.11-J - Construction Equipment Noise Levels and Acoustical Impact Assessment prepared by MBA on March 16, 2012)				
<p>To ascertain the existing noise at and adjacent to the project site, field monitoring was conducted on Tuesday, March 6, 2012. The field survey noted that noise within the proposed project area is generally characterized by vehicular noise and noise from the occasional loud individual passing by the site.</p> <p>The noise measurements were taken at 4 locations at the project location (Table 10). The results of the noise level measurements are presented in (Table 10).</p>				

Table 10: Existing Noise Level Measurements

Site Location	Description	L _{eq}	L _{max}	L _{min}
Site 1	Adjacent to Reynolds Road on the western edge of the project site	50.9	67.6	41.3
Site 2	Adjacent to County Farm Road on the northern edge of the project site	60.9	79.8	40.9
Site 3	Adjacent to Harrison Street on the sidewalk at the eastern edge of the site	65.2	80.4	48.3
Site 4	On the southern portion of the site, opposite the Lowes loading docks, on the project-side of the wall approximately 10 feet from the wall. One truck was unloading at the time.	50.4	60.6	43.1

Construction Noise Analysis

Short-term noise impacts could occur during construction activities from either the noise impacts created from the transport of workers and movement of construction materials to and from the project site, or from the noise generated onsite during grading and building activities.

Construction noise levels will vary significantly based upon the size and topographical features of the active construction zone, duration of the workday, and types of equipment employed. Typical operating cycles for these types of construction equipment may involve one or two minutes of full power operation followed by three to four minutes at lower power settings. Although there would be a relatively high single event noise exposure potential, resulting in potential short-term intermittent annoyances, the effect in long-term ambient noise levels would be small when averaged over longer time (24 hours for CNEL/L_{dn}).

Noise levels were calculated using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM) modeling program and the RCNM output is located in Appendix A. Table 11 below shows the noise levels associated with potential construction equipment use without any attenuation.

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

Table 11: Unmitigated Construction Equipment Noise Levels

Equipment Description	Noise Levels at Oak Tree Nursing Home ~80 feet from site (dBA)		Noise Levels at Geel Place ~100 feet from site (dBA)		Noise Levels at County building ~107 feet from site (dBA)	
	L _{max} ^a	L _{eq} ^{a, b}	L _{max} ^a	L _{eq} ^{a, b}	L _{max} ^a	L _{eq} ^{a, b}
Excavator	76.6	72.6	74.7	70.7	74.1	70.1
Dozer	77.6	73.6	75.6	71.7	75.1	71.1
Grader	80.9	76.9	78	75	78.4	74.4
Tractor	79.9	75.9	79	79.2	77.4	73.4

Notes:
^a Reflects a 6 dBA drop in noise level for every doubling of the distance from the source.
^b Represents the noise level averaged over the time the equipment is operated (not a 24-hr average level, such as CNEL or L_{dn}) if the equipment was continually used.
Sources: Air Quality Assessment and FHWA Road Construction Noise Model User's Guide (2006a).

The nearest existing sensitive receptor to the project site is the nursing home north of the project site. The nursing is located approximately 80 feet from the project boundary. At this distance, maximum noise levels from construction activities would occur during grading and is expected to be approximately 80.9 dBA L_{max}. The levels reported above would only occur as the piece of construction equipment passes within 80, 100, or 107 feet of the receptor boundary. The noise from construction equipment would be transitory, intermittent, and not a source of continuous noise. Grading of the project site is anticipated to take approximately one month. Noise levels in this range would not represent a substantial short-term increase over ambient maximum noise levels, as the ambient data shown in Table 11 indicate that measured daytime maximum noise levels currently range from 60.6 to 80.4 dBA at adjacent uses. In addition, construction activities would be temporary in nature, are anticipated to occur only during normal daytime working hours (7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Saturday), and are expected to comply with all local noise ordinances and regulations.

Construction noise impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant. To further reduce the noise impact, Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, as identified in Item 12 a) above, are recommended.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

12e. Response: (Source: Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan- October 14, 2004, General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 - Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6, Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, Google Earth, 2012)

The closest airport to the project site is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.9 miles northeast of the project site. Per the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan dated October 14, 2004, the project site is located outside of the airport's compatibility zones. Additionally, per Figure PS-6, Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, in the Public Safety Element of the City's 2025 General Plan, the project site is located outside of the airport safety zones for the Riverside Municipal Airport. In addition, per Figure N-8, Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours in the City's 2025 General Plan, the project is located outside of all of the CNEL contours (55, 60 and 65 CNEL) for the Riverside and Flabob Airports, therefore, no impact is anticipated in this regard.

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project 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>12f. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 - Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, AirNav website http://www.airnav.com/airports/get accessed February 27, 2012, Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan dated October 14, 2004 and Google Earth)</p> <p>The closest airport to the project site is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.9 miles northeast of the project site. Per the Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan dated October 14, 2004, the project site is located outside of the airport's compatibility zones. Additionally, per Figure PS-6, Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, in the Public Safety Element of the City's 2025 General Plan, the project site is located outside of the airport safety zones for the Riverside Municipal Airport</p> <p>Per the AirNav website and Google Earth, the proposed project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. As described in response 8e. above, the closest airport to the project site is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.9 miles northeast of the project site. Thus, there will be no impact in this regard.</p>				
<p>13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</p>				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>13a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.12-A - SCAG Population and Households Forecast, Table 5.12-B - General Plan Population and Employment Projections-2025, and 2010 Census City of Riverside Quickfacts Website: http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/06/0662000.html accessed February 23, 2012)</p> <p>In the City of Riverside there are 3.23 persons per household, per 2010 Census City of Riverside Quickfacts and 2.92 persons per household per Table H-5, Household Characteristics, in the City of Riverside Housing Element). For the purposes of this analysis, the higher persons per household number has been utilized to estimate the population of the project. The project will provide 102 apartment units to accommodate an estimated population of 330 residents (102 units multiplied by 3.23 persons per household).</p> <p>Based on 2010 census data, the City of Riverside has a population of 303,871 persons. Per Table 5.12-B, General Plan Population and Employment Projections-2025, the City's estimated population (using typical population calculations) is 346,867 for the year 2025. Based on this information, the City of Riverside expects to grow by 42,996 persons (i.e. approximately 12.39 percent) between 2010 and 2025. This equates to an approximate increase of 2,867 persons per year between 2010 and 2025. Thus, the proposed project would fall within the projected future population for the City of Riverside.</p> <p>Per Table 5.12-A, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) Population and Households Forecast, of the FPEIR for the City 2025 General Plan, SCAG's population estimate for the City of Riverside in 2025 is a population of 353,397 persons. Based on SCAG's population estimate, the City of Riverside will grow by 49,526 persons (i.e. approximately 14 percent) between 2010 and 2025. This equates to an approximate increase of 3,302 persons per year between 2010 and 2025. Thus, the proposed project would fall within SCAG's projected future population for the City of Riverside.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth <i>not already anticipated</i> in the City and therefore impacts in this regard are considered less than significant.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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>13b. Response: (Source: project site visit by Michael Brandman Associates staff)</p> <p>The project site is currently a vacant site, therefore no housing exists onsite. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard.</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>13c. Response: (Source: project site visit by Michael Brandman Associates staff)</p> <p>The project site is currently a vacant site, therefore no housing exists onsite. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard.</p>				
14. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>14a. Response: (Source: FPEIR- Section 5.13- Public Services, FPEIR Table 5.13-B - Fire Station Locations, and Riverside Fire Department Website 2012 http://www.riversideca.gov/fire/stations.asp Accessed March 1, 2012, email correspondence with William Schellhous, Fire Marshal/Division Chief for the City of Riverside Fire Department)</p> <p>As shown in FPEIR Table 5.13-B, Fire Station Locations, the nearest fire station to the project site is Station 2- Arlington, which is located at 9450 Andrew Street. Per correspondence with William Schellhous, the Arlington Fire Station has a staffing level of 11 personnel maintained 24 hours a day. However, when needed additional personnel are also available to respond from other nearby fire stations. A first alarm response would include a total of 16 personnel, a second alarm response would include 27 personnel and a third alarm response would include 34 personnel. The City of Riverside Fire Department has adequate equipment, staffing and other resources to maintain high standards of service throughout its jurisdiction.</p> <p>The Arlington fire station houses one Type I Paramedic Fire Engine, one 100' Aerial Ladder Truck, one Paramedic Rescue Squad, one Level A Hazardous Materials response vehicle, and one Level A Hazardous Materials decontamination vehicle. The Arlington fire station also houses one Battalion Chief and various other support vehicles. In addition, specialized equipment is also available to respond to this location if needed from other fire stations. This other equipment would include Heavy Rescue resources, Mass Casualty resources, Breathing Support and Lighting resources, and Fire Investigation resources (William Schellhous). Per the FPEIR for the City 2025 General Plan, the average time for onsite response to fire calls is 5 minutes, 30 seconds. William Schellhous indicated that typical response time is between 4 and 6 minutes, with a standard to respond within five minutes or less 90 percent of the time.</p> <p>The addition of 102 apartments onsite and the addition of an estimated 330 residents of the project site is anticipated to impact fire services in the project area because the addition of residents is anticipated to increase the need for fire services.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact			
<p>Per William Schellhaus, the fire Department does anticipate that with the addition of the proposed development the call volume will increase and that the demand for fire prevention services including fire safety inspections will also increase. However, the Fire Department has adequate equipment, staffing and other resources to maintain their high standards of service throughout their jurisdiction. The project consists of a proposal to construct a multi-family residential development consisting of 102 apartments with common open space and related parking. Adequate fire facilities and services are provided by Station #2 located at 9450 Andrew Street to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Fire Department practices, there will be no impacts on the demand for additional fire facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>							
<p>b. Police protection?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>14b. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 - Neighborhood Policing Centers, email correspondence with Angie King, Administrative Analyst for the City of Riverside Police Department)</i></p>							
<p>Several policing centers are located throughout the City of Riverside. As shown in Figure PS-8 in the City’s General Plan, the project site falls within the Central Policing Center and the nearest Police Department is located at the Galleria. Per the Public Facilities Element of the City’s General Plan, the Magnolia Neighborhood Policing Center (NPC), located at 10540-B Magnolia Avenue, is the base of operations for Central and West NPC Field Operations, Central and Special Investigations, Traffic Division, Special Operations, Community Policing, Training and the Records Bureau. Per correspondence with Angie King, the following police stations would serve the project area: Magnolia Police Station - 10540 Magnolia Avenue, Riverside, CA 92505 and Lincoln Police Station - 8181 Lincoln Avenue, Riverside, CA 92504. In response to a question as to whether the Police Department anticipates any adverse impacts as a result of the project, the Police Department did not identify any adverse impacts in its response. The department’s comment does encourage the management team for the proposed project to consider becoming a member of the Police Department’s Crime Free Multi-Housing Program. Thus, the addition of 102 apartments onsite and the addition of an estimated 330 residents of the project site is not anticipated to have an adverse impact regarding police protection. Therefore, the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact in this regard.</p>							
<p>c. Schools?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
<p>14c. Response: <i>(Source: Correspondence with Angie Lopez, Director of Facilities Planning/Construction for Alvord Unified School District, and FPEIR Figure 5.13-3 - AUSD Boundaries)</i></p>							
<p>Per Figure 5.13-3, AUSD Boundaries, the project site is located within the boundaries of the Alvord Unified School District (AUSD). Per correspondence from Angie Lopez, Director of Facilities Planning/Construction for Alvord Unified School District, below is information regarding the schools that students from the proposed project would attend as well as each school’s current capacity and enrollment. Per correspondence from Ms. Lopez, none of the schools listed below have any plans for future expansion.</p>							
<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="vertical-align: top; width: 33%;"> <p>Elementary School: Myra Linn Elementary 10435 Branigan Way Riverside, CA 92505 current capacity: 850 current enrollment: 708</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top; width: 33%;"> <p>Middle School: Arizona Middle School 11045 Arizona Avenue Riverside, CA 92503 current capacity: 1300 current enrollment: 1150</p> </td> <td style="vertical-align: top; width: 33%;"> <p>High School: La Sierra High School 4145 La Sierra Avenue Riverside, CA 92505 current capacity: 3800 current enrollment: 3200</p> </td> </tr> </table>					<p>Elementary School: Myra Linn Elementary 10435 Branigan Way Riverside, CA 92505 current capacity: 850 current enrollment: 708</p>	<p>Middle School: Arizona Middle School 11045 Arizona Avenue Riverside, CA 92503 current capacity: 1300 current enrollment: 1150</p>	<p>High School: La Sierra High School 4145 La Sierra Avenue Riverside, CA 92505 current capacity: 3800 current enrollment: 3200</p>
<p>Elementary School: Myra Linn Elementary 10435 Branigan Way Riverside, CA 92505 current capacity: 850 current enrollment: 708</p>	<p>Middle School: Arizona Middle School 11045 Arizona Avenue Riverside, CA 92503 current capacity: 1300 current enrollment: 1150</p>	<p>High School: La Sierra High School 4145 La Sierra Avenue Riverside, CA 92505 current capacity: 3800 current enrollment: 3200</p>					
<p>Angie Lopez also provided the following student generation rates, by grade level, for multi-family development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary School: 0.2513 • Middle School: 0.1024 • High School: 0.1264 							

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Based on the student generation rates listed directly above, the project would generate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 26 elementary school students (102 units multiplied by 0.2513) • 11 middle school students (102 units multiplied by 0.1024) and • 12 high school students (102 units multiplied by 0.1264) <p>Based on the current school capacity and current enrollment provided by the school district (listed above for each school), the additional elementary, middle and high school students to the respective schools would not exceed school capacity.</p> <p>Per Angie Lopez, below are current and new developer fees imposed by the Alvord School District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current Developer Fees for new residential: \$2.97 per square foot • New fees for new residential as of May 2012: \$3.20 per square foot <p>The project consists of a proposal to construct a multi-family residential development consisting of 102 apartments with common open space and related parking. Adequate school facilities and services are provided by Alvord Unified School District to serve this project. In addition, with implementation of General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Alvord Unified School District impact fees used to offset the impact of new development, there will be less than significant impacts on the demand for additional school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</p>				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14d. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 - Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-1, Park and Recreational Amenities in the General Plan 2025, FPEIR for the 2025 General Plan-Section 5.14 Recreation, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees)</i></p> <p>Per Figure PR-1 and Table PR-1 in the City’s General Plan, the project is located in proximity to several parks including:</p> <p>Challen Park (located approximately 0.37 mile north of the project site)- this is a 33-acre undeveloped park</p> <p>Bryant Park (Arlanza Community Center) (located approximately 1 mile northwest of the project site)- this is a 19.65-acre park with lighted softball fields, basketball and tennis courts, community center with gym, playground, picnic tables, barbeques, covered picnic areas, snack bar, childcare and social services center.</p> <p>Don Lorenzi Park (located approximately 0.8 mile northeast of the project site) - this is a 9.08-acre park with lighted sports fields, picnic tables and barbeques, restrooms and onsite parking.</p> <p>Hunt Park (Joe Renck Community Center) (located approximately 0.9 mile northeast of the project site) - this is a 13.93-acre park with lighted softball field and basketball court, sports field, volleyball court, community center, playground, pool, picnic tables, barbeques and skateboard facility.</p> <p>With the addition of an estimated 330 residents, it is anticipated that development of the project may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks.</p> <p>Per the Recreation section of the FPEIR for the City’s 2025 General Plan, Chapter 16.60, Local Park Development Fees, of the City of Riverside Municipal Code was created to enable the acquisition, development, or improvement of neighborhood and community parks to provide both passive and active recreational opportunities to the residents of the City of Riverside in order to improve the quality of life for the public.</p> <p>Per Chapter Section 16.60.020, Determinations, of the City’s Municipal Code, “The imposition of a Local Park Development Fee is necessary to provide funding for the acquisition and/or development of new parks and the expansion and/or improvement (including rehabilitation) of existing parks in order to provide adequate neighborhood and community parks benefiting the development upon which the fee is imposed. The amount of the Local Park Development Fee is to be calculated based upon the following adopted minimum standards: that the public interest, convenience, health, welfare and safety requires the provision of three acres of local parks per thousand population, consisting of 0.75 acre of Community Park per thousand population and 2.25 acres of Neighborhood Park per thousand population.”</p> <p>In lieu of payment of all or a portion of the Local Park Development Fee, land may be dedicated to the City of Riverside for</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
park and recreational purposes. The proposed project does not propose to dedicate any land to the City of Riverside for park and recreational purposes. The proposed project is required to pay park fees. These fees are a requirement for project development and are anticipated to reduce impacts to parks to a less than significant level.				
e. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>14e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure LU-8 - Community Facilities, FPEIR Figure 5.13-5 - Library Facilities, Figure 5.13-6 - Community Centers, Table 5.3-F - Riverside Community Centers, Table 5.13-H - Riverside Public Library Service Standards, Arlington Branch Library website http://www.riversideca.gov/library/loc_arlington.asp accessed March 6, 2012 and http://www.riversideca.gov/finance/finance-cfd.asp accessed March 6, 2012)</p>				
<p>Library Facilities</p>				
<p>Per Figure LU-8 in the City’s General Plan, the Arlington Brach Library is the closest library branch to the project site and is, located at 9556 Magnolia Avenue, approximately .4 mile southeast of the project site. The Arlington Brach Library is over 13,000 sq ft. Per Table 5.13-H, Riverside Public Library Service Standards, branch libraries are designed at 13,000 sq ft, which meets the service standard for 21,666 persons. The Arlington Branch library was expanded such that it is now over 13,000 sq ft and per Table 5.13-H, will be adequate, per the 0.6 sq ft standard for 21,666 persons.</p>				
<p>The project’s estimated population of 330 residents makes up approximately 1.5 percent of those who would be served by the Arlington Branch Library, assuming all project residents only used the Arlington Branch Library. Per the City of Riverside Finance website, Measure I Library Funding for library services was passed and expires in the year 2022, which provides additional funding for the City’s library system. The project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact on library services due to the number of residents estimated to be generated by the proposed project and that the Arlington Brach library is anticipated to be able to meet the needs of project residents. Thus, no mitigation is required related to library facilities, as the library currently meets the 0.6 sq ft standard for 21,666 persons and local taxes will provide library funding.</p>				
<p>The Renck Community Center/ Hunt Park are located at 4015 Jackson Street. Hunt Park, approximately 0.9 mile northeast of the project site includes the following amenities: softball field, basketball court, sports field, volleyball court, community center, playground, pool, picnic tables, barbeque, skateboard facility and restroom. The Renck Community Center is 6,337 sq ft.</p>				
<p>Community Facilities</p>				
<p>The amenities present in the project’s design will facilitate community gathering and physical activity for the health and enjoyment of its residents. These amenities will include an exercise circuit throughout the site with outdoor exercise equipment, two play areas to facilitate the needs of multiple age groups of children, a half basketball court, and striped hard court activities such as foursquare and hop scotch. As far as gathering spaces, there will be two passive seating areas with fire places, a large shade pavilion with barbecues, smaller individual picnic areas with tables and barbecues throughout the site, and an extensive open lawn area for field sports that has an adjoining tiered amphitheater so that the field may also be used as a gathering space for activities like outdoor movies. The property will also have an expansive pool area adjacent to the community center and rental office. Therefore, because the project includes a community building and other onsite amenities described above, the project is anticipated to have less than significant impacts to community facilities. Additionally, due to the limited population projected to occupy the project site (330 residents), less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. RECREATION.				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>15a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 - Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-1, Park and Recreational Amenities in the General Plan 2025, FPEIR for the 2025 General Plan-Section 5.14 Recreation, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees)</p> <p>Refer to response 15d, above regarding parks. Payment of required park fees will reduce impacts in this regard to a less than significant level.</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>15b. Response: (Source: Project Description and site plan)</p> <p>As described in response 14e. above, the amenities present in the project’s design will facilitate community gathering and physical activity for the health and enjoyment of its residents. These amenities will include an exercise circuit throughout the site with outdoor exercise equipment, two play areas to facilitate the needs of multiple age groups of children, a half basketball court, and striped hard court activities such as foursquare and hop scotch. As far as gathering spaces, there will be two passive seating areas with fire places, a large shade pavilion with barbecues, smaller individual picnic areas with tables and barbecues throughout the site, and an extensive open lawn area for field sports that has an adjoining tiered amphitheater so that the field may also be used as a gathering space for activities like outdoor movies. The property will also have an expansive pool area adjacent to the community center and rental office. Due to the onsite facilities that are proposed as part of the project, a less than significant impact is anticipated in this regard because facilities will be built onsite and are integrated into the project design to meet the needs of the project residents. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated in this regard.</p>				
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.				
Would the project result in:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16a. Response: (Source: Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by RBF Consulting, dated February 22, 2012)</p> <p>As detailed in the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the project, the proposed project consists of 102 multi-family units on approximately a 9.27-acre site. Table 12 below shows the proposed project’s trip distribution.</p>				

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

Table 12: Proposed Project Trip Generation

Trip Generation Rates								
Land Use	Unit	Daily Trip Rate	AM Peak Rate	AM In	AM Out	PM Peak Rate	PM In	PM Out
Multi-Family Residential	DU	6.65	8%	20%	80%	9%	65%	35%

Project Trip Generation									
Land Use	Intensity	Unit	Daily Trips	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
				Total	In	Out	Total	In	Out
Multi-Family Residential	102	DU	678	52	10	42	63	41	22
Total Project Trips			678	52	10	42	63	41	22

As shown in Table 12 above, the proposed project is forecast to generate 678 daily trips, which include 52 a.m. peak hour trips and 63 p.m. peak hour trips. Currently, all study intersections and roadway segments are operating at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better).

Existing Conditions (2012) Plus Project Analysis

The traffic report for the project analyzed the traffic generated from the project and added it to existing (2012) conditions and found the following: with the addition of project-generated trips in the existing year 2012, all of the study intersections are forecast to continue operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to HCM thresholds. With the addition of project-generated trips in the existing year 2012, all of the study segments are forecast to operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to City of Riverside performance criteria.

Opening Year (2015) Plus Project Analysis

Project opening year (2015) was analyzed, which includes a 2 percent growth in existing conditions volumes. Under project opening year (2015) conditions, all study intersections and roadway segments are forecast to operate at acceptable levels of service both without and with the proposed project (refer to Table 13 and Table 14 below). Therefore, no significant impacts were identified under project opening year (2015) conditions, and mitigation measures are not required.

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

Table 13: Opening Year 2015 Peak Hour Intersection Conditions Without and With Project

Study Intersection	Opening Year 2015 Without Project Conditions		Opening Year 2015 With Project Conditions		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay - LOS	Delay - LOS	Delay - LOS	Delay - LOS	
California Ave/ Harrison St	13.8 - B	15.4 - B	13.8 - B	15.5 - B	No
California Ave/ Van Buren Blvd	35.5 - D	38.4 - D	35.6 - D	38.4 - D	No
Magnolia Ave/ Tyler St	33.3 - C	37.4 - D	33.3 - C	37.5 - D	No
Magnolia Ave/ Harrison St	21.6 - C	21.8 - C	22.2 - C	22.4 - C	No
Magnolia Ave/ Van Buren Blvd	36.6 - D	38.4 - D	36.6 - D	38.5 - D	No

Note: Delay shown in seconds; Deficient intersection operation shown in bold.

As shown in the table above, with the addition of project-generated trips in the opening year 2015, all of the study intersections are forecast to continue operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to HCM thresholds.

As shown in the table below, with the addition of project-generated trips in the opening year 2015, all of the study segments are forecast to continue operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) according to City of Riverside performance criteria.

Table 14: Opening Year 2015 Conditions Roadway Segment LOS With and Without Project

Roadway	Segment	Class (# Lanes)	LOS E Capacity	Opening Year 2015 Without Project			Opening Year 2015 With Project			Impact?
				ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS	
Van Buren Boulevard	North of California Avenue	120' Arterial (6)	49,500	33,814	0.68	A	33,984	0.69	A	No
	Magnolia Avenue to SR-91	120' Arterial (6)	49,500	34,985	0.71	B	35,120	0.71	B	No
Magnolia Avenue	Tyler Street to Harrison Street	120' Arterial (6)	49,500	31,818	0.64	A	32,089	0.65	A	No
	Harrison Street to Van Buren Boulevard	100' Arterial (4)	33,000	28,399	0.86	C	28,568	0.87	C	No

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

Opening Year (2015) Plus Cumulative Conditions Analysis

Project opening year plus cumulative conditions were analyzed, which includes a 2 percent growth in existing conditions volumes and 7 approved projects in the study area. As shown in Table 15 and Table 16 below, the results of the project opening year (2015) plus cumulative conditions analysis shows that all study intersection and roadway segments are forecast to operate at LOS D or better without and with the proposed project. Therefore, no significant impacts were identified under project opening year (2015) plus cumulative conditions, and mitigation measures are not required.

Table 15: Opening Year 2015 Plus Cumulative Peak Hour Intersection Conditions Without and With Project

Study Intersections	Without Project		With Project		Significant Impact?
	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	
	Delay - LOS	Delay - LOS	Delay - LOS	Delay - LOS	
California Ave/ Harrison St	13.8 - B	15.6 - B	13.8 - B	15.6 - B	No
California Ave/ Van Buren Blvd	35.0 - D	39.1 - D	35.1 - D	39.2 - D	No
Magnolia Ave/ Tyler St	33.8 - C	38.4 - D	33.8 - C	38.4 - D	No
Magnolia Ave/ Harrison St	21.0 - C	21.2 - C	21.8 - C	21.8 - C	No
Magnolia Ave/ Van Buren Blvd	36.3 - D	39.4 - D	36.3 - D	39.5 - D	No

As shown in the table above, with the addition of project-generated trips, all of the study intersections are forecast to continue operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) for opening year plus cumulative conditions according to HCM thresholds.

Table 16: Opening Year 2015 Plus Cumulative Conditions Roadway Segment LOS Without and With Project

Roadway	Segment	Class (# Lanes)	LOS E Capacity	Without Project			With Project		
				ADT	V/C	LOS	ADT	V/C	LOS
Van Buren Boulevard	North of California Avenue	120' Arterial (6)	49,500	36,122	0.730	B	36,292	0.733	B
	Magnolia Avenue to SR-91	120' Arterial (6)	49,500	35,705	0.721	B	35,840	0.724	B
Magnolia Avenue	Tyler Street to Harrison Street	120' Arterial (6)	49,500	33,842	0.684	A	34,113	0.689	A
	Harrison Street to Van Buren Boulevard	100' Arterial (4)	33,000	30,423	0.922	D	30,592	0.927	D

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>As shown in the table above, with the addition of project-generated trips, all of the study segments are forecast to continue operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) for opening year plus cumulative conditions according to City of Riverside performance criteria.</p> <p>The results of the traffic analysis for the project found that all study intersections and roadway segments will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service. Therefore, no significant impacts were identified and mitigation measures are not required.</p>				
<p>b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16b. Response: <i>(Source: 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program, Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Website http://rctc.org/congestionmanagement.asp Accessed February 24, 2012)</i></p> <p>Per Proposition 111, each county in California is required to develop a Congestion Management Program (CMP) that analyzes at the links between land use, transportation and air quality. The Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) is the County of Riverside’s Congestion Management Agency. The RCTC prepares and periodically updates the county’s CMP to meet federal Congestion Management System guidelines and state CMP legislation (RCTC website). Per Table 2-1, CMP System of Highways and Roadways, in the 2011 Riverside County Congestion Management Program, the roads adjacent to the project site (Reynolds Drive, County Farm Road and Harrison Road) are not listed as part of the CMP System of Highways and Roadways. Therefore the project will have no impact in this regard.</p>				
<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?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16c. Response: <i>(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 - Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, , Google Earth, 2012)</i></p> <p>The nearest airport to the project site is the Riverside Municipal Airport, located approximately 1.9 miles northeast of the project site (Google Earth, 2012). Per General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 - Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, the project is outside of the Riverside Municipal Airport safety zones. Therefore, because the project site is not in the vicinity of an airport it would not affect vehicular traffic circulation and/or air traffic patterns. Therefore, no impact would occur in this regard.</p>				
<p>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16d. Response: <i>(Source: Project Site Plans, Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis Report prepared by RBF Consulting, dated February 22, 2012)</i></p> <p>The Project would construct 102 apartment units on the currently vacant site. The proposed project does not include incompatible land uses onsite, as it is an infill project, which is surrounded by urban/developed land on all sides. To the west of the project site, across the street from Reynolds Drive is an existing multi-family housing development (Geel Place). Therefore, the proposed project does not propose incompatible land uses. Primary site access is proposed to be provided via gated access along County Farm Road, approximately 200 feet west of Harrison Street and secondary access is proposed via</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>remote entry along Reynolds Drive, at the southwest portion of the project site. No access to the project site is planned at the project's frontage along Harrison Street.</p> <p>Per the Traffic Impact Analysis Report prepared for the project, the two project driveways will be controlled by stop signs at the minor-street (driveway) approaches of the intersections. Intersection corner sight distance was assessed for the two proposed project driveways. It was determined that adequate intersection corner sight distance will be provided looking in both directions of travel from the project driveways.</p> <p>A minimum sight distance of 275 feet can be provided at the project driveways, with the exception of the corner sight distance looking east from the primary driveway on County Farm Road. The sight distance looking east from the primary project driveway is limited because County Farm Road ends at the intersection of Harrison Street / County Farm Road, 200 feet east of the project site. Therefore, no through traffic will be heading westbound toward the project driveway. The travel speed of vehicles making a turn from northbound or southbound Harrison Street onto westbound County Farm Road is approximately 10-15 mph. Westbound vehicles are not likely to reach 25 mph until they have passed the location of the primary driveway. A minimum of 165 feet for corner sight distance is required based on a speed of 15 mph, which is provided.</p> <p>Although minimum corner sight distance cannot be met on County Farm Road east of the project driveway based on 25 mph speeds, slow speeds (10 to 15 mph) and metered traffic due to the upstream traffic signal at Harrison Street / County Farm Road will allow for adequate gaps in traffic. The intersection of Harrison Street / County Farm Road is clearly visible from the project driveway and poses no physical or obstructive limitations to sight distance. Therefore, the project will not create any design features or sight issues that would create a hazard and the project will have less than significant impacts in this regard.</p>				
<p>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>16e. Response: <i>(Source: Municipal Code, and Fire Code and Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by RBF Consulting, dated February 22, 2012)</i></p> <p>The project site plan will be reviewed by the City of Riverside and will be reviewed in terms of its compliance with applicable Municipal Code (such as Chapter 18.210, Development Standards and Section 13.32.080, Fire Apparatus Access Roads) regarding emergency access and Fire Code sections and as such will not result in a significant impact because it will provide adequate emergency access in accordance with City regulations and requirements. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated in this regard.</p>				
<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)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>16f. Response: <i>(Source: Figure CCM-5, Transit Facilities, in the City's 2025 General Plan, Figure CCM-6, Mater Plan of Trails and Bikeways, in the City's 2025 General Plan, General Plan 2025 Circulation and Community Mobility Element Bicycle Master Plan May 2007, Project Specific Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by RBF Consulting, dated February 22, 2012, Google Earth, 2012)</i></p> <p>Per the Traffic Impact Analysis Report prepared for the project, currently there are five Riverside Transit Agency (RTA) bus routes in the study area. Additional services provided by RTA also run in the area and include Commuter Link and Dial-a-Ride. Commuter Link routes offer service to major transit centers and Metrolink stations and Dial-a-Ride is a door-to-door service available for ADA-certified passengers.</p> <p>The closest transit stop to the project site is on RTA Route 12, with a permanent bus stop located on Harrison Street just south of Garfield Street about 150 feet north of the project site. This bus stop can be accessed using the sidewalks and the crosswalks at the County Farm Road/Harrison Street intersection. Route 12 also has commuter service on County Farm Road with a stop at Reynolds Drive, at the west side of the project site. Currently five RTA bus routes run in the study area:</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route 1 runs along the entire study segment of Magnolia Avenue. • Route 10 runs along Van Buren Boulevard from SR-91 to Magnolia Avenue and then along Magnolia to Tyler Street. • Route 12 runs along California Avenue from the east, turns onto Harrison Street to Magnolia Avenue, where it continues along Magnolia Avenue, up Tyler Street and then onto Hole Avenue. • Route 21 runs along Van Buren Boulevard north of Magnolia Avenue and then onto Magnolia Avenue to Tyler Street. • Route 13 runs along Tyler Street and ends its route at Magnolia Avenue. <p>The proposed project will not interfere with the existing bus stops for Bus Route 12 located in the vicinity of the project site, just west of the intersection of Reynolds Drive and County Farm Road and north of the intersection of County Farm Road and Harrison Street. The project site is not located near any rail corridors, per Figure CCM-5, Transit Facilities, in the Circulation and Community Mobility Element of the City’s 2025 General Plan. Therefore, the project will have no impact to these public transit facilities.</p> <p>Regarding bicycle facilities, per Figure CCM-6, Mater Plan of Trails and Bikeways, in the City’s 2025 General Plan, there are no County or City trails located adjacent to or near the project site. Per the 2007 Bicycle Master Plan for the City of Riverside, a Class 2 bikeway is defined as: Class II Bikeway provides a striped and stenciled lane for one-way travel on a street or highway. The nearest Class 2 City bikeways are located along Harrison Street and north of the project site along California Avenue. The Class 2 City bikeway along Harrison Street will not be impacted by the proposed project because the project does not propose any development that would negatively impact the operation of the bikeway. Therefore, the project will have no impact in this regard.</p> <p>Regarding pedestrian facilities, the proposed project will add two points of site access, one along County Farm Road and one along Reynolds Drive however the inclusion of these driveways are not anticipated to impact the sidewalks and pedestrian access along these sidewalks. Therefore, no impact is anticipated in this regard.</p>				
17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.				
Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17a.Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 - Sewer Facilities Map and FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas)				
<p>The proposed project would involve an increase in wastewater generated as a result of the proposed apartments onsite. Per Figure 5.16-5, the project site is within the Riverside Public Works Service Area for sewer service. As shown in General Plan 2025, Figure PF-2, Sewer Facilities Map, Riverside Public Works Department sewer lines are located in the project area.</p>				
<p>Per the FPEIR for the City of Riverside 2025 General Plan, all new development under the General Plan is required to comply with all provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program, as enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Thus, implementation of the proposed development under the General Plan would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB with respect to discharges to the sewer system or stormwater system within the City. Consequently, future development under the General Plan, such as the proposed 102-unit apartment project, would be required to adhere to existing regulations. The proposed project will be in adherence with all applicable standards, regulations, and policies of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, which are anticipated to reduce potential impacts to in this regard to less than significant.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17b. Response: <i>(Source: FPEIR- Figure 5.16-5 Sewer Service Areas, General Plan 2025 Figure PF-1, Water Service Areas, General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 - RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 - RPU Projected Water Demand, Figure 5.16-4 - Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 - Sewer Infrastructure and Riverside Public Utilities Final 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (July 2011))</i></p>				
<p>Water Facilities</p>				
<p>As depicted in FPEIR Figure 5.16-4, Water Facilities, the project site could be serviced by Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) Department water lines, which run adjacent to the project site. Per the Riverside Public Utilities 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) (Table 4-1, on page 4-1 of the UWMP), the current and projected total water supply available to Riverside Public Utilities will increase from 129,076 acre feet in 2015 to 143,226 acre-feet in 2035. Per Table 3-7, Potable Retail Water Use Projections on page 3-11 of the UWMP, which is based on future population projections, total water use projections for 2015 is 70,800 acre-feet in 2015 to 86,000 acre-feet in 2035. Thus, per the UWMP, water supply is anticipated to meet demand and therefore, the proposed project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact regarding water supply. Due to the project's location in the vicinity of existing water lines and due to the limited nature of the proposed project (102 apartments), the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or the expansion of existing treatment facilities. A less than significant impact is anticipated in this regard.</p>				
<p>Wastewater Facilities</p>				
<p>As detailed in Figure 5.16-5, Sewer Service Areas, the project site is within the Riverside Public Works Service Area. As shown in Figure 5.16-6, Sewer Infrastructure in the FPEIR, the project site is located adjacent to Riverside Public Works Department sewer lines. Per the PEIR for the City's 2025 General Plan, the City of Riverside Public Works Department provides for the collection, treatment and disposal of all wastewater through its Riverside Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant and complies with State and Federal requirements governing the treatment and discharge of wastewater.</p>				
<p>As detailed in the FPEIR for the City's 2025 General Plan, per the City of Riverside Public Utilities 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, the Riverside Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant currently treats approximately 33 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater for over 280,000 residents in the City of Riverside and the Jurupa, Edgemont, Rubidoux, and Highgrove communities. In 2005, the plant had a capacity of 40 mgd. According to the 1992 Technical Memorandum, a planned expansion by 2013 will allow the facility to treat up to 50 mgd. Due to the limited size of the proposed project (102 apartments) it is not anticipated that the proposed project will have a significant impact regarding the City's wastewater treatment facilities. Additionally, per page PF-13 of the City's 2025 General Plan, the City of Riverside has adequate planned capacity to meet the wastewater treatment needs of all future Riverside residents and businesses." Even if the planned expansion in 2013 were to not occur, it is estimated that there is adequate existing capacity because the Riverside Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant currently treats approximately 33 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater and has a capacity of 40 mgd. The proposed project would incrementally add to the amount of water the plant would need to treat each day but would not result in an exceedence of the plant's current capacity. Therefore the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities and Drainage Study for Cedar Glen, RBF Consulting, January 16, 2012)</p>				
<p>Figure 5.16-2 - Drainage Facilities in the FPEIR for the City's 2025 General Plan depicts major features of the City's drainage system. As shown in this figure, some City-owned and County-owned storm drainage facilities are located in the vicinity of the project site. Development of the project site will increase the amount of impervious surfaces onsite compared to current site conditions. As detailed in the FPEIR, increased impervious surface area will generate increased stormwater flows with potential to impact drainage facilities and require the provision of additional facilities. However, Subdivision Code (Title 18, Section 18.48.020) requires drainage fees to be paid to the City of Riverside for new construction. Fees are transferred into a drainage facilities fund which is maintained by Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. This Section also complies with the California Government Code (section 66483), which provides for the payment of fees for construction of drainage facilities. Fees are required to be paid as part of the conditions of approval/waiver for filing of a final map or parcel map.</p> <p>Additionally, per the Drainage Study prepared for the project, incorporation of permeable pavement onsite will effectively handle nuisance flows, roof runoff, and all other runoff from the site. The use of permeable pavement onsite and the requirement to pay drainage fees to the City of Riverside are anticipated to reduce project impacts to a less than significant impact.</p>				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-1, Water Service Areas, General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 - RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER SUPPLY (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 - RPU Projected Water Demand, FPEIR Figure 5.16-4 - Water Facilities)</p>				
<p>As detailed in the FPEIR for the City of Riverside General Plan, domestic water for the City of Riverside is mostly supplied from local groundwater. Approximately 97 percent of the water supplied by the Riverside Public Utilities is supplied from the following groundwater basins: Bunker Hill, Colton, Riverside North and Riverside South.</p> <p>Per Figure PF-1, Water Service Areas, the project site is located within the Riverside Public Utilities (RPU) Water Service Area. Per Table PF-1, RPU Projected Domestic Water Supply, in the City's 2025 General Plan, Riverside Public Utilities obtains domestic water from various sources, including the following existing sources (as of 2005): groundwater, imported water and recycled water. Planned sources include: John W. North Water Treatment Plant (groundwater), Riverside Groundwater-Downtown Area, Additional Gage Exchange (groundwater), recycled water and Seven Oaks Dam Conservation Storage. The General Plan indicates that total water supplies will be 116,421 acre-feet per year. Recycled water will be utilized for uses such as landscape irrigation to reduce domestic water demand.</p> <p>As shown in Table PF-2, RPU Projected Water Demand, the City of Riverside Public Utilities has projected water demand through the year 2030. As shown in the table, the total projected water demand is 104,374 acre-feet per year, which is less than the projected supply of 116,421 acre-feet per year. Per the General Plan, existing and future users, including Western Municipal Water District, are projected to demand almost one hundred five thousand acre-feet per year by 2030, which is within the supply parameters indicated in Table PF-1. Therefore, the given that the projected water demand is less than the projected water supply, less than significant impacts are anticipated in this regard.</p> <p>Additionally, as stated in Response 13a of this document, regarding population and housing, the City of Riverside expects to grow by 42,996 persons (i.e. approximately 12.39 percent) between 2010 and 2025. Despite the projected growth in the City between 2010 and 2025, use of available water per capita is anticipated to drop through recycling and recharge efforts (based</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>on the following City of Riverside General Plan Policies):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy PF-1.1: Coordinate the demands of new development with the capacity of the water system. • Policy PF-1.4: Ensure the provision of water services consistent with the growth planned for the General Plan area, including the Sphere of Influence, working with other providers. • Policy PF-1.5: Implement water conservation programs aimed at reducing demands from new and existing development. • Policy PF-2.1: Expand the use of reclaimed water for irrigation and other applications. <p>The proposed project is includes the use of water saving faucets and fixtures to reduce water usage. Additionally, the project proposes a mix of medium and low water use California friendly plantings that will satisfy water saving requirements. A weather based ‘smart’ irrigation controller will be used in conjunction with City guidelines known as the ‘Riverside Guide to California Friendly Landscaping’ to create a water conscious facility. With implementation of the above described project features, a less than significant impact is anticipated regarding water supplies for the proposed project.</p>				
<p>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17e. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 - Sewer Service Areas, Figure 5.16-6 -Sewer Infrastructure, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area)</p>				
<p>As detailed in Figure 5.16-5, Sewer Service Areas, the project site is within the Riverside Public Works Service Area. As shown in Figure 5.16-6, Sewer Infrastructure in the FPEIR, the project site is located adjacent to Riverside Public Works Department sewer lines. Per Table 5.16-K, Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, the estimated total sewage flow in the year 2025 under typical population conditions is 55.3 million gallons per day (mgd), which utilizes 96.6 gallons per day (gpd) for the future flow per capita (i.e., per person). With an estimated population of 330 residents and utilizing 96.6 gpd, the proposed project would produce an estimated sewage flow of 31,878 gallons of sewage per day which is a fraction of the 34.6 million gallons per day estimated for total sewage flow in the year 2025 under typical conditions.</p>				
<p>As detailed in the FPEIR for the City’s 2025 General Plan, per the City of Riverside Public Utilities 2005 Urban Water Management Plan, the Riverside Regional Water Quality Treatment Plant currently treats approximately 33 million gallons per day (mgd) of wastewater for over 280,000 residents in the City of Riverside and the Jurupa, Edgemont, Rubidoux, and Highgrove communities. In 2005, the plant had a capacity of 40 mgd. According to the 1992 Technical Memorandum, a planned expansion by 2013 will allow the facility to treat up to 50 mgd. Due to the limited size of the proposed project (102 apartments) it is not anticipated that the proposed project will have a significant impact regarding the City’s wastewater treatment facilities. Additionally, per page PF-13 of the City’s 2025 General Plan, the City of Riverside has adequate planned capacity to meet the wastewater treatment needs of all future Riverside residents and businesses. Therefore the project is anticipated to have a less than significant impact in this regard.</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR City of Riverside 2025 General Plan, FPEIR Table 5.16-A - Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M - Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area, and http://www.riversideca.gov/trash/commercial.asp accessed March 5, 2012, and http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/SearchList/List?COUNTY=Riverside Accessed March 5, 2012)</p> <p>The City of Riverside Department of Public Works collects trash from a majority (70 percent) of the households in the City of Riverside. The remainder of the City's solid waste is collected by a private contractor, which serves approximately 20,000 customers. Per the City of Riverside trash and recycling website, the City's Department of Public Works has instituted multi-family recycling programs through its authorized haulers. The City of Riverside has authorized commercial hauling services for the following companies: Athens Services, Burtec Waste Industries and CR&R Waste Services. One of these three companies will provide solid waste disposal services to the project site.</p> <p>Per page 5.16-15 of the FEIR for the City's 2025 General Plan, all non-hazardous solid waste collected is taken to the Robert A. Nelson Transfer Station, which is owned by the County of Riverside and operated under a 20-year franchise by a private company. Subsequently, waste is transferred to the Badlands Landfill for disposal. However, local trash haulers may dispose of collected waste at other County landfills in the area, such as the Lamb Canyon Landfill and El Sobrante landfill. All Riverside County landfills are Class III disposal sites permitted to receive non-hazardous municipal solid waste. Each of these three landfills is analyzed below in relation to their capacity and the amount of solid waste estimated to be generated by the proposed project.</p> <p>The El Sobrante Landfill is approximately 1,322 acres with 485 acres permitted for refuse disposal. It is permitted to receive a daily maximum of no more than 16,054 tons per day (TPD). It has a remaining capacity of 145,530,000 tons and is estimated to close in the year 2045.</p> <p>The Badlands Sanitary Landfill is approximately 278 acres with about 150 acres permitted for refuse disposal. It is permitted to receive a daily maximum of no more than 4,000 TPD. It has a remaining capacity of 14,730,025 cubic yards and is estimated to close in the year 2024.</p> <p>The Lamb Canyon Landfill is approximately 353 acres with approximately 144 acres permitted for refuse disposal. It is permitted to accept up to 3,000 TPD. It has a remaining capacity of 18,955,000 cubic yards and is estimated to close in the year 2021.</p> <p>Per FPEIR Table 5.16-M, Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area, multi-family residential has a generation factor of 7 pounds of solid waste per day, per dwelling unit. Using this generation factor, the proposed project, with 102 apartments (units) is estimated to generate 714 pounds of trash per day (102 units multiplied by 7 pounds). Thus, based on the information for the landfills provided above, the project will generate a fraction of each landfill's permitted capacity for solid waste each day and each of the three landfills has adequate capacity to accept the amount of solid waste generated by the proposed project. Thus, the proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact regarding each landfill's capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.</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>17g. Response: (Source: Cal Recycle History of California Solid Waste Law 2009 Website http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/Laws/Legislation/CalHist/1985to1989.htm Accessed March 2, 2012, http://www.riversideca.gov/trash/commercial.asp accessed March 5, 2012, and FPEIR General Plan 2025 City of Riverside)</p> <p>Assembly Bill 939, the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 requires each city or county plan to include an implementation schedule that shows diversion of 50 percent of all solid waste from landfill or transformation facilities by January 1, 2000, through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities (Cal Recycle History). Public Resources</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Code Section 41780 requires every city and county in the State to divert from landfills at least 50 percent of the quantity of waste generated within their jurisdiction in 2000. The Legislature amended this statute in 2000, requiring jurisdictions to sustain their waste diversion efforts into the future (FPEIR City of Huntington Beach 2025 General Plan, page 5.16-15).</p> <p>The City of Riverside has achieved a 60 percent diversion rate and the City remains committed to continuing its existing waste reduction and minimization efforts with the programs that are available through the City (FPEIR City of Huntington Beach 2025 General Plan, page 5.16-48). Public Works has instituted multi-family recycling programs through its authorized haulers. The City of Riverside has authorized commercial hauling services for the following companies: Athens Services, Burtec Waste Industries and CR&R Waste Services.</p> <p>The proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with any of the policies of the City of Riverside because it will comply with City requirements regarding solid waste disposal and the project site will be served by an authorized commercial hauling service. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated in this regard.</p>				
18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
<p>a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18a. Response: (Source: Figure OS-6 - Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-8 - MSHCP Cell Areas, MSHCP Conservation Report Summary Generator Website http://www.rctlma.org/online/content/rcip_report_generator.aspx Accessed February 23, 2012, MSHCP, General Plan 2025 -Figure OS-7 - MSHCP Cores and Linkage, General Plan 2025 - Figure OS-5 - Habitat Areas and Vegetation Communities and General Plan 2025 - Figure OS-6 - Stephen's Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP))</p>				
<p>The project does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment. As described in responses 4a through 4f above, the project will not 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. Additionally, as described in responses 5a through 5d above, with mitigation, the project will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Therefore, less than significant impacts are anticipated.</p>				
<p>b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18b. Response: (Source: FPEIR Section 6 - Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)</p>				
<p>As discussed in the threshold questions for sections 1-17 above, after mitigation, this project would not result in any significant project level environmental impacts. None of the project’s impacts would be cumulatively considerable; however, long term cumulative impacts resulting from buildout of the City of Riverside, pursuant to the City’s 2025 General</p>				

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Plan have resulted in unavoidable significant impacts. Those significant impacts were identified and evaluated in the EIR prepared for the City's 2025 General Plan (FPEIR, Section 6), and City-wide mitigation measures apply to all developmental projects. The City of Riverside continues to implement objectives, policies, and programs to reduce those significant impacts. This project would not result in any new or more severe significant cumulative impacts above and beyond those identified in the General Plan.</p>				
<p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>18c. Response: (<i>Source: project description and plans</i>)</p> <p>The project includes various design features and commitments that, together with compliance with standard codes and regulations, would reduce potentially adverse impacts on human beings to a less than significant level.</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 Measures

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Aesthetics	MM AES-1 Construction equipment staging areas shall use appropriate screening (i.e., temporary fencing with opaque material) to buffer views of construction equipment and material, and stockpiled soil.	During project construction	Planning Division Building & Safety Division	During City project inspections.
Aesthetics	MM AES- 2: To further reduce impacts related to light pollution, the City shall require at the time of issuance of building permits all development which introduces light sources, or modifications to existing light sources, to have shielding devices or other light pollution limiting characteristics such as hoods or lumen restrictions.	Prior to issuance of building permits for individual projects.	Planning Division Building & Safety Division	Site Plan Review and Issuance of Building Permits.
Agriculture & Forest Resources	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Air Quality	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Biological Resources	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Cultural Resources	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Geology & Soils	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

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

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Green-house Gas Emissions	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall prepare a Soil Management Plan to develop procedures to deal with the TPHd-bearing soil prior to/during redevelopment activities.	Prior to issuance of a building permit.	Planning Division and Building and Safety Division	City review of the Soil Management Plan
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	MM HAZ-2 If the project is approved by the City of Riverside, the CRWQCB shall be notified of the proposed change in land use and redevelopment plans.	City approval of the proposed project.	Planning Division	Upon project approval the CRWQCB shall be notified.
Hydrology/ Water Quality	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Land Use/ Planning	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Mineral Resources	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Noise	MM NOI-1 All construction equipment shall use available noise suppression devices and properly maintained mufflers. All internal combustion engines used in the project area shall be equipped with the type of muffler recommended by the vehicle manufacturer. In addition, all equipment shall be maintained in good mechanical condition to minimize noise created by faulty or poorly maintained engine, drive train, and other components.	During project construction.	Planning Division and Building & Safety Division	During City project inspections

Impact Category	Mitigation Measures	Implementation Timing	Responsible Monitoring Party¹	Monitoring/Reporting Method
Noise	MM NOI-2 During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive noise receptors and as far as possible from the boundary of the sensitive use.	During project construction.	Planning Division and Building & Safety Division	During City project inspections
Population/Housing	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Public Services	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Recreation	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Transportation	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Utilities & Service Systems	No mitigation measures are required.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable