1. **Case Number:** P13-0785 (Conditional Use Permit) & P13-0787 (Design Review)

2. **Project Title:** Grace Community Church Expansion

3. **Hearing Date:** January 23, 2014

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

5. **Contact Person:** Gustavo González, AICP
   **Phone Number:** (951) 826-5277
   **Email:** ggonzalez@riversideca.gov

6. **Project Location:** 4247-4313 Van Buren Boulevard, situated on the easterly side of Van Buren Boulevard, northerly of California Avenue

7. **Project Applicant/Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**
   **Applicant**
   Eric Scheck
   Van Daele Development Corp.
   2900 Adams Street, C-25
   Riverside, CA 92504

   **Owner**
   Pastor Brian Smith
   Grace Community Church
   4247 Van Buren Boulevard
   Riverside, CA 92503

8. **General Plan Designation:** C – Commercial and MHDR – Medium High Density Residential

9. **Zoning:** CG-S-1-X - Commercial General, Single-story and Building Setback Overlay Zones and R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential Zone

10. **Description of Project:**

    The applicant is requesting approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Design Review to allow for a proposed church expansion, consisting of the construction of a new 11,074 square-foot sanctuary building, a 1,092 square-foot detached garage structure and a 232-space surface parking lot on five contiguous parcels totaling approximately 3.43 acres, developed with two single-family residences and an existing 16,885 square foot church facility. The project also includes complete upgrades to the entire project site including an approximately 6,500 square-foot outdoor patio with decorative paving and landscape planters, covered
walkway trellises, decorative fencing along the perimeter and a comprehensive planting plan that includes numerous shade and accent trees throughout the project site.

To minimize interruptions to church services and activities, the project is proposed to be development in two phases. Phase One includes demolition of the two on-site single-family residences and existing parking areas and construction of the proposed surface parking lot. Phase Two will commence immediately upon completion of Phase One and includes construction of the sanctuary building, garage structure, outdoor patio and complete landscape and fencing upgrades.

The new sanctuary building is proposed to contain 404 fixed seats and a raised platform in the main hall area, a large lobby, two counseling rooms, nursery area, parents’ room, green room and restrooms. An arcade walkway is proposed along the west and north elevation of the sanctuary building, connecting to the main entrance of the existing church facility. The new garage structure is proposed to contain three parking spaces to be used for church vehicles only. The new sanctuary building, garage structure and outdoor patio have all been designed to integrate with and complement the existing church facility.

Access to the site will be provided via two, 24-foot wide driveways with sliding security gates providing ingress and egress access along Van Buren Boulevard. The site is proposed to be secured by a six-foot high tubular steel fence with stucco pilaster and decorative cap along the street frontage and a six-foot high combination precision/split-face block wall along the interior property lines of the site.

Upon completion of Phase Two, the existing church facility, located along the southerly property line of the site, will continue to be used as a fellowship hall for meetings, receptions, offices, bible studies and Sunday school. No exterior changes are proposed to this building at this time. The applicant has also indicated that the existing church facility will not be used for religious services.

As proposed, the expanded church facility will operate under the following schedule:

- **Sundays**: Worship services from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. for a maximum of 800 parishioners in total. Infrequently, church service would also be provided on Sunday nights for approximately 50 parishioners.

- **Monday Nights**: Small bible studies group for adults only from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. for approximately 20 parishioners.

- **Wednesday Mornings**: Small bible studies group for children and adults from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. for approximately 20 parishioners.

- **Wednesday Evenings**: Large bible studies group for children and adults from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. for approximately 250 parishioners.

- **Thursday Evenings**: Small bible studies group for adults only from 6:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. for approximately 30 parishioners.

- **Friday Evenings**: Small bible studies group for adults only from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. for approximately 10 parishioners.

- **Saturdays**: Various activities and events for all ages for approximately 50 parishioners.
According to the applicant, the greatest concentration of persons is expected on Sundays between 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m. for two services with approximately 400 parishioners attending each service. Each service is expected to last one hour and 15 minutes with an interval of 30 minutes between each service. As indicated above, the remainder of the week includes smaller groups primarily gathering in the evenings with the largest group (approximately 250 parishioners) gathering on Wednesday evenings. With the proposed expansion, it is anticipated that the church will employ 4 full-time employees who will primarily work during the regular office hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 6 part-time employees who will work at various times including evenings and weekends.

11. Surrounding land uses and setting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Site</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>C – Commercial and MHDR – Medium High Density Residential</td>
<td>CG-S-1-X – Commercial General, Single-story and Building Setback Overlay Zones and R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Manufactured Home Community and Single Family Residential</td>
<td>MHDR – Medium High Density Residential and MDR – Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Manufactured Home Community</td>
<td>MDR – Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>R-1-7000 – Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Animal Hospital</td>
<td>C – Commercial</td>
<td>CR – Commercial Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West (across Van Buren Blvd)</td>
<td>Grocery Store</td>
<td>C – Commercial</td>
<td>CR-S-2 – Commercial Retail, Two-story Overlay Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

   a. None

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

   a. General Plan 2025
   b. GP 2025 FPEIR
   c. Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by IW Consulting Engineers, Inc. dated December 2013
   d. Soils Investigation prepared by John R. Byerly, Inc. dated August 5, 2013
   e. Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. dated October 8, 2013

14. Acronyms

   AICUZ - Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study
   AQMP - Air Quality Management Plan
   AUSD - Alvord Unified School District
   CEQA - California Environmental Quality Act
   CMP - Congestion Management Plan
   EIR - Environmental Impact Report
   EMWD - Eastern Municipal Water District
EOP - Emergency Operations Plan
FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency
FPEIR - GP 2025 Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report
GIS - Geographic Information System
GhG - Green House Gas
GP 2025 - General Plan 2025
IS - Initial Study
LHMP - Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
MARB/MIP - March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port
MJPA-JLUS - March Joint Powers Authority - Joint Land Use Study
MSHCP - Multiple-Species Habitat Conservation Plan
MVUSD - Moreno Valley Unified School District
NCCP - Natural Communities Conservation Plan
OEM - Office of Emergency Services
OPR - Office of Planning & Research, State
PEIR - Program Environmental Impact Report
PW - Public Works, Riverside
RCALUC - Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission
RCALUCP - Riverside County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
RCP - Regional Comprehensive Plan
RCTC - Riverside County Transportation Commission
RMC - Riverside Municipal Code
RPD - Riverside Police Department
RPU - Riverside Public Utilities
RTIP - Regional Transportation Improvement Plan
RTP - Regional Transportation Plan
RUSD - Riverside Unified School District
SCAG - Southern California Association of Governments
SCAQMD - South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCH - State Clearinghouse
SKR-HCP - Stephens’ Kangaroo Rat - Habitat Conservation Plan
SWPPP - Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
USGS - United States Geologic Survey
WMWD - Western Municipal Water District
WQMP - Water Quality Management Plan
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signature ___________________________ Date ____________________

Printed Name & Title ___________________________ For City of Riverside
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
### ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 1. AESTHETICS.
Would the project:

- **a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

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

  The project consists of an infill project within an urbanized area completely surrounded by existing development where there are no scenic vistas and where direct, indirect and cumulative impacts to scenic vistas are **less than significant impacts**. The project will serve to enhance and augment the aesthetic qualities of the surrounding area by providing superior architectural and aesthetic enhancements to the site as well as additional streetscape improvements such as curb, gutter and landscaping where minimal to no landscaping exists.

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

  **1b. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.1-1 – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Parkways, Table 5.1-A – Scenic and Special Boulevards, Table 5.1-B – Scenic Parkways, the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)*

  There are no scenic highways within the City that could potentially be impacted. Further, there are no rock outcroppings or historic buildings within view of this proposed project so no impacts to these resources are expected. However, the proposed project is located along Van Buren Boulevard, a scenic, parkway and special boulevard as designated by the City’s General Plan 2025. With implementation of the General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with the conditions of approval, Citywide Design Guidelines and the City’s Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual, scenic resources will be protected and even enhanced. Lastly, the Zoning Code regulates building setbacks, building heights, land uses, landscaping, parking and other development standards for use and development of all properties. The proposed project complies with these standards without the need for any variances to these standards. Therefore, any potential adverse direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from this project will be **less than significant impact**.

  **c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

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

  The proposed project consists of an infill project for the expansion of Grace Community Church, which is completely surrounded by existing development. The project, consisting of a new sanctuary and related surface parking lot, has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding area. Therefore, it will not degrade the existing visual character of the area and **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to the visual character or quality of the Planning Area will occur.

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

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

  The site is not within the Mount Palomar Lighting Area and no new lighting is proposed under this project. **No impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur as a result of this project which would adversely affect day or nighttime views.
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information complied by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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))? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

2a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability & General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Appendix I – Designated Farmland Table)
The Project is located within an urbanized area. A review of Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability of the General Plan 2025 reveals that the project site is not designated as, and is not adjacent to or in proximity to any land classified as, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively to agricultural uses.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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))? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

2b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-3 - Williamson Act Preserves, General Plan 2025 FPEIR – Figure 5.2-4 – Proposed Zones Permitting Agricultural Uses, and Title 19)
A review of Figure 5.2-2 – Williamson Act Preserves of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR reveals that the project site is not located within an area that is affected by a Williamson Act Preserve or under a Williamson Act Contract. Moreover, the project site is not zoned for agricultural use and is not next to land zoned for agricultural use; therefore, the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively. The site is within a built environment and no Williamson Act contracts are implemented on the site. The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or any applicable Williamson Act contracts. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

2c. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)
The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland. Therefore, no impacts will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.
**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2d. Response: (Source: GIS Map – Forest Data)**
The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover nor does it have any timberland, therefore **no impacts** will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**2e. Response: (Source: General Plan – Figure OS-2 – Agricultural Suitability, Figure OS-3 – Williamson Act Preserves, Title 19 – Article V – Chapter 19.100 – Residential Zones – RC Zone and RA-5 Zone and GIS Map – Forest Data)**
The proposal to construct a new sanctuary and expand the parking lot to serve the existing Grace Community Church is located in an urbanized area of the City. Additionally, the site is identified as urban/built out land and therefore does not support agricultural resources or operations. The project will not result in the conversion of designated farmland to non-agricultural uses. In addition, there are no agricultural resources or operations, including farmlands within proximity of the subject site. The City of Riverside has no forest land that can support 10-percent native tree cover. Therefore, **no impacts** will occur from this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively to conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or to the loss of forest land.

**3. AIR QUALITY.**

| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**3a. Response: (Source: South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP))**
Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD’s AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TRIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) that are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.

| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

| potentially significant impact | less than significant with mitigation incorporated | less than significant impact | no impact |

3b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 AQMP, CalEEMod, EMFAC 2007 Model)

An Air Quality Model was conducted using CalEEMod. The results of the air quality model showed that the proposed project would generate emissions far lower than the SCAQMD thresholds for significance for air quality emissions and it was determined to be less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively to ambient air quality and will not contribute to an existing air quality violation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily Emissions (lbs./day)</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM-10</th>
<th>PM-2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Construction</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Y/N Threshold?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Daily Emissions (lbs./day)</th>
<th>ROG</th>
<th>NOx</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>SO2</th>
<th>PM-10</th>
<th>PM-2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD Daily Thresholds Operation</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Project - Emissions Operational</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds Y/N Threshold?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above tables compare the project emissions (short-term and long-term) to the SCAQMD daily thresholds and shows that established thresholds will not be exceeded. Therefore, because the project will not violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, and will be subject to further mitigation the impacts directly, indirectly and cumulatively will be less than significant impacts to ambient air quality and to contributing to an existing air quality violation.

c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

3c. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod)
Environmental Initial Study

ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2137 Model**

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

The portion of the Basin within which the City is located is designated as a non-attainment area for ozone, PM-10 and PM-2.5 under State standards, and as a non-attainment area for ozone, carbon monoxide, PM-10, and PM-2.5 under Federal standards. Because the proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, cumulative impacts related to criteria pollutants as a result of the project were previously evaluated as part of the cumulative analysis of build out anticipated under the General Plan 2025 Program. As a result, the proposed project does not result in any new significant impacts that were not previously evaluated and for which a statement of overriding considerations was adopted as part of the General Plan 2025 FPEIR. Therefore, cumulative air quality emissions impacts are less than significant.

3d. **Response:**

*Source: General Plan 2025 FPEIR Table 5.3-B SCAQMD CEQA Regional Significance Thresholds, South Coast Air Quality Management District’s 2007 Air Quality Management Plan, CalEEMod*

In conformance with the General Plan 2025 FPEIR MM AIR 1 and MM AIR 7 an CaLEEMod computer model analyzed long-term operational related impacts of the project and determined that the proposed project would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds for long-term operational impacts. Therefore, the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and a less than significant impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project.

3e. **Response:**

The project would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors because no odors are anticipated to be generated by the proposed use. Therefore, no impact to creating objectionable odors will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

4. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.**

Would the project:

4a. **Response:**

*Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area*

The project site is located within an urban built-up area and is surrounded by existing development. A search of the MSHCP database and other appropriate databases identified no potential for candidate, sensitive or special status species, suitable habitat for such species on site, Federal Species of Concern, California Species of Special Concern, and California Species Animal or Plants on lists 1-4 of the California Native plant Society (CNPS) Inventory. Thus there is little chance that any Federally endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats could persist in this area. Therefore, no impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively will occur to federally endangered threatened, or rare species or their habitats.

b. **Response:**

The project would not 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. Response:</td>
<td>(Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 - Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No wetland or riparian vegetation exists on the project site, as it is fully developed. Furthermore, the project site is located within an urban built-up area and contains existing development. Generally, the surrounding area has been developed for many years and a long history of severe disturbance exists in the area, such that there is little chance that any riparian habitat could have persisted. Therefore, <strong>no impact</strong> to any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with implementation of the proposed project will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c. Response:</td>
<td>(Source: City of Riverside GIS/CADME USGS Quad Map Layer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is located within an urban built-up area, contains existing development, and has a long history of severe disturbance such that the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Therefore, <strong>no impact</strong> will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d. Response:</td>
<td>(Source: MSHCP, General Plan 2025 –Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project site is not located within any MSHCP Criteria Cells, Cores, or Linkages. Further, the project site is significantly degraded and does not facilitate the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The project site is not used as a migratory wildlife corridor, nor does it qualify for use as a native wildlife nursery site. The project will result in <strong>no impact</strong> directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e. Response:</td>
<td>(Source: MSHCP, Title 16 Section 16.72.040 – Establishing the Western Riverside County MSHCP Mitigation Fee, Title 16 Section 16.40.040 – Establishing a Threatened and Endangered Species Fees, City of Riverside Urban Forest Tree Policy Manual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Plan 2025 includes policies to ensure that future development would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation polices. This project has been reviewed against these policies and found to be in compliance with the policies. For these reasons, the project will have <strong>no impact</strong> directly, indirectly and cumulatively local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

The project site is located on a previously developed/improved site within an urbanized area and will not impact an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan directly, indirectly and cumulatively. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** on the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

5. **CULTURAL RESOURCES.**

Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?
   - Response: **No**

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines?
   - Response: **No**

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
   - Response: **No**

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
   - Response: **No**

5a. Response: *(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas and Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code)*

The project is proposed on the Grace Community Church campus where no historic resources exist as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, including the existing single-family residences and related accessory structures proposed to be demolished or the existing church facility. The proposal involves constructing a sanctuary and surface parking lot expansion for the existing church on an already disturbed portion of the campus. Therefore, **no impacts** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to historical resources are expected.

5b. Response: *(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D – Cultural Resources Study)*

The project is located on a previously disturbed site within an urbanized area where no archeological and paleontological resources or human remains have been found or would be expected to exist. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to archeological and paleontological resources or human remains pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

5c. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 Policy HP-1.3)*

Please refer to Response 5b. above.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
   - Response: **No**

5d. Response: *(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity and Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity)*

Please refer to Response 5b. above.

6. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS.**

Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
   - i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning
      - Response: **No**
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

6i. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-1 – Regional Fault Zones & General Plan 2025 FPEIR Appendix E – Geotechnical Report)

Seismic activity is expected in Southern California. In the City of Riverside, there are no Alquist-Priolo zones. The project site does not contain any known fault lines and the potential for fault rupture or seismic shaking is low. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that no impacts related to strong seismic ground will occur directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

6ii. Response:

The San Jacinto Fault Zone located in the northeastern portion of the City, or the Elsinore Fault Zone, located in the southern portion of the City’s Sphere of Influence, have the potential to cause moderate to large earthquakes that would cause intense ground shaking. Because the proposed project will be required to comply with California Building Code regulations, impacts associated with strong seismic ground shaking will have less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

6iii. Response:

The project site is located in an area with very low potential for liquefaction as depicted in the General Plan 2025 Liquefaction Zones Map – Figure PS-2. Compliance with the California Building Code regulations will ensure that impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would have less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

6iv. Response:

The project site and its surroundings have generally flat topography and are not located in an area prone to landslides per Figure 5.6-1 of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR. Therefore, there will be no impacts related to landslides directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

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?

Thus, no impacts are expected as a result of this project.
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable. The preliminary soils report prepared for this project indicates that the soil is very low. Compliance with the recommendations of the soils report and applicable provisions of the City’s Subdivision Code- Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard. As such, the project will have **less than significant impact** resulting in a geologic unit or soil becoming unstable resulting in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☐ |

**6d. Response:** *(Source: 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, Appendix E – Geotechnical Report, and California Building Code as adopted by the City of Riverside and set out in Title 16 of the Riverside Municipal Code, Soils Investigation prepared by John R. Byerly, Inc. dated August 5, 2013)*

Expansive soil is defined under **California Building Code**. The soil type of the subject site is Cienega, Bonsall and Fallbrook (See Figure 5.64 – Soils of the General Plan 2025 Program Final PEIR.) The preliminary soils report prepared for this project indicates that the soil is very low. Compliance with the recommendations of the soils report and applicable provisions of the City’s Subdivision Code- Title 18 and the California Building Code with regard to soil hazards related to the expansive soils will be reduced to a **less than significant impact** level for this project directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

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

The proposed project will be served by sewer infrastructure. Therefore, the project will have **no impact**.
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.
Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? □ □ □ □

7a. Response:
The proposed project proposes to expand an existing church facility with a sanctuary and surface parking lot expansion to serve the existing Grace Community Church. As the project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, the project will not interfere with the State’s goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020 as stated in AB 32 and an 80 percent reduction in GhG emissions below 1990 levels by 2050 as stated in Executive Order S-3-05. Emissions resulting from the proposed project are expected to be far lower than the SCAQMD thresholds for significance. Therefore, this project will have less than significant impacts with respect to GHG emissions.

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

7b. Response:
Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since these forecast numbers were used by SCAG’s modeling section to forecast travel demand and air quality for planning activities such as the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the SCAQMD’s AQMP, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and the Regional Housing Plan. This project is consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) which are consistent with the General Plan 2025 “Typical Growth Scenario.” Since the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 it is also consistent with the AQMP. The project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively to the implementation of an air quality plan.

8. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.
Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? □ □ □ □

The proposed project does not involve the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material because the proposal constitutes an expansion of an existing church. As such, the project will have no impact related to the transport, use, or disposal of any hazardous material either directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? □ □ □ □

The proposed project does not involve the use of any hazardous materials. As such the project will have no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively for creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-
### ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8c. <strong>Response:</strong> <em>(Source: General Plan 2025 Public Safety and Education Elements, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.7-D - CalARP RMP Facilities in the Project Area, Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D RUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-3 AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E AUSD Schools, Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries, California Health and Safety Code, Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, California Building Code)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project does not involve any emission or handling of any hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing school because the proposed use is an assemblies of people use, therefore **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively related to this proposal.

| 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? | | | | | X |

| 8d. **Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-5 – Hazardous Waste Sites, GP 2025 FPEIR Tables 5.7-A – CERCLIS Facility Information, Figure 5.7-B – Regulated Facilities in TRI Information and 5.7-C – DTSC EnviroStor Database Listed Sites)* | | | | |

A review of hazardous materials site lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 found that the project site is not included on any such lists. Therefore, the project would have **no impact** to creating any significant hazard to the public or environment directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | X | | |

| 8e. **Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP and March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005)* | | | | |

The proposed project is located within Airport Compatibility Zone E as depicted on Figure 5.7-2 of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR for Riverside Municipal Airport as noted in the Riverside County Airport Land use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP). The project was reviewed by Planning staff to ensure that the project is consistent with the compatibility zone as well as in compliance with the land use standards in the RCALUP. Because the project has been found to be consistent with the RCALUCP, impacts related to hazards from airports are **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

| 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? | | | | | X |

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

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

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

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

The project will be served by an existing, improved street, Van Buren Boulevard, as well as a network of on-site parking lot drive aisles. All street, access points and drive aisles have been designed to meet the Public Works and Fire Departments’ specifications. Therefore, the project will have a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly and cumulatively to an emergency response or evacuation plan.
**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The proposed project is located in an urbanized area where no wildlands exist and the property is no located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone (VHFSZ) or adjacent to wildland areas or a VHFSZ; therefore **no impact** regarding wildland fires either directly, indirectly or cumulatively from this project will occur.

**9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.**

Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

**9a. Response:** *(Source: GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.8-A – Beneficial Uses Receiving Water and Project Specific Hydrology Study, Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by IW Consulting Engineers, Inc. dated December 2013)*

During the construction phase, a final approved WQMP will be required for the project, as well as coverage under the State’s General Permit for Construction Activities, administered by the Santa Ana RWQCB. Storm water management measures will be required to be implemented to effectively control erosion and sedimentation and other construction-related pollutants during construction. Given compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal laws regulating surface water quality and the fact that the project will not result in a net increase of surface water runoff, the proposed project as designed is anticipated to result in a **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to any water quality standards or waste discharge.

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)? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

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

The proposed project is located within the Riverside Water Service Area Water Supply Basin. This proposed project includes the construction of an approximately 11,074 square-foot sanctuary building and 232-stall surface parking lot. The project is required to connect to the City’s sewer system and comply with all NPDES and WQMP requirements that will ensure the proposed project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Therefore, there will be **no impact** to groundwater supplies and recharge either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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

**9c. Response:** *(Source: Preliminary grading plan, and Water Quality Management Plan, Project Specific Water Quality Management Plan prepared by IW Consulting Engineers, Inc. dated December 2013)*

The project is subject to NPDES requirements; areas of one acre or more of disturbance are subject to preparing and implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the prevention of runoff during construction. Erosion, siltation and other possible pollutants associated with long-term implementation of projects are addressed as part...
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The project site is not located within a 100 or 500-year flood plain. Underground storm drains and streets are designed to accommodate the 10-year storm flow from curb to curb, while 100-year storms are accommodated within street right-of-ways. The runoff from the site in a developed condition was analyzed at the time the site was developed to address off-site discharge is the same as the undeveloped condition. Therefore, no flooding on or off-site as a result of the project will occur and there will be no impacts directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

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? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☒ |


The project is over one acre in size and required to have coverage under the State’s General Permit for construction activities (SWPPP). As stated in the permit, during and after construction, best management practices (BMPs) will be implemented to reduce/eliminate adverse water quality impacts resulting from development. Furthermore, the City has ensured that the proposed development does not cause adverse water quality impacts, pursuant to its Municipal Separate Storm System (MS4) permit through the project’s WQMP. Thus, the project will have a less than significant impact directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☒ |


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

g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | ☐ | ☐ | ☑ | ☒ |

9g. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps)*

A review of National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0715G Effective Date August 28, 2008) and Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas of the General Plan Program FPEIR, shows that the project is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area. Further, the project does not involve the construction of housing. As such, there will be no impact caused by this project directly, indirectly or cumulatively as it will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

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

9h. Response: *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps)*

The project site is not located within or near a 100-year flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0715G Effective Date August 28, 2008). Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that...
### ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>would impede or redirect flood flows and no impact will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9i. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-4 – Flood Hazard Areas, and FEMA Flood Hazard Maps)*

The project site is not located within or near a flood hazard area as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas and the National Flood Insurance Rate Map (Map Number 06065C0715G Effective Date August 28, 2008) or subject to dam inundation as depicted on General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR Figure 5.8-2 – Flood Hazard Areas. Therefore, the project will not place a structure within a flood hazard or dam inundation area that would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam and therefore no impact directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The project site is not located near a hillside or body of water. Further, the City is not located in a coastal area. As such, no impacts due to seiching, tsunamis or mudflow will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

### 10. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10a. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design Element, Project site plan, City of Riverside GIS/CADME map layers)*

The existing church has existed at its current location for many years and has become an established part of the surrounding community. Additionally, the proposed project has been designed to be consistent with and fit into the pattern of development of existing buildings, parking, landscape, access, circulation and connectivity consistent with the General Plan 2025, Citywide Design Guidelines and in compliance with the requirements of the Zoning and Subdivision Codes. Therefore, the project impacts related to the community are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10b. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 17 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)*

The subject site is located within the boundaries of the MSHCP and has been previously analyzed for consistency with this Plan and it complies, as documented by staff. Furthermore, the project is also located within the boundaries of the RCALUCP and it has been designed to be consistent with this plan. Finally, the proposal was analyzed for consistency with the Zoning Code which contains site location criteria and site development standards to ensure that buildings would not create significant land use compatibility problems for surrounding existing or future uses. Application of these standards would ensure that the project would not have a detrimental impact on adjacent land uses. Although no variances are requested to implement the project as proposed, specific variances can be considered through review of the CUP. In the judgment of the Planning Division, the potential environmental impacts of any variances should be considered less than significant, given that a process for the consideration of variances is specified in the City’s Municipal Code. Based on the above-referenced information, the proposed Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a sanctuary building for the expansion of the Grace Community Church campus would have a less than significant impact and not conflict with any adopted plan, policy or regulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10c. Response:</th>
<th>(Source: General Plan 2025, General Plan 2025 – Figure LU-10 – Land Use Policy Map, Table LU-5 – Zoning/General Plan Consistency Matrix, Figure LU-7 – Redevelopment Areas, enter appropriate Specific Plan if one, Title 19 – Zoning Code, Title 18 – Subdivision Code, Title 7 – Noise Code, Title 17 – Grading Code, Title 20 – Cultural Resources Code, Title 16 – Buildings and Construction and Citywide Design and Sign Guidelines)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: See response 4f above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. MINERAL RESOURCES.
Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

11a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)
The project does not involve extraction of mineral resources. No mineral resources have been identified on the project site and there is no historical use of the site or surrounding area for mineral extraction purposes. The project site is not, nor is it adjacent to, a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated in the General Plan 2025, specific plan or other land use plan. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** on mineral resources directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

11b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure – OS-1 – Mineral Resources)
The GP 2025 FPEIR determined that there are no specific areas with the City of Sphere Area which have locally-important mineral resource recovery sites and that the implementation of the General Plan 2025 would not significantly preclude the ability to extract state-designated resources. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan 2025. Therefore, there is **no impact**.

12. NOISE.
Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

12a. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)
The proposed project does involve uses or activities that would increase ambient noise levels as the project involves the construction of a new sanctuary on an already developed site. However, the project will be required to comply with the City’s noise standards and compatibility matrix of the Noise Element (for both construction and operation related noise). Thus, **less than significant impacts** will result from this project.

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

12b. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, FPEIR Table 5.11-G – Vibration Source Levels For Construction Equipment, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report)
The proposed project does not involve uses or activities that would result in any exposure of persons to or generation of
excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. However, construction related activities although short term are the most common source of groundborne noise that could affect occupants of neighboring uses throughout the City. Compliance with the City’s Noise Code will reduce impacts to less than significant.

e. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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?

12c. Response: (Source: General Plan Figure N-1 – 2003 Roadway Noise, Figure N-2 – 2003 Freeway Noise, Figure N-3 – 2003 Railway Noise, Figure N-5 – 2025 Roadway Noise, Figure N-6 – 2025 Freeway Noise, Figure N-7 – 2025 Railroad Noise, Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contours, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, FPEIR Table 5.11-I – Existing and Future Noise Contour Comparison, Table 5.11-E – Interior and Exterior Noise Standards, Appendix G – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Title 7 – Noise Code)

Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, the City of Riverside does not have an established standard that ties a specific increase in ambient noise to a significance determination. Although the City relies on the noise compatibility matrix in the General Plan 2025 Noise Element (Figure N-10) to determine if a future development project will be subject to significant noise impacts, whether self-created or from the existing environment, this threshold related to ambient noise levels is not addressed by that approach. Per the GP 2025 FPEIR, the term “substantial,” as used in this threshold, is not defined in most environmental compliance guidelines. Noise analysis methodology is accurate only to the nearest whole decibel and most people only notice a change in the noise environment when the difference in noise levels are around 3 dB CNEL. An increase or decrease in noise level of at least 5 dBA is required before any noticeable change in community response would be expected. Therefore, a clearly perceptible increase (+5 dB) in noise exposure of sensitive receptors could be considered significant. However, a requirement to comply with the City’s Noise Code would result in less than significant impact.

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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?

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

The primary source of temporary or periodic noise associated with the proposed project is from construction activity and maintenance work. Construction noise typically involves the loudest common urban noise events associated with building demolition, grading, construction, large diesel engines, truck deliveries and hauling. Both the General Plan 2025 and Municipal Code Title 7 (Noise Code) limit construction activities to specific times and days of the week and during those specified times, construction activity is subject to the noise standards provided in the Title 7. Considering the short-term nature of construction and the provisions of the Noise Code, the temporary and periodic increase in noise levels due to the construction which may result from the project are considered less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

12e. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure N-8 – Riverside and Flabob Airport Noise Contours, Figure N-9 – March ARB Noise Contour, Figure N-10 – Noise/Land Use Noise Compatibility Criteria, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 200)

While the proposed project is located within Airport Compatibility Zone E as depicted on Figure 5.7-2 of the General Plan 2025 Program FPEIR for Riverside Municipal Airport as noted in the Riverside County Airport Land use Compatibility Plan (RCALUCP), it is not located within any of the airport noise contour areas as depicted on Figures N-8 and N-9 of the Noise Element of the General Plan 2025. For this reason, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to airport noise. Therefore, impacts will be less than significant directly, indirectly and cumulatively on people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>area to excessive noise levels?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING.

Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

The project is in an urbanized area and does not propose new homes or businesses that would directly induce substantial population growth, and does not involve the addition of new roads or infrastructure that would indirectly induce substantial population growth. Therefore, **no impacts** will result from this project.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

13b. Response: *(Source: CADME Land Use 2012 Layer)*

The project involves the redevelopment of an underutilized site and will displace existing housing as the project proposes to demolish two existing single-family residences. However, the displacement impact will be **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Program, which provides for adequate housing elsewhere throughout the City through such avenues as the establishment of three new mixed-use land use designations and one very high density land use designation throughout the City. Further, the project does not involve a General Plan amendment or rezoning from an existing residential land use designation to a non-residential designation or to a different residential designation that would lower residential densities planned for the site or that would result in the elimination of future housing units anticipated under the General Plan.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

13c. Response: *(Source: CADME Land Use 2012 Layer)*

Please refer to Response 13b.

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?
## ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14a. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.13-B – Fire Station Locations, Table 5.13-C – Riverside Fire Department Statistics and Ordinance 5948 § 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City of Riverside Fire Department’s major facilities include 13 fire stations located throughout the City, administration/prevention offices and a training center. The closest Fire Station (Station 2) is located approximately 0.85 miles from the site at 9450 Andrew Street. Therefore, the project can be adequately served by the Fire Protection Agency. The project will be required to comply with the requirements of the City Fire Department and the Uniform Fire Code. Overall, the project, which will result in an incremental additional demand for public services, is consistent with the adopted General Plan, which provides for adequate public services. Therefore less than significant impacts will result from implementation of this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-8 – Neighborhood Policing Centers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project consists of the expansion of an existing church facility. Adequate police facilities and services are provided by the Central Neighborhood Policing Center to serve this project. In addition, CPTED principles will be applied to the project to ensure greater security and crime prevention through design. With implementation of CPTED principles, General Plan 2025 policies, compliance with existing codes and standards, and through Police Department practices, there will be less than significant impacts on the demand for additional police facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c. Response: (Source: FPEIR Figure 5.13-2 – RUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-D – RUSD, Figure 5.13-3 – AUSD Boundaries, Table 5.13-E – AUSD, Table 5.13-G – Student Generation for RUSD and AUSD By Education Level, and Figure 5.13-4 – Other School District Boundaries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is a non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase numbers of school age children. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional school facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14d. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Parks Master Plan 2003, GP 2025 FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is a non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population. Therefore, there will be no impact on the demand for additional park facilities or services either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project is a non-residential use and will not involve the addition of housing units resulting in any increase population. Therefore, no impact related to demand for public facilities will result from the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 15. RECREATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PR-1 – Parks, Open Spaces and Trails, Table PR-4 – Park and Recreation Facilities, Figure CCM-6 – Master plan of Trails and Bikeways, Parks Master Plan 2003, FPEIR Table 5.14-A – Park and Recreation Facility Types, and Table 5.14-C – Park and Recreation Facilities Funded in the Riverside Renaissance Initiative, Table 5.14-D – Inventory of Existing Community Centers, Riverside Municipal Code Chapter 16.60 - Local Park Development Fees, Bicycle Master Plan May 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Levels</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The project is a non-residential use that will not involve the addition of any housing units that would increase the population and, thus, increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities. Therefore, there will be **no impact** on the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities either directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**15b. Response:**
The project will not include new recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, there will be **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

### 16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.

**Would the project result in:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Levels</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**16a. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP, Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. dated October 8, 2013)*

The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Densities. Further, the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared for the project concluded that the intersection of Van Buren Boulevard and California Avenue as well as the two proposed driveways along Van Buren Boulevard will operate at a LOS C or better when the project has been fully constructed and operating, and no improvements are recommended. Therefore, the increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is **less than significant** directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☒ |

**16b. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure CCM-4 – Master Plan of Roadways, FPEIR Figure 5.15-4 – Volume to Capacity (V/C) Ratio and Level of Service (LOS) (Typical 2025), Table 5.15-D – Existing and Future Trip Generation Estimates, Table 5.15-H – Existing and Typical Density Scenario Intersection Levels of Service, Table 5.15-I – Conceptual General Plan Intersection Improvement Recommendations, Table 5.15-J – Current Status of Roadways Projected to Operate at LOS E or F in 2025, Table 5.15-K – Freeway Analysis Proposed General Plan, Appendix H – Circulation Element Traffic Study and Traffic Study Appendix, SCAG’s RTP, Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. dated October 8, 2013)*

The roadway capacity of Van Buren Boulevard, a principal arterial within Riverside County’s Congestion Management Program (CMP), is adequate to accommodate the projected traffic volumes of the proposed project. Further, the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared for the project concluded that the intersection of Van Buren Boulevard and California Avenue as well as the two proposed driveways along Van Buren Boulevard will operate at a LOS C or better when the project has been fully constructed and operating, and no improvements are recommended. As such, the project is consistent...
### ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

with the CMP and an increase in traffic in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system is **less than significant** directly, indirectly and cumulatively.

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?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

**16c. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PS-6 – Airport Safety Zones and Influence Areas, RCALUCP, March Air Reserve Base/March Inland Port Comprehensive Land Use Plan (1999), Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for March Air Reserve Base (August 2005))*

The proposed project is located in Zone E of RCALUCP for Riverside Municipal Airport and has been designed to be consistent with this plan. The project will not change air traffic patterns, increase air traffic levels or change the location of air traffic patterns. As such, this project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively on air traffic patterns.

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**16d. Response:** *(Source: Project Site Plan, Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. dated October 8, 2013)*

The project will take access from two proposed driveways along Van Buren Boulevard. Traffic flow and sight lines for the ingress/egress point have been analyzed by the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the project and no improvements are recommended. As well, the project has been designed so as not to cause any incompatible use or additional or any hazards to the surrounding area or general public. Thus, this project will have a **less than significant impact** on increasing hazards through design or incompatible uses directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |


The project has been developed in compliance with Title 18, Section 18.210.030 and the City’s Fire Code Section 503 (California Fire Code 2007), therefore, there will be **less than significant impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively to emergency access.

f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**16f. Response:** *(Source: FPEIR, General Plan 2025 Land Use and Urban Design, Circulation and Community Mobility and Education Elements, Bicycle Master Plan, School Safety Program – Walk Safe – Drive Safe!)*

The project, as designed, does not create conflicts with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks). As such, the project will have **no impact** directly, indirectly or cumulatively on adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

### 17. UTILITIES AND SYSTEM SERVICES.

Would the project:

| ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

**17a. Response:** *(Source: General Plan 2025 Figure PF-2 – Sewer Facilities Map, FPEIR Figure 5.16-5 – Sewer Service Areas, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Table 5.16-L - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the Planning Area Served by WMWD, Figure 5.8-1 – Watersheds, Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)*

All new development is required to comply with all provisions of the NPDES program and the City’s Municipal Separate Sewer Permit (MS4), as enforced by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB with respect to discharges to the sewer system or stormwater system within the City. Because the proposed project is required to adhere to the above regulations related to wastewater treatment the project will have a **less than significant** impact.
**ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17b. Response:</td>
<td>(Source: General Plan 2025 Table PF-1 – RPU PROJECTED DOMESTIC WATER Supply (AC-FT/YR), Table PF-2 – RPU Projected Water Demand, RPU, FPEIR Table 5.16-G – General Plan Projected Water Demand for RPU Including Water Reliability for 2025, Table 5.16-K - Estimated Future Wastewater Generation for the City of Riverside’s Sewer Service Area, Figure 5.16-4 – Water Facilities and Figure 5.16-6 – Sewer Infrastructure and Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project will not result in the construction of new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 where future water and wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-E, 5.16-F, 5.16-G, 5.16-H, 5.16-I, 5.16-J and 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). As part of the General Plan 2025 Program, to mitigate potential impacts related to the need for expanded entitlements for water and wastewater treatment plant capacity if population growth exceeds the Typical Project level, the City will review population and development trends with respect to water sources and supply and wastewater treatment plant capacity in 2015 and 2020 to assure growth is occurring as expected under the Typical Project development scenario. **No impacts** will result from this project.
ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wastewater Integrated Master Plan and Certified EIR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of (Regional Water Quality Control Board). The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Growth Scenario where future wastewater generation was determined to be adequate (see Table 5.16-K of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Further, the current Wastewater Treatment Master Plan anticipates and provides for this type of project. Therefore, no impact to wastewater treatment directly, indirectly or cumulatively will occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

17f. Response: (Source: FPEIR Table 5.16-A – Existing Landfills and Table 5.16-M – Estimated Future Solid Waste Generation from the Planning Area)

The project is consistent with the General Plan 2025 Typical Build-out Project level where future landfill capacity was determined to be adequate (see Tables 5.16-A and 5.16-M of the General Plan 2025 Final PEIR). Therefore, no impact to landfill capacity will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

17g. Response: (Source: California Integrated Waste Management Board 2002 Landfill Facility Compliance Study)

The California Integrated Waste Management Act under the Public Resource Code requires that local jurisdictions divert at least 50% of all solid waste generated by January 1, 2000. The City is currently achieving a 60% diversion rate, well above State requirements. In addition, the California Green Building Code requires all developments to divert 50% of non-hazardous construction and demolition debris for all projects and 100% of excavated soil and land clearing debris for all non-residential projects beginning January 1, 2011. The proposed project must comply with the City’s waste disposal requirements as well as the California Green Building Code and as such would not conflict with any Federal, State, or local regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impacts related to solid waste statutes will occur directly, indirectly or cumulatively.

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or an endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

18a. Response: (Source: General Plan 2025 – Figure OS-6 – Stephen’s Kangaroo Rat (SKR) Core Reserve and Other Habitat Conservation Plans (HCP), Figure OS-7 – MSHCP Cores and Linkages, Figure OS-8 – MSHCP Cell Areas, General Plan 2025 FPEIR Figure 5.4-2 – MSHCP Area Plans, Figure 5.4-4 - MSHCP Criteria Cells and Subunit Areas, Figure 5.4-6 – MSHCP Narrow Endemic Plant Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-7 – MSHCP Criteria Area Species Survey Area, Figure 5.4-8 – MSHCP Burrowing Owl Survey Area, MSHCP Section 6.1.2 Protection of Species Associated with Riparian/Riverine Areas and Vernal Pools, FPEIR Table 5.5-A Historical Districts and Neighborhood Conservation Areas, Figure 5.5-1 - Archaeological Sensitivity, Figure 5.5-2 - Prehistoric Cultural Resources Sensitivity, Appendix D, Title 20 of the Riverside Municipal Code. See responses in Sections 4 (Biological Resources) and 5 (Cultural Resources). Information contained in this initial study supports the conclusion that the proposed project will not result in the degradation of environmental resources. Therefore, no impacts will result from this project.

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 ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES (AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**18b. Response:** *(Source: FPEIR Section 6 – Long-Term Effects/ Cumulative Impacts for the General Plan 2025 Program)*

Because the project is consistent with the General Plan 2025, no new cumulative impacts are anticipated and therefore cumulative impacts of the proposed project beyond those previously considered in the GP 2025 FPEIR are **less than significant**.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**18c. Response:** *(Source: FPEIR Section 5 – Environmental Impact Analysis for the General Plan 2025 Program)*

Effects on human beings were evaluated as part of the aesthetics, air quality, hydrology & water quality, noise, population and housing, hazards and hazardous materials, and traffic sections of this initial study and found to be less than significant for each of the above sections. Based on the analysis and conclusions in this initial study, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects, directly or indirectly to human beings. Therefore, potential direct and indirect impacts on human beings that result from the proposed project are **less than significant**.

---